

missions presented abroad by the Department of Labor, and trade missions organized and sent overseas by the Department of Commerce.

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 6, 1972.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, before moving to adjourn, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 11:30 a.m. After the two leaders have been recognized under the standing order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements limited therein to 3 minutes, at the conclusion of which the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, H.R. 12910, an act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

At the time the unfinished business is laid before the Senate, the pending question will be on the adoption of amendment No. 956, by the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH). The vote on that

amendment and any amendments thereto will occur at no later than 4 o'clock p.m. tomorrow. There is an agreement limiting time on amendments in the second degree, motions, and appeals, to 30 minutes.

There will be rollcall votes tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:30 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 2:35 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 7, 1972, at 11:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TEAR THAT MOUNTAIN DOWN

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I include the text of an article appearing in the New York Times of January 19, 1972, under the headline "Tear That Mountain Down!" at this point in the RECORD:

TEAR THAT MOUNTAIN DOWN!

(By Robert Lasch)

TUCSON, ARIZ.—Since I came West in the Spring, I have been watching the progressive growth of a great white scar on the face of the Santa Rita Mountains south of here.

The scar marks the site of a new limestone quarry. Beginning as a small blemish, scarcely distinguishable from natural rock, it has now expanded into a pallid, ugly blotch on the serene mountain landscape. Zigzag roads slash up the slopes beside it. As the crusher machinery grinds on and trucks haul away limestone to the copper mines and cement plants, there is no longer any doubt that some day we shall wake up to find one of the Santa Rita peaks missing.

Well, the quarry operator promised as much. Responding to complaints in a fit of imprudent candor, he said, according to The Green Valley News, "We'll tear down that whole mountain if we can sell the limestone."

Tearing down a mountain would be bad enough if the man owned it, but the Santa Ritas, being part of the Coronado National Forest, happen to belong to the American people. If a limestone quarry can arrogantly invade the public domain without so much as a tip of the hat to its proprietors, so can the copper mines which have already despoiled the ranges to the west of the Santa Cruz valley, and so can any other extractive industry with a mind to.

Several miles south of the limestone quarry, in fact, silver miners have recently announced their intention of bulldozing a road across National Forest land to open up diggings in Madera Canyon. Forest Service officials rightly fear these operations could upset the delicate ecological balance of one of the nation's finest bird sanctuaries.

All this goes back to an absurd relic of the

robber baron era, the still surviving Mining Act of 1872, which permits any citizen to stake a mining claim on public lands and to exploit the claim as he pleases.

I suppose nobody much minded such a grant of private power over public property in 1872. There were few people and wide reaches of empty land in the West then. Today the eight mountain states, though sparsely settled by comparison with the rest of the country, harbor 25 times as many residents as they did a hundred years ago, and annually entertain a huge influx of travelers seeking temporary refuge from the seething cities. People as well as minerals now demand consideration. It is time they got it.

Somehow I do not think they are about to, certainly not in the Nixon Administration. In 1970, a commission which had studied the public land laws since its appointment by the Johnson Administration brought in a voluminous report which, while it is said to contain some worthy features, proposed to perpetuate the outrageous and nearly absolute preference for mining over all other possible uses of the public lands. Invoking the great American standard of living and blowing the tired bugles of national defense, the commission urged only minor revisions in the 1872 law, and actually suggested, in case of "national emergency," mineral exploration in the National Parks, which have hitherto been excluded from the bulldozer's track.

Representative Wayne N. Aspinall of Colorado has introduced a bill embodying these weaseling recommendations, and with his power as chairman of the House Public Lands Committee stands in excellent position to push it through. The exploiters of public land have no better friend.

Fortunately, the commission report included a dissent by four of its nineteen members, among them Representative Morris K. Udall of Arizona, regarded by the mining industry as the *enfant terrible* of the West. Udall has introduced his own bill which would substitute for free and easy usurpation of public lands a system of mineral leasing similar to that in effect since 1920 for gas and oil.

As the fragrant memory of Teapot Dome reminds us, leasing offers no certain guarantee of protecting the public interest when lessors connive with lessees. But Udall's bill would at least lodge mining decisions with respect to the people's property in public

rather than private hands. It would require the decision-makers to take into account competing land uses of possibly greater social values, and to have a care for the protection of the environment.

Some eccentrics, I do not doubt, might even say there is a public interest in preserving mountains just to look at.

CELLER ANNOUNCES HEARINGS ON FAMILY FARM ACT

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, increased vertical integration in the agriculture industry has accelerated a concentration of economic power that requires congressional attention.

A million farms are eliminated every 10 years, and farmers are currently going out of business at the rate of 2,000 per week. At the same time, there has arisen the conglomerate farmer, corporations which own or control food production, food processing, and food marketing. The goal of these corporations has been expressed as "integration from seedling to supermarket."

The Congress is in need of much information regarding the competitive effects of these new agricultural conglomerates. Attention must be focused upon the benefits and the dangers inherent in these new structures. I am pleased, therefore, to announce that the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary will, on March 22, 23, and 29, 1972, begin hearings on H.R. 11654, the Family Farm Act. The hearings will be held in Room 2141, Rayburn House Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m.

Persons interested in offering testimony or submitting statements for the RECORD should contact subcommittee counsel at 225-4853, or write to the committee.

TROUBLES IN THE DOMINICAN
REPUBLIC

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Stephen E. Johnson, a constituent, recently wrote me of his experiences in and concerns about the Dominican Republic. His letter follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
February 5, 1972.

Representative DON FRASER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRASER: Although I know you have many demands on your time, I am writing in hopes that you might find a moment to spare for a matter of some concern to me.

Last summer my wife and I visited the Dominican Republic, where I served as a Peace Corps volunteer from 1967 to 1969. Visiting the community (Naranjo Dulce, just out of the city of San Francisco de Macoris) where I had worked as a rural community development officer, we found that many of the community leaders and some of the teenage boys had been jailed on various pretexts and then beaten or otherwise tortured by the police and the military. One leader, a friend of mine by the name of Maximo de la Cruz, had just been released from jail, where he had been held for nine days, and he showed us six deep gouges on his abdomen, made by a wire-wrapped stick, and his back, which was swollen and purple from beatings. It was particularly shocking to me to see what had happened to this man, as he had been the primary supporter of a school-building project in the community—a project underwritten by an agency of the Dominican government.

He was not a political leader; he owned one of the two or three small businesses in the community and was widely respected. Yesterday I received a letter from a friend informing me that Maximo de la Cruz was killed ("they killed him," says the letter) on Christmas Day. I do not have any details, and may not get them (although I have written for more information) since the community is no doubt in an even greater state of fear and intimidation now than it was in July.

At that time a man who had been one of my co-workers in the government's rural community development agency (ODC) (and who is scarcely an alarmist, much less a radical) told me that the country was in a worse state than it had ever been under Trujillo. People were "disappearing" every day. The various branches of the police and the armed forces, he said, were completely out of the control of responsible civilian leaders (including President Juan Balaguer) and were using their unchecked powers in destroying what little effective community organization exists in the Republic. When we returned to the capital, we talked with a political officer in the American embassy, but he did not seem particularly concerned.

I know that in the face of the wide-scale atrocities being carried out in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Pakistan, and elsewhere what is happening in the Dominican Republic may be relatively insignificant to the United States. Yet anyone who has studied U.S.-Dominican relations cannot fail to see that the U.S. has played a rather special role in the creation and maintenance of the regimes which have controlled the Republic since the earliest years of this century. For good or ill, our decidedly paternal role has had an enormous influence—to a

degree that many knowledgeable Dominicans claim, with no little apparent validity, that the country is governed from the U.S. embassy.

Be that as it may, it is clear that we have contributed many millions of dollars in an attempt to achieve the Republic's economic (and thus, political) stability. There is a measure of stability in the country today; you can see how it's achieved by walking down any street or driving along a rural road—the police and the army occupy every corner, while the countryside is roamed by the dreaded "patrullas" (patrols). For the great majority of people in the Dominican Republic stability means repression and fear. Our support, well-intentioned or not, is buying a resentment and hatred for this country that can only add to the distrust that is already the norm among the educated and the less fortunate populations of Latin America.

Our present administration appears to be taking a "benign neglect" stance towards Latin America. I don't expect much sympathy from it. But isn't there something we of the loyal opposition might do in order to at least bring some pressure to bear on Dr. Balaguer's government to stop the killing? Would it be worth asking sympathetic members of various congressional committees dealing with foreign relations or foreign aid to question the nature of the government we support in Santo Domingo? Or is there some way we could indicate to the Dominican Ambassador that some Americans are concerned about the abrogation of civil rights and the political killings in his country? In short, is there anything we can do?

I plan to write other political and government people and explore additional channels through which I might stir up support for those Dominicans who have few means of defending themselves, but because I feel I can get the most sympathetic hearing and advice from you, I am sending this letter ahead of the others. I do feel very pessimistic about changing the situation but am bound and determined to do what I can. If there is anything you can do or suggest that I might do, I'd be most grateful.

Let me take this opportunity to express my wife's and my appreciation for your work; we are proud to have you as our representative.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN E. JOHNSON.

I also include with these remarks a letter concerning the Dominican Republic recently received from the State Department and an Evening Star article dated February 16, 1972. The Star article is about Gen. Neit Nivar Seijas, chief of the DR national police.

The letter and article follow:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1972.
Hon. DONALD M. FRASER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRASER: Thank you for your letter of February 10, 1972, in which you request information concerning the reported death of Maximo de la Cruz in the Dominican Republic and concerning the present political situation there. We have requested our Embassy in Santo Domingo to provide us with any available information regarding de la Cruz and will forward it to you when it is received.

As regards the political situation, the Dominican Republic appears currently to be enjoying a degree of public tranquility which is almost unprecedented in recent years. Buoyed by a substantial US sugar quota under the 1971 amendments to the Sugar Act and high prices in the world sugar market, the Dominican economy is expanding and

the business sector is confident. There are no serious challenges to the Dominican Government's authority at the present time, and we foresee none barring a sudden and unexpected change in the present circumstances.

With specific reference to your interest in civil liberties, you may be aware of the operations of "La Banda" from April to October of last year. "La Banda" was a gang of thugs which constituted itself, apparently with some covert police support, as an "anti-Communist" band and carried out a number of excesses against members of opposition parties as well as against non-political individuals who had incurred "La Banda's" wrath for one reason or another.

Dominican public concern with "La Banda's" activities grew during the summer of 1971 and the same type of concern was expressed abroad. In a dramatic gesture in October, President Balaguer appointed a new police chief and ordered him to put a stop to "La Banda's" activities. "La Banda" was effectively suppressed at that time and has not been revived since.

Although violence is endemic in the Dominican Republic, the level of violence from whatever quarter has been remarkably low since the demise of "La Banda". There was a violent confrontation in early January between the security forces and a small Communist band, which had reportedly robbed a bank late last year, which left the four Communists and eight police and military dead. Other than this incident, there have been no significant acts of violence in 1972.

There is not a severe civil liberties problem at the present time. The press is free and independent, and there has even been recent support among both government and opposition elements for the "legalization" of the Communist parties. From time to time in the past we have heard of incidents of harassment of opposition parties in the countryside even when the same parties were left untroubled in the capital, but the lack of such reports since the suppression of "La Banda" appears to indicate that the opposition is not being molested. Because of the absence of significant political issues, and with the next elections over two years away, political activity is at an unusually low level at the present time.

I trust that this information has been responsive to your inquiry. However, if you have any further questions please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. ABSHIRE,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional
Relations.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 16, 1972]

DOMINICAN POLITICS—POLICE STRONGMAN
FOLLOWS TRUJILLO'S PATH TO POWER
(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

SANTO DOMINGO.—Fewer than 12 years after the death of Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo, a new caudillo in the image and likeness of the slain dictator is beginning to emerge in this troubled land.

He is Brig. Gen. Neit Nivar Seijas, 47, chief of the National Police, who was a young lieutenant in Trujillo's time and is now the most powerful military figure in a country where guns and influence are the ultimate weapons in the continuous plotting, feuding and jockeying for position.

Nivar was born in Trujillo's hometown, San Cristobal, and like the Dominican Caesar is of humble birth.

Standing between Nivar and the achievement of ultimate power here is his patron and wary friend, President Joaquin Balaguer, who is lavish in his praise of Nivar, particularly for putting an end to the cut-throat operations of the police-sponsored counter-terror gang, La Banda.

HEARD ON RADIO

When La Banda's brutalities threatened to become an international scandal last summer, Balaguer sent to Maj. Gen. Enrique Perez y Perez from the police chieftainship to command of the Army's 1st Brigade on the outskirts of Santo Domingo.

Nivar, commander of that U.S.-trained and equipped brigade, strongest in the Dominican armed forces, heard on the radio that he was swapping jobs with his bitter enemy, Perez y Perez.

Balaguer's move took him off the hook for the La Banda killings by disposing of his police chief. It also gave him the opportunity to put the ambitious Nivar in the police job, a traditional deadend in Dominican politics.

For a few hours in October 1971, the nation quivered over whether Nivar would accept the demotion or march on the capitol as some of his hothead officers urged him to do.

SHREWD ADVICE

But Nivar gets shrewd advice from his counsellors, notably Cuban Santiago Rey Perna, who was a minister of interior under Fulgencio Batista, and a Peronist Argentine named Luis Ramon Gonzales Terrado.

He accepted the transfer and kept a crew of tailors up all night to make him a new police general's uniform. He further turned the move to his advantage by going directly into a slum area where no policeman had ventured since five young men were murdered by La Banda. Nivar was hailed as a benefactor when he promised an end to the counter-terror.

He did end it, too. There has scarcely been a killing since. Nivar passed the word to his policemen that La Banda was finished. Balaguer said peace returned because most of the extremists were exiled, arrested or killed.

But Nivar gets the credit for the almost unreal tranquility that has prevailed here since October and even the opposition leftist party of Juan Bosch, the Partido Revolucionario Dominicano, has been looking with favor on Nivar.

As for Perez y Perez, he has discovered that he is commander of the 1st Brigade in name only. The key commanders and their troops are totally loyal to Nivar, who is a tireless visitor to the homes, the weddings and funerals of the military as well as a dispenser of easy pesos among the soldiery.

Nivar earlier got the upper hand from the armed forces commander, Ramon Emilio Jimenez, a Navy man, by "discovering" that one of Jimenez' officers was involved in a comic-opera coup being planned by rightist Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin last June. Jimenez has treated Nivar with deference ever since.

AMASSED FORTUNE

Nivar has assembled a fortune. He profits from the importation of Haitian sugar cane cutters, he owns a prosperous radio station and is involved in a race track and a profitable small-plane airline, *Alas del Caribe* (Wings of the Caribbean).

His special relationship with the president gives him enormous economic power as he can arrange for large government contracts to go where he wishes.

Nivar has little interest in military professionalism, but does have an overriding concern about the loyalty of subordinates. Perez y Perez, a professional soldier, scorns the sort of political game played by Nivar.

The intriguing question is when and how Nivar will make his move to ultimate power. Balaguer has won consecutive elections in 1966 and 1970 and probably can win a third term in 1974.

The informed speculation is that Balaguer is not threatened now by Nivar. The two could collide over Nivar's wish to be rid of the police job and Balaguer's wish to keep him there but this likely will be solved by giving Nivar a cabinet-level job.

It is not anticipated that Nivar will attempt to overthrow Balaguer although there is little to prevent him other than Balaguer's popularity. Balaguer himself is no mean politician and does not appear to be worried overmuch about Nivar.

But if Balaguer should die or become incapacitated there is nobody in the Dominican Republic who believes the ceremonial vice president, Carlos Rafael Goico Morales, would ever succeed to the presidency. If anything happens to Balaguer, the betting is that the poor boy from Trujillo's home town would take charge and stay in charge.

Others have noted a supposed dilemma of Latin American culture: To opt for order under a supposed benevolent dictator or to choose chaos under constitutional democracy. Chaos is not always the product of constitutional democracy, but it is true that this form of government is often less orderly than that achieved by dictatorships. However, too often even the benign dictatorships enforce order at the expense of political and social progress. And the benevolence of dictators often finds expression, as it has in Naranjo Dulce, through brutality and murder.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the optimism expressed by the State Department concerning the Dominican Republic political situation is realistic. Given the turbulent history of the Dominican Republic and Mr. Johnson's experiences, one cannot be too optimistic.

CHINA PANDAS BELONG HERE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the fascinating possibilities resulting from the President's trip to mainland China is the acquisition by U.S. zoos of giant pandas which are native to China.

The Brookfield Zoo in suburban Cook County was the home of three giant pandas the last of which died in 1953.

I have written to the President urging that should the Chinese Government make a gift of these pandas that the Brookfield Zoo in Brookfield, Ill., in view of its history and relationship to previous pandas exhibited in the Western World, be given priority consideration as a home for the next giant pandas to reach the United States.

An editorial in the Thursday, March 2, *Suburban Life* properly makes the argument in favor of the Brookfield Zoo designation.

The editorial follows:

CHINA PANDAS BELONG HERE

For many good reasons President Nixon should select the Brookfield zoo as the future home of two giant pandas which are China's gift to the American people.

The zoo has all the experience necessary to handle the black and white bears, distant relatives of the three that lived in the Brookfield facility years ago, including Mei Lan ("Little Flower") who died in 1953 at 14 years of age, old as pandas go.

Brookfield became the first zoo in the world to house a giant panda in 1937 and was the

last zoo in America to have one, holding the longevity record for a panda in captivity.

It still maintains the same barless grotto that Mei Lan was kept in, but a new home for the prizes would be built if Nixon's nod goes to the west suburban zoological gardens. Many of its personnel are still familiar with the handling of pandas.

Another important advantage is Brookfield's central United States location, permitting a maximum number of Americans to see the pandas.

Fourteen years ago an attempt by the zoo to purchase a panda by way of Europe was foiled by the federal government. That panda Chi-Chi, eventually went to the London zoo, becoming one of the most famous animals in the world.

No matter where they wind up, it will be panda (monium) in every zoo town other than the one that gets the cuddly creatures. But the President should not hesitate in sending the pandas to Brookfield. The zoo has everything in its favor and has earned the right to regain these prize animals for its collection.

ORCHESTRA DA CAMERA PERFORMING ARTS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Orchestra Da Camera Performing Arts programs are a "vivid demonstration showcase, a model whose techniques and varied programs can be used as a pilot in school districts throughout the State."

This is how Dr. Vivienne Anderson, director of the New York State Education Department's Division of the Humanities and the Arts described the outstanding programs and services of the Orchestra Da Camera when designating the orchestra as a "showcase" orchestra in 1968.

In a time when all of us are deeply concerned with the need to improve the "quality of life" in this Nation, Dr. Anderson's observations are eloquent testimony to the enormous contributions the Orchestra Da Camera is making in enriching the cultural lives of hundreds of thousands of students in schools throughout Long Island.

The Orchestra Da Camera is a self-contained cultural center, dedicated to the introduction and dissemination of man's heritage, and his cultural arts through model programs to people—especially to children and students.

The Da Camera, in residence in the Mineola public schools is fulfilling the commitment to the arts expressed by the New York State Board of Regents in their position paper on the "Humanities and Arts in Elementary and Secondary Education."

They say:

We believe that a special opportunity exists in the humanities and the arts to provide the leadership needed for a true educational renaissance in our school system. We believe especially that literature, drama, music, the dance and the visual arts can help young people to relate to one another, and to the universe, with a new sense of excitement, concern, and reverence.

Perhaps the most signal feature of the Da Camera's activities is that the emphasis is on programs that involve the personal participation of large numbers of young people in the school districts being served and on presenting talented artists from a variety of ethnic backgrounds. It is highly significant that the Da Camera programs are taking a rightful place among the schools' basic instructional services and thus are becoming vital components of the educational program.

The vast success of the Orchestra Da Camera, which gives some 700 in-school performances each year, is a tribute to the vision displayed by its founder, Mrs. Flori Lorr. Herself a gifted musician, Mrs. Lorr recognized more than a decade ago the need to make cultural programs available to the burgeoning school population in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. She has translated a dream into a vibrant reality.

Over the years, the orchestra's programs in grand opera, chamber opera, symphony concerts, chamber ensembles, ballet, jazz and ethnic and modern dance, have won acclaim, and justifiably so, from school administrators, teachers, parents, and, most important, from hundreds of thousands of students who have gained a better appreciation of the arts.

The achievements of the orchestra have been duly recognized too by both the Federal and State governments. Grants totaling more than \$218,000 have been awarded to the orchestra over the past 2 years, the most recent one a \$100,000 grant from the National Endowments for the Arts.

I believe that the efforts of the Orchestra Da Camera, in making an immeasurable contribution to the quality of life in the communities it serves merit our applause and our support.

RARICK TESTIFIES ON RIGHT OF AMERICANS TO OWN GOLD

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today I testified before the House Committee on Banking and Currency asking for favorable consideration to amend the dollar devaluation bill (H.R. 13120) to provide that American citizens be granted the right to own gold.

I include the text of my testimony:

STATEMENT OF JOHN R. RARICK

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I welcome this opportunity to testify today as you continue hearings on the Administration's proposed legislation devaluing the dollar.

I speak today in behalf of the American citizen's right to own gold, a freedom that has been denied him since the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. Unfortunately, however, the leaders of this country have, up to August 15, 1971, seen fit to meet this country's commitments to stabilize foreign interests

through payments in gold, a practice that has depleted our gold reserves, threatened our economy, and now has forced the Administration to propose the legislation presently before the Committee.

The simple truth is that American government has discriminated against its own citizens by denying Americans a right that it guarantees to foreign interests, thus allowing foreigners to reap the intrinsic evidence of American labor—stable gold.

It is time for the Congress to recognize and correct this discriminatory practice that denies the American citizen the right to own gold, yet lets his national leaders squander his gold for the benefits of foreigners, thus threatening to bankrupt the American people along with their government.

I urge this Committee to consider amending the proposed legislation to include provisions restoring this basic right of owning gold to the American people in the event that either one of the other of two possibilities occur: (1) the requirement that gold reserves be held against currency in circulation is removed; or (2) the President lifts the moratorium he has placed on payment in gold of American obligations to foreigners. I have introduced H.R. 353 to offer this relief in the event that the requirement that gold reserves be held against currency in circulation is removed.

Mr. Chairman, I include a copy of my bill H.R. 353 in my testimony at this point:

"H.R. 353

"A bill to permit American citizens to hold gold in the event of the removal of the requirement that gold reserves be held against currency in circulation, and for other purposes

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

"SECTION 1. At any time when reserves in gold or gold certificates are not required by law to be held against currency in circulation—

"(1) the Secretary of the Treasury shall sell any gold held by the United States to any citizen of the United States on demand at a price equal to that then being charged foreign governments, banks, firms, or individuals for gold purchased from the United States Treasury.

"(2) the Secretary of the Treasury may purchase from any citizen of the United States any gold tendered at a price equal to that then being paid to foreign governments, banks, firms, and individuals for gold being purchased by the United States Treasury.

"(3) no prohibition in the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 or any other law, and no prohibition in any regulation, shall be effective to prohibit or restrict the acquisition, holdings, or disposition of gold by any citizen of the United States."

That either one or the other or both of these possibilities that I have outlined might occur is evident from two passages appearing on pages 16 and 17 of the Committee Print entitled "Background Material on Legislation Modifying the Par Value of the Dollar," a copy of which was provided by the Chairman to Members. These passages are worth noting in their entirety:

"Furthermore, the United States believes that the monetary role of gold should continue to diminish. With the advent of Special Drawing Rights in the Fund, the world now has a basic reserve asset which is not held in private hands and hence is free from the private hoarding and speculation which have arisen in connection with gold. There is no need to raise the official gold price merely to increase world reserves.

"It is the view of the U. S. Administration that this modest change in the official gold price should not be allowed to disturb the trend toward de-emphasis of gold in the international monetary system. . . . As gold is becoming more widely used as a non-monetary commodity, it becomes less satisfactory as a monetary reserve."

It is, therefore, evident from the Administration's position that the first alternative I mentioned, the removal of the requirement that gold be held against currency in circulation, is a distinct possibility as the Administration moves further and further into a position virtually favoring a type of international currency, the SDR, or paper gold scheme.

The significance of the second possibility I mentioned, that the President would lift the moratorium presently in effect forbidding the payment of gold for American commitments to foreigners, is evident. There is no reason whatsoever that American citizens should continue to be deprived of their right to own gold while foreigners continue to drain our gold reserve. While the financial manipulators are theoretically planning to abandon gold as evidence of wealth and exchange, some of us, Mr. Chairman, would like to have a few gold coins, if for no other reason than a memento or to show our grandchildren what gold looks like.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out perhaps the most significant passage from the Committee Print dealing with this legislation:

"INCREASE IN VALUE OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

"The currency realignment will increase the value of certain United States international reserve and other assets. Our gold assets, and those with a fixed relationship to gold, such as the gold tranche in the International Monetary Fund and Special Drawing Rights, will increase in value in terms of dollars by 8.57 percent—corresponding to the change in the par value of the dollar. Foreign exchange assets will increase to take account of dollar devaluation plus any revaluations of the currencies held.

"The par value change will also require an increase of 8.57 percent in the value of our dollar subscriptions to international financial institutions. This increase in the value of dollar subscriptions stems from a provision in agreements governing our participation in international financial institutions that subscriptions be maintained in value in terms of gold. The purpose of this requirement is to assure that the contributions of all members are maintained in value in relation to each other despite changes in exchange rates. It also assures that our share in the assets and voting rights in these institutions is not impaired by devaluation of our currency.

"Currency realignment will also mean increased dollar costs on repayment of certain foreign currency borrowings.

"The increases in value of assets in some cases exceed the increases in related liabilities, and in others, assets and liabilities almost offset each other. As indicated, the increases in value of assets and liabilities are in most instances the direct result of the privileges and obligations of membership in international financial institutions."

It is therefore, evident that the total United States obligation in gold—our international debt—to foreign monetary authorities will remain constant, presumably "as a direct result of the privileges and obligations of membership in international financial institutions." Adoption or rejection of the legislation as it now exists means nothing—except to satisfy the vanity of the Ministers and Central Bank Governors of the 10 countries participating in the General Arrange-

ments to Borrow. Identified from the 18 December 1971 press communique, they are:

"PRESS COMMUNIQUE OF THE MINISTERIAL MEETING OF THE GROUP OF TEN ON 17TH-18TH DECEMBER, 1971 IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

"1. The Ministers and Central Bank Governors of the ten countries participating in the General Arrangements to Borrow met at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington on 17th-18th December, 1971, in executive session under the Chairmanship of Mr. J. B. Connally, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, Mr. P.-P. Schweitzer, the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, took part in the meeting, which was also attended by the President of the Swiss National Bank, Mr. E. Stopper, and in part by the Secretary-General of the O.E.C.D., Jonkheer E. van Lennep, the General Manager of the Bank for International Settlements, Mr. R. Larre, and the Vice-President of the Commission of the E.E.C., Mr. R. Barre. The Ministers and Governors welcomed a report from the Managing Director of the Fund on a meeting held between their Deputies and the Executive Directors of the Fund."

This communique revealed further the means by which the decisions of this meeting were to be implemented: "It is the hope of the Ministers and Governors that all governments will cooperate through the International Monetary Fund to permit implementation of these measures in an orderly fashion."

The total amount of this "obligation for membership in international financial institutions" is approximately 51.5 billion dollars; there is, at present, only 12.1 billion dollars in reserve assets. I ask that the appropriate table from the Committee Print be inserted at this point in my testimony:

TABLE 2—U.S. RESERVE ASSETS AND LIQUID LIABILITIES TO FOREIGNERS

The chart that follows shows how our reserve assets have declined and our short-term liabilities to foreigners have risen until the short-term liabilities are now more than five times as large as our reserve assets.

Our liabilities to foreign monetary authorities, which are included in the \$68 billion figure of total liquid liabilities to foreigners, are currently estimated at \$51½ billion.

U.S. RESERVE ASSETS AND LIQUID LIABILITIES TO FOREIGNERS¹

(In billions of dollars)

Year	U.S. reserve assets	U.S. liquid liabilities to all foreigners ²	U.S. liabilities (liquid and nonliquid) to foreign official agencies
1950	24.3	8.9	(?)
1951	24.3	8.8	(?)
1952	24.7	10.4	(?)
1953	23.5	11.4	(?)
1954	23.0	12.5	(?)
1955	22.8	13.5	(?)
1956	23.7	15.3	(?)
1957	24.8	15.8	(?)
1958	22.5	16.8	(?)
1959	21.5	19.4	(10.6)
1960	19.4	21.0	(11.9)
1961	18.8	22.9	(12.6)
1962	17.2	24.3	(13.8)
1963	16.8	26.5	(15.4)
1964	16.7	29.5	(16.7)
1965	15.5	29.7	(16.8)
1966	14.9	31.1	(16.0)
1967	14.8	35.8	(19.3)
1968	15.7	38.6	(18.5)
1969	17.0	46.0	(17.1)
1970	14.5	47.1	(24.5)
1971	12.1	68.0	51.5

¹ Including nonliquid liabilities to foreign official agencies.

² Not available.

³ Estimated.

It is, therefore, evident, Mr. Chairman, that the problem with the American economy lies in excessive entanglements with foreign alliances and international monetary organizations. The American government has, in effect, served as a banker for the world, only we have paid our "foreign friends" interest to use our money; furthermore, our "foreign friends" can collect in gold, a privilege denied to Americans.

The leaders of this country have, until August 15, 1971, followed the policy of guaranteeing the freedom of foreigners to own gold while depriving our own citizens of the same, or equal, right. A forthright indication of the present Administration's attitude toward America's role in the world is also evident in the Committee Print to accompany this legislation:

"Thus, in view of our responsibilities in providing assistance to developing nations and our economic role as a moderate supplier of private investment capital to the less developed world, net outflows of long-term capital and government grants could not reasonably be expected to fall below \$6 billion annually. In addition, we expected to continue to experience net payments of about \$1 billion annually in current account and long-term capital transactions which cannot be specifically identified.

"This assessment of the world payments situation made it clear that a very sizable swing in our position—and corresponding changes in the positions of others—would be required to restore reasonable international payments balance.

"Balance in the U.S. basic accounts, on the cyclically adjusted basis referred to above, would require a current account surplus large enough to cover our long-term capital outflows and government grant aid. Nearly the whole of the necessary current account surplus would have to be found in the trade account, at least for a number of years to come. The difference between the needed surplus and the deficit in prospect if no action was taken was massive. Drastic action would be required, even to restore the U.S. position to near-balance.

"These international considerations coincided with the appearance of evidence that domestic recovery and the fight against inflation were not proceeding satisfactorily. Decisive action, then, was called for by both domestic and international conditions. A strong domestic economy would be essential to an improvement in our international position, and improvement in our balance of payments would aid the recovery of confidence and domestic economic activity."

Mr. Chairman, it is time to stop discriminating against the American people. It is time to restore their right to reap the fruit of their labors; it is time to restore their right to own gold. I urge you and the Members of this Committee to give favorable consideration to amending this proposed legislation, H.R. 13120, to provide that American citizens be granted the right and privilege to own gold.

COLORADO'S "VOICE OF DEMOCRACY" WINNER

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a "Voice of Democracy" contest. This year nearly half a million

secondary school students participated in the contest competing for the five national scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes.

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington for the final judging as a guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This year's finalist from Colorado is Stanley R. Heady, a sophomore at Broomfield High School, Broomfield, Colo. I believe this fine young American's essay would be of interest to all of my colleagues in the House, and for that reason I am pleased to insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Stanley R. Heady)

Freedom, is word so often misused and misunderstood in our times, but as a young American I realize its meaning and my role in maintaining its preservation. I am responsible for upholding freedom in this generation, and setting an example for the ones to follow. It is my obligation to educate myself in order that I may be able to understand the mature use of freedom, and I am accountable for the actions I take to fulfill my personal role in freedom's preservation and defense.

Freedom is an expensive luxury, and since the conception of this nation each generation has had to pay a very costly fee for liberty. Perhaps, I will never know what price the present generation has paid to preserve my freedom, just as they do not realize the price their fathers paid. However, I must come to understand that someday I will also be called to account. Our freedom has been abused and taken for granted. We have come to think of it as quite a natural right, but under certain regimes for men to decide their own destiny and make their own decisions concerning their life style, freedom is as natural as water flowing uphill. In this country, that flow is unimpaired but not always appreciated.

It has often been said that the future belongs to those who prepare for it best. Consider then two young men, one who makes the best of the present, sets goals for himself, and tries to meet them, realizing the potential value of today for tomorrow. The second young man takes his youth and time for granted. He is unable, or perhaps afraid, to realize that his innocent youth will soon pass him by, leaving him unprepared, as a man, to face a competitive and hostile world. Countries are much the same way, and prudence is the best security for freedom. It was James Madison who said, "Diffusion of knowledge is the only guardian of true liberty." Freedom's greatest enemy is ignorance, and its greatest defender is the man who is wise and whose senses are keen. The fight is not always won by the strong, but by the vigilant and brave as well.

Each man must accept the fatigue of supporting freedom if he expects to reap its blessings. Every individual at sometime is called to a particular type of service for freedom's preservation, and we are individually responsible as to how we respond to that summons. Some are obliged to render service as soldiers, others as politicians or government aides, and still others as players of vital roles in our society, whether they be office workers or the average man on the street. I, as a youth in a free society, realize that I must educate myself, speak out in defense of freedom, and challenge those who would abuse its privileges.

The importance of becoming aware of my responsibility can not be overdramatized, for it is my generation and myself who will face the sternest challenge, to freedom's preservation.

WEEKLY REPORTS TO NINTH
DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the texts of my last four weekly reports which review the military, economic and political conditions Vietnam and the status of the peace proposals.

WASHINGTON REPORT—FEBRUARY 14, 1972

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the first of four reports reviewing the military, economic and political conditions in Vietnam and the status of the peace proposals.)

One of the main purposes of the American presence in Vietnam is to buy time to strengthen the Saigon government and to enhance its capacity to meet the Communist threat. It is the judgment of our top officials that while the South Vietnamese are gaining strength, they are not yet strong enough for us to withdraw completely.

The most critical phase of the American strategy of Vietnamization will occur this year. By May 1, America will have only 69,000 troops in South Vietnam, and it is expected that by the end of 1972 there will be no more than 30,000 American troops in that country.

Even today, America has only very limited combat strength in Vietnam, and we are becoming increasingly dependent upon South Vietnamese troops for protection. The only viable military option which is being left to us is use of airpower. In this circumstance, there is deep concern about the ability of the South Vietnamese to develop into a strong, independent nation.

All progress in South Vietnam depends upon security. The fact that 90 percent of the children now attend school, that the number of doctors is increasing, and that one can drive the length of the country on good roads and in relative safety indicates that South Vietnam is reasonably secure.

The Viet Cong are still present, however. There are an estimated 60,000 in South Vietnam, and efforts to destroy their infrastructure have not been completely successful. Because of continued attacks by the Viet Cong, and by North Vietnamese infiltrators, South Vietnam continues to take serious casualties—21,500 dead in 1971, against a claimed enemy toll of 97,000.

Although the enemy has launched no successful operation of any real importance since 1968, there are reports that he is preparing a major offensive this year. All during 1971, the enemy did not engage in a single attack on a South Vietnamese city. He knows that if he is to disrupt the Vietnamization process, he must get into the cities.

The enemy's main force units are reported to be still far in the interior, unpopulated parts of the country. American military officials do not believe that he has the capability to mount another effort the size of the 1968 Tet Offensive.

The South Vietnamese have about one million men under arms, and many more in regional self-defense forces. Their combat efficiency has improved, although after heavy losses in the Laotian campaign, they are not as confident as they once were. As defensive forces, they have proven themselves to be very tough; their offensive military operations have sometimes faltered.

The North Vietnamese have about 320,000 men under arms, and those involved in the

South Vietnam campaign are being supplied over the Ho Chi Minh Trail. Despite almost continuous bombing, supplies coming down the trail have increased enough to enable the enemy to continue his efforts to disrupt Vietnamization. U.S. Air Force officials concede that bombing, by itself, will not cut off the flow of supplies.

In Laos and Cambodia, the military situation has deteriorated and is critical. The enemy could take over effective control of both countries if he chose to do so. American officials speculate that he has not because he apparently wants to concentrate his major efforts in South Vietnam.

North Vietnam now controls about 50 percent of the land area of Laos, but not the most important areas. North Vietnam soldiers also control about half of Cambodia, but only 15 or 20 percent of the population. The initial optimism of the Cambodians about their military potential has diminished and they are beginning to realize they are in for a long, bitter struggle if they are to survive. There are about three North Vietnamese divisions in Cambodia, and they are capable of doing about what they choose in that country.

WASHINGTON REPORT—FEBRUARY 21, 1972

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second of four reports reviewing the military, economic and political conditions in Vietnam and the status of the peace proposals.)

South Vietnam's capacity to survive and maintain itself as a nation will depend in large part upon the political stability of the government and an improving economy.

Economy. The economy of South Vietnam now hangs in a delicate balance. In recent months, a measure of stability has come to it. The government has taken some firm steps in stabilizing the economy through devaluation, increasing interest rates, and by moving to reduce corruption.

The government knocked the heart of the black market in 1971 by devaluing the piaster. By increasing interest rates, the government has promoted a 100 percent increase in savings deposits to further dampen inflation, which is down from 35.4 percent in 1970 to 13.7 percent in 1971. The production of rice, the country's major food grain, is sufficient, although the distribution system needs improvement, and a chronic shortage of manpower shows signs of easing.

Although the economy has shown a growth of from 6 to 7 percent in the last year, considerable doubt remains as to whether these favorable developments will hold or continue to improve. A sharp reduction in the current level of U.S. aid—about \$700 million annually—would throw the country into chaos.

Political. American policy-makers have serious doubts about Vietnam's future political stability, and particularly whether genuine stability can be achieved by President Thieu and his government. American hopes for a viable election process faded with the uncontested election of Thieu, and the realists are saying that the question of political stability is still in doubt.

Most Americans believe, however, that the quality of political leadership throughout South Vietnam continues to improve at all levels. They point out that key government incumbents are superior in competence and integrity to the previous occupants of those offices. It is possible that Saigon's administration could come apart because of internal differences, but American officials don't expect that to happen.

Corruption remains a way of life in Vietnam, however, despite U.S. insistence that the Saigon government make more of an effort to root it out. Pleas have been made to order officials not to accept gifts from subordinates seeking better positions, to stop

bribes paid by parents to keep their sons out of the war, and to halt the practice of falsifying draft eligibility records for a price, but without much success.

In any country in which people are poorly paid, which has endured a prolonged war and brutal inflation, corruption is widespread. As the economy grows, corruption becomes less of a problem. It is still accepted, however, that cash, not words, count.

Outlook. It is possible that South Vietnam will emerge one day from the war as an independent, democratic nation on the way to peace and prosperity. But there is surely not much indication that it is going to happen soon. The optimism of 1970-1971 has faded, however, and the hope now is that South Vietnam will not lose the war, and that, in time, it can make an acceptable accommodation with North Vietnam.

Most American officials believe the war will gradually wind down. A major spasm of some kind may occur this year, but eventually, they believe, there will be some kind of accommodation between the two Vietnams. Meanwhile, the war goes on in spite of all. The infiltration from the North continues, ample supplies continue to come from China and the Soviet Union, and there is no diminution of North Vietnam's determination to fight.

The hope remains that some sort of agreement between the two sides can be reached, bringing an end to the killing. But no one can see the outlines of such an accommodation yet.

WASHINGTON REPORT—FEBRUARY 28, 1972

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the third of four reports reviewing the military, economic and political conditions in Vietnam and the status of the peace proposals.)

The President's eight-point Vietnam Peace Plan is the first new proposal for a general settlement to the Vietnam War in more than 2½ years. The major points of his plan include:

- A total cease-fire throughout Indochina.
- The withdrawal of U.S. and allied forces from South Vietnam within six months of North Vietnam's acceptance of the proposal.
- A new presidential election in South Vietnam.

The resignation of President Thieu one month before the election.

The creation of an independent body representing all political forces in South Vietnam, including the Viet Cong, to organize and oversee the election.

Under the proposal, North and South Vietnam would agree to release all prisoners of war captured in Indochina. The exchange would be carried out in conjunction with troop withdrawals.

The disclosure of the U.S. proposal makes the Nixon record on negotiations for peace much clearer. The disclosure also makes clear the chief barrier to the settlement of the war: Who will eventually control South Vietnam? The military questions, including a date for U.S. troops withdrawal and the release of American prisoners, apparently are negotiable on both sides. The political question of the future make-up of the government of South Vietnam is not.

The President's proposal is apparently unacceptable to North Vietnam because of its deep suspicion of the electoral process, and of the existing South Vietnamese government, which it believes would influence the outcome of an independent election, despite guarantees by the Allies. The North Vietnamese have insisted that two basic conditions for settlement would be (1) the fixing of a date for total U.S. military withdrawal, and (2) the withdrawal of all support for the Thieu regime.

North Vietnam's record in these negotiations shows that country's negotiators to be tough, determined and willing to exploit

every opportunity, including the American prisoners of war. The North Vietnamese are not interested in a fair settlement, or in "looking good." They want a unified Vietnam under their control.

The President's critics have charged that he failed to make a straightforward offer of a withdrawal date in exchange for the release of the American prisoners. The President did disclose a proposal made in May 1971, in which the United States would agree to a deadline for the withdrawal of American forces in exchange for all prisoners, but he added the requirement of a cease-fire. By tying a withdrawal to the acceptance of a cease-fire, the President encountered Hanoi's opposition, which felt that a total cease-fire would only strengthen and solidify President Thieu's control over most of the South Vietnamese population. North Vietnam rejected the President's proposal, insisting that any settlement had to include political elements.

The debate between the President and his critics over a withdrawal date in exchange for the prisoners, regardless of past importance, is no longer relevant. Negotiations must now focus on political arrangements inside Indochina.

The immediate effect of the negotiating deadlock is that the war will go on. Each side has presented the other with unacceptable demands. Hanoi wants the U.S. to get out, take everything with us and stop all aid to South Vietnam. The United States wants Hanoi to stop fighting, withdraw its troops, give up the goal that it has sought for decades and enter into an election which Hanoi suspects will be controlled by President Thieu's agents.

The apparent failure of the President's peace proposals raises the question of what happens next. The President has said that the only alternative is to continue the Vietnamization program, which means that troop withdrawals will continue—but so will the periodic bombings of North Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

WASHINGTON REPORT—MARCH 6, 1972

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the last of four reports reviewing the military, economic and political conditions in Vietnam and the status of the peace proposals.)

There are two points of view about the prospects of ending the Vietnam war by negotiations. One is hopeful and the other, pessimistic.

The hopeful view holds that President Nixon's revised Vietnam peace proposals, and the spirit in which they were offered, will serve as a beginning for the first real bargaining since the frustrating Paris Peace Talks began three years ago on the central issue of who controls South Vietnam after the war.

The optimists contend that the wide gap between the two sides on the political questions in Vietnam has been narrowed. They emphasize that the Thieu government is growing stronger, its economy is improving, its military forces are maintaining security, and that Hanoi will be wise to negotiate now, rather than later.

The pessimistic view is that the discussions have accentuated the determination of the North Vietnamese to gain political control of South Vietnam. Hanoi has pursued that goal for some 30 years, and is not about to give it up now. Hanoi wants to drive out all foreign soldiers and unify the nation under the control of the communist party of North Vietnam.

The pessimists hold that Hanoi simply feels it does not have much reason to negotiate. As the U.S. military strength declines, its bargaining power recedes. Hanoi withstood everything South Vietnam could throw against it when 550,000 American soldiers, with all kinds of firepower and mobility, were helping, and it feels it can do better after the Americans are gone, taking their modern war machines with them.

In this view, no matter how successful Vietnamization may be, the improvement of Saigon's fighting ability will not fill the gap as the Americans withdraw. As one American analyst put it: "Why should the North Vietnamese compromise? Instead, they will just wait."

Americans are tired of this war, and they are growing increasingly determined to end it. It is helpful, but distasteful, to recognize that the U.S. bargaining position declines as its military power dwindles, and that there are very real limits to our capacity to determine the future of South Vietnam. Although we have not guaranteed the survival of a non-communist South Vietnam, we have done about all we can reasonably be expected to do to give that country a chance to survive. We are sharply reducing our presence there after nearly 56,000 of our men have died, and we have expended \$132 billion, and we are leaving South Vietnam with a well-equipped army of more than a million men.

Without negotiations the outlook is for the war to continue, and for an American withdrawal down to a residual force backed by strong American airpower. American prisoners probably will remain as hostages for total withdrawal, and perhaps even for a political settlement favorable to Hanoi.

The harsh alternative is to set a date for total withdrawal and hope that Hanoi will release the prisoners of war. That course leaves most questions unanswered, however, including the central one of who controls South Vietnam. But it does permit the process of accommodation in South Vietnam to begin in earnest.

It is important that the secret negotiations in Paris be resumed, that the President use his trips to China and the Soviet Union to discuss the possibilities of a political accommodation, perhaps involving a coalition government and a mutual limitation of arms to Southeast Asia, and that the United States press South Vietnam to work out a political accommodation.

McGOVERN—THE MAN TO SUPPORT

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues the fine article on Senator GEORGE McGOVERN which appeared in the February 19, 1972, issue of the Economist.

The article follows:

ELECTION 1972—MODEST McGOVERN

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Probably the American Senate does not contain a better senator than Mr. George McGovern of South Dakota. He is thoughtful, well informed, enlightened, quick and orderly of mind and speech, hard-working, free of self-seeking or self-indulgence, intellectually and morally consistent, and yet possessed of the habit of moderation that a politician needs if he is to be effective in a system that works by alliance and compromise. Besides being an estimable senator he is a sound man whose life has been well organized and whose first intuitive reactions to an event are usually right for him; thus he is spared the need to mumble, temporise, back away or revise his position after second thoughts. Put together, his characteristics make up something close to the picture of an ideal President.

When other politicians acknowledge this fact, as they sometimes do, they shake their heads or murmur that it is a pity, as if to say that nomination, let alone election, is nat-

urally not for such as he. And indeed the course of Mr. McGovern's presidential effort up to the moment does seem to confirm that this is so. Having announced his candidacy first of the Democratic contenders, he has been campaigning fairly hard for a full year (and is campaigning really hard now). But measured by the opinion polls his advance has been small, from 3 or 4 percent to 5 or 6 percent of Democratic voters.

There are some mundane political explanations for this relative and, as yet, inconclusive failure, such as lack of money or of any big organised source of political strength. South Dakota does not count for much: but then, neither does Senator Muskie's state, Maine, and Senator Muskie is far away in the lead in the race for the Democratic nomination. More weighty is the fact that Senator McGovern was an insurgent in 1968 and therefore the support of the regular party notables in the states and localities does not come to him naturally. Nor does the support of organised labour, which is dividing between Mr. Humphrey and Mr. Muskie.

Something lacking in Mr. McGovern's visible personality in the explanation most commonly encountered for his failure to make more of an impact. He does not dominate, he does not suggest strength or radiate a sense of power. His voice, though not weak, is soft, his manner is unassuming, quiet and civilised. He is a former professor of political science at a small university in the great plains and the son of a Methodist preacher in a small town, and he is completely authentic. He is not showy.

The other explanation is that Mr. McGovern is still generally thought of as a one-issue candidate. He was a consistent opponent of President Johnson's policy in Vietnam and was briefly a presidential contender in 1968 as an opponent of the war. He refuses now to believe President Nixon's assurances that the present policy on Vietnam is aimed at a negotiated peace. Mr. McGovern's speeches often include a pledge to resign the presidency if, having been elected, he fails to bring the war to an end within a few months.

Whatever the truth of the matter may be, there is manifestly no simple issue of peace or war that is perceived clearly enough, or is the subject of feelings deep and widespread enough, to unite a party around a candidate at present. Senator McGovern knows this. He has other policies to talk about. His small organisation has produced a workmanlike study of defence problems, on the basis of which he proposes selective cuts in the defence budget. He has an interesting programme for a combined reform of direct taxation and the welfare system and another for relieving the schools of their reliance on local property taxes. But it is probably true that most of the voters (those who have heard of him at all, that is) still think of him as an anti-war candidate.

Although some rival candidates for the support of the liberal wing of the Democratic party dropped out last year, the gap was filled quickly by Mr. Eugene McCarthy and by Mr. John Lindsay. The Democrats' new rules for selecting delegates to the nominating convention give Mr. McGovern chances to win support where four years ago the entrenched local party officials would have prevented it. But in each case he encounters liberal competitors for these newly liberated sources of convention strength.

The liberal wing, in short, has not yet united conclusively around Senator McGovern and he is aware that this fact may prevent him arriving at the party's national convention in July with the volume of delegate support that would make him a force to be reckoned with. The party's wounds of 1968 are also not fully healed. Mr. McGovern, as a decided liberal but also a loyal party man courageously innocent of factionalism,

might be the natural beneficiary of a reconciliation between the party's liberals and its centre; but this also has not happened yet.

"WOMAN POWER" IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, as we recall the debate in this House of last October over the equal rights amendment we will remember that reference was made to President Nixon's efforts to bring women into the upper echelon positions in the Federal Government.

I have been particularly interested in this aspect of the Nixon administration, because, in my view, it is extremely important that the support for the equal rights amendment in Congress be complemented by action on behalf of equality in job opportunities for women in the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, while the Senate continues its consideration of the measure which we passed last October, it behooves supporters of the equal rights amendment to keep up the momentum which this issue gained in the House of Representatives last year. One of the best ways to do this is to point to the contributions which women are making to the Federal Government. Were it not for the discrimination which prevailed for so many years, more women could have participated in our democracy at high levels of government decades ago—and I am convinced that we are just beginning to tap the tremendous resources which has come to be known as woman power.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the accomplishments of the present administration in the area of full equality for women, and I commend to my colleagues in both Houses the following article which appeared in the January 17, 1972, issue of U.S. News & World Report:

WOMEN IN GOVERNMENT—INTERVIEWS WITH SIX IN TOP JOBS

Quietly and rapidly, "woman power" is making unparalleled headway in the upper ranks of the Federal Government, which by tradition has been dominated by a male hierarchy.

There are now more women in top decision-making jobs in the Government than ever before. In 1971, the number of women in such positions, earning from \$28,000 to \$42,500, more than doubled—from 36 to 79. In addition, 260 women have been named to presidential commissions.

The sudden increase is the direct result of President Nixon's order last April to hire women for high-level positions in Government. Heading the search for female talent is Mrs. Barbara Hackman Franklin, staff assistant to the President.

"Our goal," she says, "is to find women qualified for just about every kind of job there is in the Government. The President told me when I took this job: 'We can't afford to waste so many of our resources.' That's why we're trying to broaden women's roles in policy making."

Progress, Mrs. Franklin admits, is slower than she would like. Women still are heavily outnumbered by male executives, and there are no women in the present Cabinet or on the Supreme Court. "But we hope to make a breakthrough there, too," she says. "And there is no reason why a woman shouldn't some day be President of the United States."

Mrs. Virginia Mae Brown, a member and former Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, believes women may be heading for eventual equality with men in numbers of high federal jobs.

"Women are more interested in advancement now," Mrs. Brown declares. "It is not enough to say, 'We're discriminated against.' We've got to work for advancement—really deserve it."

To learn first hand how women are faring in top Government posts, "U.S. News & World Report" went to six in high positions for interviews that appear on this and the following pages.

Q. Chairman Bentley, is it difficult being a woman executive in a Government that's run principally by men?

A. Not for me, because I worked almost exclusively in a man's field for more than 20 years. When I was in the newspaper business covering the waterfront, I was dealing primarily with men, because there were very few women around.

Q. In dealing, as you do on occasion, with rather hard-bitten men, how do you handle the situation?

A. I play it very straight with them. We don't mince any words. I tell them what's on my mind, and listen to what they have on their minds.

Sometimes we come to a meeting of the minds, sometimes we don't. On occasion I might hang up on them, or on occasion they might hang up on me. But I think for the most part I have managed to retain most of them as my friends over the years.

Q. Women are sometimes accused of using their feminine wiles to achieve what they want in a job. Do you find that's really true, or is that just a myth?

A. I think it's a male myth. Maybe many years ago, because it was so very difficult for a woman to move ahead, she had to use whatever talent she had. I know that I had to fight my way most of the time.

Q. Did you have to work harder than a man?

A. Yes, very definitely. I had to work much harder. Over the years, I've probably put in three times the number of hours as any man in my job. I've also had to be twice as competent in doing it, too.

One thing: I've always felt that if a woman made a mistake, everybody immediately knew it. It just seemed like everybody was watching. But a man could make that mistake or a man could make 50 mistakes just like it before anybody would begin to take notice.

I think the situation is improving a bit now. I have felt in the past two years that there's a definite turning, and it's beginning now to come almost like a tidal wave, with the change in attitude, determination and confidence of women—although there's still a long way to go.

Q. What sort of hours do you work?

A. Let me look at my calendar for a couple of typical days: I leave home in Lutherville, Md., at 6:30 in the morning, catch the 7:05 train, and arrive in my office about 8:15, depending on traffic. I usually go home on the 8 o'clock train at night.

Q. So you spend about 12 hours in the office?

A. Yes, easily. Once in a while I stay over here with a friend. She has an apartment in Washington, and I stay there if, like tonight, I have a speech here. Tomorrow I have an early-morning meeting at 7:30, then I'll hear an oral argument all day on a maritime

case, and there's a luncheon here with the Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Tomorrow night I speak at the National War College. So my day will finish about 9:30 or 10 o'clock tomorrow night.

"IT'S ROUGH" ON FAMILY LIFE

Q. How does this schedule fit in with your family life?

A. It's rough, but I've done it so long that this is my way of life. I was very much a career person before I was married—I didn't get married until I was 36—and Bill [William R. Bentley] understood that before we were married. It probably would not fit with the average person's life, especially if they were married younger and had children.

Q. Is this the main reason why there aren't more women working in top-level jobs?

A. I think it has been more a matter of male prejudice. The second reason is that it is difficult for women who have families and children to take on a major responsibility.

Another problem is that it's hard for many women to move. It's easy for a man to move his family here after he receives a presidential appointment. But if the wife is given a presidential appointment it's a little difficult, because her husband is probably entrenched in business out there, and she may have trouble persuading him to move.

Q. How are you accepted by your male counterparts in top-level jobs?

A. They accept me as an equal. I think I've proven myself. I don't expect anybody to show me any favoritism. I have always worked on an equal basis. When I was in the newspaper business, I felt when I took somebody out to lunch as part of a story that I should pick up the check.

Sometimes I felt I was trodden upon because I was a woman. I felt that I wasn't paid as well as some of the men at times, even though I had more responsibility and did more work.

Q. Do you have a good relationship with the White House?

A. The White House staff, with whom I work closely and regularly, treats me as they would treat any man. I don't think I'm treated with any more or less respect, or with any more or less care. I go to them on a straight business basis.

The President has sent me a number of messages in response to different matters, and I have talked to him occasionally about various things. He is always warm and considerate, but no more so, I think, than he would be with a man.

I know that there are one or two people at the White House who are reputed not to care particularly for women executives, but I haven't run into that sawmill yet.

Q. Is public service a good career field for women?

A. It is good if they are devoted to it. Public service is a tough field. You have to get things done, and at the same time not offend too many people. A number of people here tell me: "Oh, Helen, why don't you just let things go? Why rock the boat?" Well, that's not the way I work.

Q. Will there be more Cabinet-level posts occupied by women in the near future?

A. We hope so. There have been only two women in Cabinet posts in this country's entire history. I would hope at least one or two will be appointed in the next year or so.

Look at the Attorney-General spot, for instance. In the past, we have had a couple of Attorneys General who I don't think have been very good at all. I am not going to name any names. But I certainly have known a number of women with legal backgrounds who are much more capable.

Q. General Holm, most people think of the Air Force as a man's world. Is it difficult for high-ranking woman officers to hold their own in the armed forces?

A. Actually, the Air Force has always been "coeducational"—the only service that has been. From the day the Air Force was established, it has included both men and women. So they've been used to having women around.

I've never experienced difficulty as a woman in the Air Force. I can't say that this is true for all women in the Air Force all the time, but I haven't experienced it. I've been treated with great deference and courtesy.

Q. What led you to join the Air Force?

A. I joined the Army initially in World War II. At that time there was a tendency for everyone to want to get involved in something. My brothers were in the Navy, and my father had been a Marine in World War I, so I just had a yen to join the armed forces. I joined the first one that came along, and that was the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps [WAAC]. Initially, I was an enlisted woman—called an auxiliary—equivalent to a buck private, earning \$21 a month. Then I went to Officer Candidate School and got a commission as an officer.

I got out at the end of World War II because there was no future for women in the military. There was no permanent status at all.

The Women's Armed Services Integration Act was passed in 1948 while I was in college. I got a letter saying: "Are you interested in coming back in the armed forces?" I checked a little box on a card that said: "Yes, I am interested in Regular Air Force." And so my Regular appointment came out of the Air Force. I knew I wanted to come back in the armed forces, but I'm not exactly sure why.

Q. Have you ever regretted the decision?

A. Never. I didn't plan to make it a career, though. Most people think that if you've made a career of the military, you've planned it that way. I've always had very good jobs, and I've worked for good people. I've felt as long as I had good jobs and enjoyed it, I had no reason to leave.

Q. Is it the kind of career you would recommend for most young women?

A. I don't know what you mean by "most young women." I would recommend it as a career to anyone who gets along with people, who is interested in improving herself, or who is interested in being a professional.

Anyone who wants to come into the Air Force for frivolous reasons might just as well forget it.

NEW OUTLOOK FOR UNMARRIEDS

Q. The Air Force has been criticized by some for discriminating against women, specifically, an unmarried woman who was ordered discharged because she was pregnant—

A. We've changed that policy. Last summer we started examining all these policies, and we decided that we would have to make some accommodation to the desires of women to have children and be in the armed forces. Today we no longer say that a woman who has any minor children may not come into the Air Force. She may apply for either enlistment or commissioning.

A woman may also remain in the service if she marries a man with children. At one time we used to discharge her automatically.

The only problem we have is with pregnancy. Normally we still discharge a woman who is pregnant, because she is not assignable. If she gets orders to Southeast Asia, obviously she couldn't go.

It isn't a good idea to reassign her at all while she's pregnant, because the gaining command would get someone who's a potential medical loss to them for a while. So we say: "We'll discharge you when you're pregnant, but you may apply to come back to active duty within 12 months of discharge. Or, you can ask for a waiver of discharge and it will be considered on an individual basis."

But she's got to recognize that the child

is her responsibility for care—and that's a tough one for a young woman.

Q. Is this true for both unmarried and married women?

A. We don't make a distinction between married and unmarried in that respect. But an unmarried woman has a special set of problems, particularly if she's in a low rank. She can hardly afford to hire a baby-sitter.

Q. Are there limits on what jobs a woman can have in the Air Force?

A. All Air Force jobs are open to women except those that are restricted by law. Those are the air-crew—pilot, navigator—jobs, and those closed for physiological reasons, that is, they are beyond the physical capabilities of the women—although we make exceptions there. The best example is the jet-engine mechanic, because that job requires a strong man who can lift heavy items. But we do have air-craft-maintenance officers. One is serving in Southeast Asia.

We also close jobs that we consider culturally repugnant. The best example of that would be a woman guarding the perimeter of a base with a gun over her shoulder. We consider that sociologically unacceptable. Nor would we assign a woman to a radar site on top of a mountain where she would be alone with a group of men. We would consider this culturally unacceptable. But there are very few jobs in this category.

COMBAT: FOR MALES ONLY

Q. Do you think women should be excluded from combat?

A. The law says she must be excluded from combat. This does not restrict them from combat zones, however. Nonetheless, I don't think our American culture is willing to accept women as combatants, per se. They are not even ready to accept them as draftees. I don't foresee that changing—and I don't think it should change unless we were to have a severe national crisis.

Q. As the highest-ranking woman in the Air Force, what are your duties?

A. In my current position, I spend about a third of my time on the road visiting bases where I talk to the commanders and staffs. I talk to the women themselves about anything they want to talk about, primarily so that I can find out what policies need changing, what problems they face and how they feel about things.

I do a lot of public relations, too, when I'm out in the field. There is considerable public interest today in a woman who has an unusual position.

In Washington, I am the adviser in the Air Force Headquarters on all matters affecting women. I also appear before the Congress in hearings on personnel to help defend the Air Force budget.

Q. Does this job interfere with your home social life?

A. Yes, it does to some degree. Much of my social life involves official or semiofficial functions. I do try to plan my time so that I can do some of the things I really enjoy—boating and skiing, especially.

Q. Do you find that there is a negative attitude among some men—and women—toward women in the service?

A. Yes, I think that still exists, but to a much less degree than it used to.

I think that's part of our culture. You know, in the '50s we went through a unique period in our country. There was a tendency for the woman to go back to the home and for our culture to say, "That's where you belong." But that was not typical of what women have done historically in this country. Women have worked, historically. I think that notion of "women's place" has affected everyone's attitude.

Any time women have gone into a profession that was essentially dominated by men, we've had problems of acceptance. The first women who went into Civil Service had a terrible time. The first women who were nurses

had a miserable time. In World War II, women in the service had a difficult time in terms of acceptance. But I think those attitudes are disappearing, particularly as the new generation of male comes into the Air Force. They don't have those hang-ups. Neither do the young women.

The women are learning to walk that professional line and still be women. It's important for a woman herself to recognize that there's nothing unfeminine about being a professional—it's bad only if she acts like a man and gets confused in her role.

Q. Commissioner Spain, has the President's emphasis on the hiring of women had an effect on the Civil Service Commission? Do you favor women over men in any jobs?

A. The President's emphasis is having a real impact on thinking and practices throughout Government, but it doesn't call for or permit favoritism. In Civil Service you can't do that—and it's self-defeating, anyway.

This is a merit system, and each individual is judged strictly upon his or her merit. Hiring is through a system of open competition. Sometimes written examinations are taken, or, in many cases, objective appraisals of experience, education and past performance are made. The specific techniques are designed to be job-related, and so vary with the jobs to be filled. Applicants end up ranked, based on their skills and abilities.

People seeking jobs are on a referral system here. It's like a talent bank. We simply send the names, addresses and résumés of people who would fill the specifications to the agency seeking an employee. Agencies do their own interviewing and they do their own hiring.

Q. There have been complaints about discrimination against women in the Civil Service. Do you get many such complaints?

A. We get about the same sort of complaints within Government as you get outside Government.

While I don't have figures for industry for comparison, I'm sure the volume of complaints in Government is relatively low—and this I think reflects on the gains that have been made on the federal side.

Over the most recent 18 months that we've done tabulations, fewer than 250 formal complaints were filed under our regular system for reviewing the complaint of a person who feels he or she has been discriminated against because of sex. Under that system, if an issue can't be resolved informally, it can eventually reach an independent board here in the Commission for decision.

Women have been discriminated against in our society—let's make no mistake about that. It's really more a matter of attitude than an overt thing. When men in supervisory and top-management jobs think of promoting someone, they too often think first of the young men in their department, and second of young women. This is something that's been going on for 2,000 years, and you can't blame the men. They, too, have been brainwashed, the same as women. Women, up until fairly recently, haven't complained about it.

For years, we've had complaints that women are not paid the same as men for the same job, but that's just not the case in the Federal Government. You can't get away with that in Government or industry any more. Sometimes a company has said about a woman's complaint: "She isn't doing the identical work as a man." But the courts have ruled that it doesn't have to be absolutely identical work. If it is similar—and the woman takes the same kind of initiative, and makes the same kinds of decisions as a man—the work is considered worthy of equal pay.

But the real solution rests on more than rulings on individual cases. It rests on

changing basic misassumptions and misbeliefs that lead to the more-subtle forms of discrimination.

Q. How does the Commission combat this kind of prejudice?

A. Getting the message across is important. One thing I personally do is drive home the point in all my public addresses—I usually speak at least twice a week—that under the Civil Rights law for industry, and under presidential directive for Government, job discrimination against women is simply and clearly not legal.

It's an educational process, and we're not going to change it overnight. We've got to start with very young children. Mothers and fathers have always indoctrinated children when they crawl out of the cradle by saying: "Oh, no, Mary, you don't play with that football. Johnny plays with that." And they'd tell Johnny, "Oh, no, you don't play with a doll," in a shocked sort of a way.

Children are brainwashed that they have a specific role, and somehow or other if they get out of that role it's wrong. They go to school and the grade-school teacher follows through with that. By the time they get to high school where there is counseling, it's almost too late. By then the girl who perhaps would have loved to be a civil engineer has gotten it deeply imbedded in her mind that there's something wrong with a girl who wants to be a civil engineer.

A good example is: I knew one director of nursing who was a man, and he explained the struggle he had had, and the things he had to overcome. From the time he was a small child, he wanted to be a director of nursing—not a doctor. Yet people say, "A man a director of nursing?"—as if there's something wrong with that. Well, there's nothing wrong with it if he wants to do it and he's good at it.

"CHANGES IN ALL AGENCIES"

Q. What specific examples are there of gains being made by women in federal employment?

A. Changes are being made in all agencies. For instance, today there are women in the Forest Service. They've never been in the Forest Service before as foresters.

There are women sky marshals. Women previously were seldom able to do any work where they had to carry a gun.

About a month ago I saw a very exciting thing: I was asked to give the graduation address for the twentieth class of special agents being graduated from the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. There were two very beautiful young women in this class. They were the top marksmen in the class. I looked at these very pretty, frail things and thought "They could kill you with judo and with karate, and they don't look like they are strong enough to pick up 10 pounds."

I can see where women in work like this will be able to do a tremendous job for a number of reasons. For instance, you can have a man and a woman together working as a police team without anybody thinking about it. You put two men together as a police team and they attract attention all too quickly.

Women are going into fields they've not been in before, and they're doing very well.

Q. Is the Government leading private industry in advancing the status of women?

A. The Government seems to me to be far ahead of private industry. But that's only as it should be. I think the Government really should lead. Private industry is more conservation. Just as Government led in the hiring of the handicapped and the mentally retarded, so are we paving the way for advances by women in all fields of employment.

Q. What's the proportion of women to men in the Civil Service—particularly in supervisory jobs?

A. Of the 1.2 million career-service employees—that excludes trades and crafts—

over 500,000 are women. At the technical levels—say, jobs starting between \$8,500 and \$15,000—women hold 27.6 per cent of the jobs. At the middle and top-management levels—say, from \$15,000 on up—women are in 5.4 per cent of the jobs.

These figures, particularly for the middle and top levels, represent some real gains over the past few years. Well over 17,000 women are now in jobs that pay in the \$15,000 to \$36,000 range.

We think this is a pretty good showing, but we are not satisfied with it. If there are any artificial barriers to qualified women getting to the top, whether it is conscious or unconscious discrimination, we want to remove them.

Q. Miss Watson, as one of the highest-ranking women and blacks in Government, do you find that some people are doubly prejudiced against you?

A. That is a difficult question. But, on balance, I would say that they are not—and that being a black and a woman has been more of an advantage than a disadvantage.

I think a woman can bring to any type of work—and certainly to Government—a kind of sensitivity which is valuable in dealing with problems, particularly human problems. In a sense, it gives a broader view. Mind you, I am not saying that men have a narrower view, but certainly we can make a different sort of input into a question.

Being a black is another asset, in that you are able to bring another point of view, in terms of our entire population, because you are in a minority as well. This helps to give a balanced view of problems without, I hope, weighting them improperly one way or the other.

I often deal in my work with emergencies involving people in trouble overseas. I like to think a woman is able to give the kind of soothing touch which helps to allay the fears of these people, and at the same time put into action the necessary machinery to remedy the problem.

A man, on the other hand, may tend to forget the human side of the problem.

This bureau deals with the movement of people—the issuance of visas to foreigners who wish to visit this country, and passports for Americans who travel abroad. This often involves all sorts of problems, such as people abroad who fall ill or become mentally unstable or are thrown into jail. We try to help them as best we can.

Q. Do you ever intervene personally in these cases?

A. Very often, I get the calls directly. In one instance, a young Marine captain was brought to me. He was very upset. He had married a very charming Vietnamese girl, and she was delayed in getting a visa to come to this country. The matter was stalled somewhere in the bowels of bureaucracy—in one of our consulates. After getting all of the facts, I cabled our consulate and said I would be interested in knowing what the problems were. I got a return cable: "Visa issued. She is on her way."

It is things like this which are very gratifying. You feel a little better when you've made a young couple happy.

Q. What was your background for the job?

A. I am a lawyer by profession. My father was a judge, my grandfather was a judge, and my brother is a customs judge. Our background is legal. I had been an assistant corporation counsel in the city of New York, and then was the executive director of the New York City Commission to the United Nations. There I was dealing with problems of international law, particularly with respect to the settlement of the U.S. in the city of New York.

Q. The State Department has been criticized for some of its personnel policies, especially concerning women. Are these being changed?

A. There has been a whole new look at

the personnel system—an "agonizing reappraisal." Wherever there have been injustices, the Department is attempting to right them. Among the considerations is the question of women in the Foreign Service. The result is that women are being given assignments regardless of sex as long as they have the competence to handle the job. More and more women in the Department are getting the positions that equate with their abilities.

SOME KEYS TO SUCCESS

Q. How do you go about eroding old prejudices against women executives?

A. One way is to be highly competent in the job. Another is to do the job with a light, gentle touch and a sense of humor.

I was brought up with the old expression, "You can draw more flies with honey than you can with vinegar." If you express an understanding of the other person's viewpoint and problems, this helps to erode resentment. If, on the other hand, you operate on the assumption that "I can do anything better than you can," you have already heightened the barrier.

Very often you have the situation where men have not been accustomed to having women as bosses. The important thing is to know how to deal with that so that you lead but you don't lead, if you know what I mean. This takes skill and is great fun once you know how to do it.

It is just like the man who thinks he is the head of the household, but it turns out that he is doing everything that his charming, very smart wife has determined she wants to do—only it comes out, in his estimation, as his idea.

Q. Chairman Bedell, why haven't there been more women in the top echelon of the Federal Government before this?

A. There is no one simple answer. Part of it is discrimination, and a great deal of that I think was an unconscious discrimination. People who were in the position of promoting within the Government, or hiring from the outside, just traditionally thought of "men only."

Women, too, must bear some of the blame. Many didn't see the opportunity to upgrade themselves and so didn't try for promotion.

Q. You were a member of Congress for 12 years. Why aren't more women in that branch of the Government?

A. When I came to the United States Congress in 1959, we had 16 women members of the House and one in the Senate. Now Congress is down to 12 women.

I think one reason for this is that for many years the party leaders did not encourage women to run for public office.

Another reason that isn't often talked about is that it's hard for most women to find enough money to run for public office. Women, because of the nature of the lives they lead, often don't have the acquaintance-ship of the people who finance campaigns.

Also, I think women often have a personal hang-up about running for office because they downgrade themselves and their ability to handle the job.

Another obvious drawback is that women cannot leave their children while they're young—and that is a real hindrance, with today's emphasis on younger candidates. Thus, many women are not free to run until they are in their 40s.

Q. On a typical day, what sort of decisions do you make?

A. For one thing, I have complete charge of the agenda for meetings of the Commission. We meet three or four days a week, morning and afternoon. If we have public hearings, they run for several days, with morning and afternoon sessions. Recently we have stayed in hearing session until 11 o'clock at night.

Major decisions are made with the concurrence of the other Commissioners.

My administrative decisions deal with personnel, finance, housekeeping details and

generally trying to keep the show on the road.

Right now I'm up to my neck in our budget, trying to steer it safely through the shoals of Congress. This means I'm making lots of calls on White House personnel and members of Congress.

Q. How are your relations with a largely male Congress? Have you ever been dealt with as a woman rather than as a chairman of a commission?

A. In my entire time in Washington, there was only once when there was even the hint of discrimination against me as a woman. A male colleague objected to my appointment to a congressional committee, but I was appointed anyway. The Congressman who had felt this way came to me later and said, "I've changed my mind."

I like being treated as an equal and given credit for my work when it is good. But I certainly don't mind my colleagues thinking of me as a woman—I am a woman!

Q. Have you ever felt any of your staff resented you because you're a woman?

A. I sincerely hope that none of my staff felt like that. I think we've had great relationships. In Congress, I had only a very small turnover in staff.

I have often heard the criticism that women don't make good executives, and, quite honestly, I have seen women take advantage of being a woman in an executive position and not handle their staff well, particularly other women.

I remember one case many years ago when I saw a woman in quite a powerful position in State government read out a man—just give him the very dickens—in front of his other colleagues. That was a humiliating thing for him, maybe more so because she was a woman. But this is an example of poor executive ability, whether it is a male or a female boss.

THE PRICE THAT CAREERS EXACT

Q. Have you ever wished you hadn't entered public life?

A. Yes—and not because I'm a woman. I would think every member of Congress has felt the same way at times.

Public office is hard on family life. In my own case, I had to be away from home a lot, and I had young children when I came here. My marriage ended two years ago, and my former husband always maintains that my service in Congress had nothing to do with our decision on this—but I'll never be sure if this is so.

There are times when you are particularly tired and working hard, and you wonder if you've done the right thing. But, in the end, most of us consider it well worth it and are grateful for the opportunity to make a contribution.

Q. Did your children mind your being in public life?

A. No. Now that they are grown—I have a daughter 21 and a boy 25—they say they never felt deprived. But you have those awful guilt feelings when they're younger. It's a sacrifice.

I am not whining, because I made the decision. But I have a great sympathy for all people who serve in public office. I think the public doesn't understand that they make a great personal sacrifice to do so.

Too often it is assumed that political ambition overrides an interest in family. This is wrong. Most persons who run for public office just don't realize how much is going to be demanded of them.

Q. Mrs. Knauer, is there any "sure" route for a woman to a top-executive job in the Government?

A. I suppose the surest way is for a woman to qualify herself in some career, such as law, economics or public service. She should then back that up with years of experience in public service either at the community or State level. She should get experience and exposure with the press and work with com-

mittees so that she knows a great deal about organization and the fundamentals of getting along with people. And she has to be lucky enough to be the right person in the right spot at the right time, and that there is a job that needs her particular expertise.

It can also be important to have a political background, regardless of which party it is.

Q. As the President's only woman adviser, are you frequently in the White House?

A. Yes. Because the President wants this consumer voice at the highest levels of Government, he added me a couple of years ago to the 7:30 a.m. briefing team. This group includes all the President's counselors and assistants. We review the legislative situation and the progress of our own programs, and keep each other informed—and naturally the President. The purpose is so the President has a daily report on just what our various programs are doing.

I happen to be the only woman at that table, but I must say I have never had any difficulty. I have never found any antifemale prejudice. These gentlemen—these very talented, dedicated members of the Administration—treat me as an equal partner, and certainly solicit my views at the appropriate time. In fact, they don't have to solicit them; I freely volunteer them. I have been called both noisy and persistent.

Q. How often do you see the President?

A. It just depends. Frequently, I would say. Certainly he sends for me occasionally or asks me to address a Cabinet meeting, or even the party leadership on some matters. And he occasionally drops in to the 7:30 meeting or sends for us singly or collectively.

We're given great freedom, great latitude to make our own decisions—and when I need advice I know exactly where to go.

Q. Do you ever have to speak sharply to anyone, including the President?

A. I don't think I've ever spoken sharply to the President. But, yes, I'm a hard bargainer, and that's what I mean by saying I'm noisy and persistent. I have a certain amount of expertise in this area. I headed the Pennsylvania State Bureau of Consumer Protection. And I had the experience of eight years as an elected city councilman in Philadelphia. So I do have a certain political background and experience in this consumer area.

When I say something, I don't try to sell a dead cause. It's usually something that I think is good for consumers, that would fit in and be part of an over-all picture for the Administration.

Q. What effect has all this work had on your home life?

A. I've always been busy. My husband, Wilhelm F. Knauer, is very understanding, and encouraged me as soon as the children were in school to go out and have an outside life. Like most American women, I did the usual thing on hospital boards and charity drives. I gradually became involved in politics and participation in party caucuses and that sort of thing. I have been for about 12 years vice chairman of the Republican Party in Philadelphia, in charge of women's activities.

I have an apartment here in Washington. Unfortunately, my husband is not well, and he lives in Philadelphia, and I try to get home every week-end that I'm not doing something official or speaking somewhere. We're always very happy to see each other again.

The very first thing after my husband kisses me and welcomes me home, my housekeeper hands me a shopping list. So I get right back in the car again and head for the supermarket. I get a chance to meet a lot of my neighbors there as I do shopping for the family.

UPSET HUSBAND-WIFE ROLES? "NO"

Q. Will it ever be a common thing for a woman to be in a top job in Government and her husband to be actually at home raising the children?

A. No, because that's a reversal of the traditional roles. I think a woman who is a pretty good organizer can organize her own career to do both well. I think a good marriage—and I've been blessed in having an excellent marriage—is a foundation for a woman. She can realize her full potential both as a woman and as a community leader.

Q. Do you think a woman will ever be President of the United States?

A. Yes. I think the time will come when the public will give vast support to a woman candidate. Right now, there are many women in top positions in Government—more than in any other Administration.

My first deputy director, Elizabeth Hanford, and many of my top staff are women.

So I don't think the time is too far away—with the appropriate training and proper temperament and the support of both men and women—when a woman could conceivably be President.

THE NEED FOR PRESIDENTIAL INITIATIVE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, last month, an article appeared in the Washington Afro-American about American Presidents' relation to black people and other minorities. Written by history professor George Sinkler of Morgan State College, the column was extremely important and relevant.

Dr. Sinkler's thesis is that American Presidents are capable of far-reaching initiative in the area of equal rights for minorities, provided that they are convinced that the American people wish them to take that initiative.

He writes principally of the 19th century, but closes with some remarks about recent Presidents and presidential candidates.

Professor Sinkler also discusses the importance of black voter registration and the fact that black voters need not, in fact should not, have a permanent allegiance to either of the major political parties. He places his idea in an historical context, that it is the responsibility of the black voter to elect persons to office who are responsive to the needs of minorities, regardless of the candidate's political party.

Dr. Sinkler's theory of Presidential initiative is particularly significant today, when President Nixon has failed completely to take the lead in behalf of equal rights for minority groups. An obvious case in point is the schoolbusing question, where the President's only initiative has been in the interest of confusion, by complicating an issue which had already been decided by the Supreme Court.

In case my colleagues missed Dr. Sinkler's fine and scholarly article as it appeared in the Washington Afro-American of February 15, 1972, I would like to bring it to their attention today.

The article follows:

HOW TO USE WHAT HISTORY TELLS US ABOUT PRESIDENTS
(By George Sinkler)

More than 67 years ago, historian Carter G. Woodson promoted the national celebra-

tion of Negro or Black History Week for the purpose of making more widely known among white and black alike, the contributions of black Americans to American and to world civilization.

Woodson hoped that this would be one way of combatting that ancient European and American myth of black inferiority in race and culture.

While the myth of black inferiority is by no means dead, it may be that at this point in our racial maturation we can use the opportunities afforded by the celebration of Black History Week not simply to point with pride to the heroes in black history but to reread and to examine with some degree of reflection both the white and the black experience, hopefully for useful lessons which might benefit us in the present and perhaps the future.

If we do that, try to profit from our historical experience—we may successfully challenge the validity of the statement of a wise man who once said: "The only thing we learn from history is that we learn nothing from it."

Following our own advice we could examine the historical record for some indication of how American Presidents, for example, have behaved and thought on matters of race.

There are probably people today who would give their proverbial "eye tooth" to know just how President Nixon really feels about blacks, or about Jews, or about Catholics, Mexicans or what have you.

There has been a time, just like right now, when matters of race were indeed crucial in this country—the Post Civil War period. After the Civil War the black question, the Indian question, the Chinese question and even the Filipino question, each had its turn to parade across the national stage.

How did these racial minorities fare at the hands of the Presidents then in office? Are there any lessons to be learned?

I suppose that what I am really getting at is this: Does an American President have a special responsibility in matters of race relations in this country?

History seems to suggest that he does.

In the 19th century as much as in the 20th it was the unmistakable duty of Presidents to use the moral prestige as well as the actual powers of their office to defend the Constitution and to execute the laws in letter and in spirit.

As far as the blacks were concerned the President, after the Civil War, was responsible for enforcing the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments to the Constitution (all giving special protection to blacks), for putting down domestic violence (blacks at this time were victims of much of this)—and for positive leadership of public opinion in matters of race.

As matter of fact, when President Eisenhower called out the troops to get nine black children into the all white schools of Little Rock, Ark. (under Federal Court order based on the 14th Amendment), he was enforcing the law as no President before him had done since General Grant, as President, who called out the troops to help put down the Ku Klux Klan in South Carolina, 1870-71!

The same thing can be said for President Kennedy in bringing in the troops to enter James Meredith in the University of Mississippi and Autherine Lucy in the University of Alabama.

Not too long ago the Civil Rights Commission took most of our contemporary presidents to task for their shortcomings in the area of race relations: "In the final analysis," the Commission said in part, "the achievement of civil rights goals depends on the quality of leadership exercised by the President in moving the nation toward racial justice."

"His example of courageous moral leader-

ship can inspire the necessary will and determination not only of federal officials who serve under his direction but of the American people as well."

"Are we getting that kind of leadership and direction from the White House these days?"

We keep hearing about "Southern strategies," which seem to mean catering to the white fears of black advance about our President's opposition to busing for integration (even though the Supreme Court said it was proper), about the opposition of the President to what he called "forced economic integration of the suburbs" (which, translated another way means keep the poor blacks—most of us—out) and finally, about the President's determination to put four conservatives and strict constructionists on the Supreme Court with the hope, it seems, of slowing down the spate of court decisions in favor of black right, among other things.

This kind of rhetoric emanating from the White House indicates that the President may be dragging his feet in matters of race. Throughout our history it seems that "nowhere has the distance between the Constitutional dream and social reality been more noticeable than in American race relations."

A recent study, by this writer, on the racial attitudes of 10 American Presidents from Abraham Lincoln to Theodore Roosevelt led to the conclusion that while most of these men were rather liberal in their written and verbal opinions on matters of race, when measured by actual accomplishment their record for the most part was one of stark failure or refusal to enforce laws involving matters of race, and extreme reluctance to champion unreserved racial equality in the full uninhibited spirit of American Democracy.

In situations calling for vigorous action in matters of race, these Presidents were paralyzed. With perhaps the exception of General Grant, they lacked vigor and courage in matters of law enforcement. Their executive arms and legs, too, for that matter, were palsied!

In the course of wrestling with the black question, few, if any, of them exploited the full potentialities of the Presidential office in the interest of racial statesmanship.

These Presidents believed in the idea of inherent racial differences and as a matter of course assumed the superiority of the white race. They were conscious of race.

Historically the term "race consciousness" for Americans implied an awareness of racial identity to the extent that it would keep one from too close an association with other races, at least not to the point of amalgamation.

It is in this sense that all of the 10 presidents were race conscious, though not all of them, shared completely all of the biases usually associated with race prejudice.

At least five of them, Lincoln, Andrew Johnson, Hayes, Garfield and Theodore Roosevelt were not in favor of the biological crossing of the races.

As a matter of fact these Presidents were much more receptive to the possibilities of Indian-white amalgamation than they were to the genetic fusion of Chinese, Japanese and black with the whites.

On the other hand, if their racial rhetoric may be believed, the Presidents never doubted that blacks were American citizens who would eventually enjoy the full blessings of American democracy. They were not quite as willing to assume that this would also be true for orientals.

Scholars now know that the oceans of racism and anti-black thought flowed through the antebellum and post bellum North. Presidents of the late 19th century were aware of northern race prejudice but still they thought of the blacks primarily as a southern problem.

And the Presidents rarely talked about removing prejudices or trying to mitigate them. None of these men came out for social equality between the races. They limited themselves to pleas for the elementary rights of citizenship for blacks: safety in life, liberty and property.

However, U.S. Grant said that social equality was not a matter for legislation anyway. He contended that blacks could be given all of their civil rights and whites would still be free not to associate with them if they didn't want to do so.

This case study of Presidents also suggests that perhaps the bane of the race question as it concerned blacks was the tendency both yesterday and today to treat it politically rather than morally. One is almost overwhelmed by the regularity with which the Presidents judged the black question to be at root a matter of politics.

With the exception of the subject of education, the Presidents did not take up the economic or social aspects of the race question, except perhaps to deny the relevance of social equality to the problem.

On the other hand one should perhaps not be overly surprised that the Presidents viewed the matter of race as a political liability. After all these men were politicians. In matters of race they were afraid to move, since it was impossible to know the right move to make.

And yet one gets the feeling that they did not fear so much to move as they dreaded making a move that would fail. They seemed convinced that force in behalf of the blacks, which, after all, had already been tried during the Civil War and Reconstruction, would do more harm than good and would in all probability end in failure.

Politicians hate to fail. Theodore Roosevelt, for example, said that politicians should not attempt the impossible—especially in matters of race.

At this point a word or two on the nature of leadership in a democracy, especially Presidential leadership.

According to one scholar "the President must lead public opinion. To a much greater degree than we realize, ours is a government of public opinion and we look to our chosen leader to sense our doubts and fears, hopes and aspirations and to be the nation's spokesman."

Unfortunately, in a democracy, "a President so far ahead of his time as to voice aspirations the common man is not yet ready to understand (and accept) is inevitably doomed to failure."

This seems to be the dilemma of the leader and of the politician. He must lead but he must not lead too far ahead.

"The obvious weakness of government by opinion," in the words of an English man of letters, "is the difficulty of ascertaining it."

American Presidents of the last third of the 19th century were certainly "practical" American politicians on matters of race: They were "timid in advocacy, infertile in suggestion, always listening to the popular voice, always afraid to commit themselves to points of view which may turn out unpopular," or in Roosevelt's words, impossible.

What is also striking is the fact that as these American Presidents faced the problems of race, their personal views on race seemed less decisive in determining their actions than what they considered to be the views of the majority of the American people. And they were white.

What mattered most to Abraham Lincoln, for example, as he wrestled with the problems of race was not so much his own views as what he identified as the "universal feelings" of the white American majority on matters of race.

While Lincoln did not agree that blacks should be unjustly treated, during the pre-presidential years he was unwilling to grant blacks full equality:

"My own feelings will not admit of this; and if mine would we well know that those of the great mass of white people would not."

And then Lincoln took a line of reasoning which seemed to doom the black minority forever to the mercy of the white majority:

"Whether or not these feelings accord with justice and sound judgment, is not the sole question, if indeed, it is any part of it."

"A universal feeling, whether well or ill founded cannot safely be disregarded. We cannot make them our equals."

According to Harold Laski, statesmanship in American consists not only in representing the special interests of the leader's own section but in finding a formula that will bring the different regions together in a common policy.

And perhaps this is the reason for the confusion, the hesitation, the ambivalence and the caution displayed by Presidents of the late 19th century and their colleagues in matters of race.

Are there any possible lessons to be learned from this sketchy summary of the racial views of Presidents of the latter 19th century?

It appears that American Presidents will never champion the cause of full racial equality for blacks in America as long as they feel that the majority of the average white Americans are against it, thus making it politically inexpedient.

An immediate exception to this thesis comes to mind—the passage of the open housing bill.

It seems most unlikely that open housing would win in a nationwide referendum on the question. Whites, in the main don't care for open housing.

Why then did Congress pass it anyway and the President sign it? My only answer is that the country at this time was caught up in the agony and emotion of the Kennedy and King assassinations which enabled the Nation to transcend its prejudices.

And make no mistake about it. White Americans are capable of transcending prejudice when they have a mind to do so.

They have done so many times in American history and are doing it, many of them daily, today.

Because of the political and minority nature of the black question, blacks should not expect any American President to go all out for their cause.

Presidents should but they won't—at least not if the white majority puts up too much resistance.

President Lyndon B. Johnson came pretty close to going all out for the blacks. Who knows what he might not have done had the Vietnam war and the riots not intervened.

What then can blacks do if they can't expect substantive help from the White House?

It appears that now that the law is finally on their side, blacks must individually and collectively cast down their buckets of resistance to racial prejudice and discrimination wherever they are in every local hamlet of the land.

In the spirit of W. E. B. Dubois, there needs to be more individual assertion on the part of blacks in pursuit of their rights wherever they find themselves.

Every individual black should yelp like a wounded dog when he feels he is being victimized by discrimination and unequal treatment in any area of American life.

Only in this way will prejudice on the part of individual whites be challenged often enough to cause them to begin to question their prejudices and soften up a little.

Blacks would also fortify their political muscle if every single black in America of voting age would register and make it his business to vote in every election that is held.

Talk about black power! Now that's the kind of black power that, while it would

produce no miracles, would cause politicians to pay more attention to minority demands.

We can always be out voted. But if blacks turned out 90 per cent in every election and ganged up on candidates admittedly unresponsive to minority needs it could make a difference.

There is no proof for any of this other than the perspective of history.

It just seems to me that if Mrs. Rosa Parks had not sat in the wrong bus seat in Montgomery, and if the bus boycott had not followed, and if the freedom rides and sit ins and wade ins had not been attempted in the local hamlets of America, and if the blacks had simply waited for a public accommodations law to be championed by a President and passed by Congress, we would still have public segregation.

Congressional action came only after myriad sacrificial acts of heroic self assertion on the part of blacks and sympathetic whites in the very dens of prejudices themselves.

And it also seems that ultimately the white majority holds the key to the solution of the black problem.

For it was the white majority that first decided that they didn't care for black people and constantly notified their political representatives of this fact.

And only when whites begin in large numbers to notify their local state and national legislators, their bosses on their jobs, the pastors in their churches, the superintendents and boards of their schools, the sellers of their homes, the proprietors of the public and private places they patronize, and even their own children, that irrespective of the past, they no longer wish unequal treatment and discrimination against blacks to continue, only then will our social, economic, religious, constitutional and political institutions begin to accord black citizens the same privileges and immunities and equal protection of the laws of the United States which every white citizen enjoys simply by being born.

Since most of the Presidents of the latter 19th century were Republicans a final word may be in order on that particular political party during this period.

It is common knowledge that as a result of the Civil war and Reconstruction, Southerners for the most part refused to vote Republican until the election of Herbert Hoover in 1928.

Ever since Reconstruction the Republican Party has been preoccupied with the subject of rehabilitating the party in the South and making it more acceptable and respectable in that region.

Most of the Southern white Republicans beat a hasty retreat from the party after Reconstruction, leaving it almost wholly black.

Those who remained swore to the Presidents that the only way to make the party viable in the South was to find ways of getting more whites into it.

Black members were not to be pushed out but it was felt that blacks should be less prominent in party leadership and that whites should lead.

For the next 30 years the Republicans struggled with the problems of an effective party in the South without resolution.

It seems ironic that the Republican Party, the party that freed the slaves, carried out Reconstruction and enacted the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments, should have abandoned the blacks and made attempts to make the party viable in the South for whites at the expense of the blacks.

In 1972 the Republican Party has still not figured out a successful way of building a viable organization in the South without sacrificing the blacks.

The current Republican "Southern Strategy" of exploiting anti-black feeling among Southern and even Northern whites in the hopes of turning white Southern Democrats

into Republicans at the expense of a lesser or non-black presence is so reminiscent of attempts in the latter 19th century to create "lily-white" Republican parties in the South. They failed. But the Party keeps trying.

Throughout the late 19th century blacks stuck with the Republican party long after that party had for all practical purposes abandoned their cause.

History again dictates that should the current object of black political affection, the Democrats, show signs of abandoning their commitment to equality, blacks should not hesitate to try to peddle their political porridge elsewhere—perhaps back to the Republicans!

Presidential hopeful Muskie has proven that racially he too has traveled no further than Abraham Lincoln when he, for all practical purposes, admitted that due to the "universal feeling" on the part of the white majority of distaste for blacks, he, Muskie, would not welcome a black man, though qualified, on his ticket.

Could it really be true that the only thing we learn from history is that we learn nothing from it?

Or has Muskie learned the lessons of history only too well in this case?

Dr. George Sinkler, 44, is professor of history at Morgan State College in Baltimore where he has worked since 1966. His first book, "The Racial Attitudes of American Presidents from Abraham Lincoln to Theodore Roosevelt," was published last June. Born and reared in South Carolina, he received his doctorate from Teachers College, Columbia University, and has been an educator since 1955. He has numerous scholarly articles to his credit.

WESTERN CIVILIZATION FACES GRAVE CRISIS

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, a growing number of Americans are deeply troubled about the grave crisis that faces not only our own country, but the whole of Western civilization.

It is more than the conflict of man against man, and nation against nation. These are the fruits of the crisis. Rather, we are experiencing a pervasive dehumanization of our society that is evidenced by our lack of discipline over passions and appetites.

We see a growing tendency to indulge every whim, and a developing attitude that often attributes goodness to that which previously had been considered evil. In short, we are experiencing a crisis of the spirit that is destined to have a profound impact on our way of life.

In this connection, I would like to share with my colleagues a very profound and provocative assessment of this subject given by the distinguished junior Senator from New York, the Honorable JAMES L. BUCKLEY, in an address before the St. Francis College Alumni Society, at the Americana Hotel, New York City, on February 17, 1972.

Speaking before this predominately Catholic group, Senator BUCKLEY related today's crisis to the many faced throughout the years by the Roman Catholic Church. However, he makes it abundant-

ly clear that the forces unleashed in "this cruel century" threaten not only Catholicism, but Protestantism and the future of mankind as a whole.

He says that we have lost that certainty of purpose in the scriptures which previously had united all of Western civilization. Our Founding Fathers, he observes, understood that political rights and responsibilities must be rooted in the divine order.

He notes:

The gravity of the present crisis is such that the doctrinal distinctions between Protestant and Catholic, or among Protestant, Catholic and Jew for that matter, are of minor political significance. A genuine community of interest transcending doctrinal differences can, and must, be created out of a sense of common danger.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting Senator BUCKLEY's excellent address at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUCKLEY

In the year of our Lord, Eighteen-Hundred and Forty, the famous English historian, Thomas Macaulay, sat back to survey the progress of religion in the western world and, in the course of a long and learned essay, paused to pay tribute to Catholicism. Such was his praise that it remains to this day perhaps the noblest tribute ever paid to Catholicism by one not of the faith. "There is not, and there never has been," he wrote.

"A work of human policy so well deserving of examination as the Roman Catholic Church. The history of that church joins together the two great ages of human civilization. No other institution is left standing which carries the mind back to the time when the smoke of sacrifice rose from the Pantheon. The proudest royal houses are but of yesterday when compared with the line of supreme pontiffs. That line we trace back in an unbroken series, from the Pope who crowned Napoleon in the nineteenth century to the Pope who crowned Pepin in the eighth; and far beyond the time of Pepin, the august dynasty extends, till it is lost in the twilight of fable . . . the Papacy remains, not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigor. The Catholic Church is still sending forth to the farthest ends of the world missionaries as zealous as those who landed in Kent with Augustine. Nor do we see any sign which indicates that the term of her long dominion is approaching. She saw the commencement of all the governments and all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world; and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the temple at Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigor when some traveler from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's."

The world, of course, has turned over many times since Macaulay's day; its orbits have even been photographed by men standing on the moon. Were Macaulay somehow to come alive today, he would be saddened, I am sure, to discover that his distant traveler from New Zealand could no longer gaze upon St. Paul's from an arch of London Bridge, for London Bridge has been transported, brick by antique brick, to Lake Havasu City, Arizona.

But most of all, perhaps, Macaulay would be amazed to discover that the Catholic Church, which he had praised so movingly as the most enduring institution on the face

of the earth, was itself facing some of the severest trials of its long dominion. It would be difficult for him, I think, to repeat the confident prophecy he uttered 130 years ago. For we have come in the intervening years, to the point where the Vicar of Christ could be heard, as he was not many months ago, pleading with some of the clergy to stop "crucifying" the church.

Crisis and conflict, to be sure, are not new to the Church. She has seen and survived the most savage attacks. And so, one supposes, it must be. For while it has been the mission of the Church to teach all men, she has never been guaranteed that all men or even most, will be disposed to learn. It has been her mission to minister to the spiritual needs of the faithful, but she has never been guaranteed that the faithful will retain the faith. It has been her mission, in short, to preach the gospel of love to the sons of Adam—the first of whom, it must not be forgotten, slew his brother. But whatever her temporary travail, she has been assured that even the Devil himself cannot prevail against her. And it is for that reason that, even in the midst of grave peril, we have cause to take heart. The faith which inspired the letters of St. Paul and the wisdom of Aquinas, the faith which survived reformations and revolutions, the faith for which countless millions have given their lives, the faith of our fathers and of our fathers' fathers, will not all of a sudden come tumbling down because some self-appointed 20th century Joshua march around its walls shouting that God is dead.

But even while we take heart in the knowledge that the Church shall in the end prevail, it is difficult in these days not to be pessimistic about the shorter term. For it is not alone the Church which finds its principles denied and its authority doubted. Civilization itself is in crisis in the West; and the crisis consists precisely in the fact that the West has become uncertain of its purpose.

The West was at one time certain of its purpose, of a purpose in which all men were, or could be, united, and that purpose found its fullest expression in the news of glad tidings and great joy contained in scripture. On the political level, that purpose found its noblest expression in the founding of America. Those who constructed this nation understood that political rights and responsibilities must be rooted in the divine order, and they therefore looked for guidance to the laws of nature and of nature's God. They understood, further, that only a virtuous people can remain a free people. Because if the citizens of a free society begin to lose their willingness to curb their own aggressions through self-discipline, then government will inevitably step in and impose that discipline upon them.

The fate of all governments, but of democracies in particular, depends decisively on the character of those who govern. In the words of the great English statesman, Edmund Burke,

"Men are qualified for civil liberty in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites, in proportion as their love of justice is above 'their rapacity, in proportion as their soundness and sobriety of understanding is above their vanity. . . . In proportion as they are disposed to listen to the counsels of the wise and good in preference to the flattery of knaves. Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere; and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters."

It is the loss of this understanding, and the failure to act upon it, that most disturbs thoughtful men in America today. Much of

the country seems hell-bent on encouraging the young—and, for that matter, the old—to indulge their every whim. But the oldest wisdom in the world teaches that those who indulge their passions become slaves to them. They are incapable of building free institutions, or of maintaining them; and, in the end, they become the stuff of which anarchy first, and then tyranny are made.

In intruding this pessimistic note, I do not mean to suggest that the western world in general, or the United States in particular, is beyond repair. Quite the contrary. My intention is precisely to present the full gravity of the present crisis of the spirit in order to suggest that men and women such as you because of your faith are in a better position than most to do something about it. Events have contrived to render the fate of the Church coincidental with the fate of western civilization, and they have further contrived to render the fate of western civilization coincidental with the fate of the United States. And I am increasingly drawn to the conclusion that the fate of the United States may depend decisively on the role played by the American Catholic laity.

It is true, of course, that when Catholics first came to this country in large numbers during the 19th century, they were most often treated as somehow outside the mainstream of the American experience. The laws and customs of the land reflected an essentially Protestant view of life; and there existed strong currents of anti-Catholicism because in an era of deep sectarian passions, differences in rituals and dogma overshadowed the underlying community of belief among Protestants and Catholics in those basic Christian insights which played so important a role in the shaping of the American republic.

It is the irony of our times, in what is increasingly called the post-Christian era, that so many Americans continue to try to isolate Catholics not because of differences in ritual or dogma, but precisely because of Catholicism's continued belief in those basic principles of the moral law, which were once considered fundamental to American life. We are told, further, that in a pluralistic society any conviction as to public matters which happens to hinge on a belief in God and on an understanding of the natural law must somehow be buried. Yet from its inception, the laws of this country have openly reflected the moral consensus of its people.

Nevertheless, because of their historic experience in America, Catholics have tended to feel on the defensive as Americans, even though their critics have themselves abandoned the traditional American understanding of the role of religion and of morality and of personal accountability in the life of the nation.

There persists, among American Catholics, a certain defensive mentality that is not only unnecessary, but dangerous, under present circumstances.

It is unnecessary for the simple reason that the social and political conditions which gave rise to it have for the most part disappeared. And it is dangerous because the nation, now more than ever, has need of an informed Catholic perspective. We are still, it is true, a predominantly Protestant country. But this cruel century has unleashed which threaten Protestantism no less than Catholicism; indeed, they threaten the future of mankind as a whole. We are confronted by the barbarian from without, and by the Philistine from within; by the tyrannical malevolence of communism on the one hand, and by the moral sterility of secular humanism on the other. Indeed, it is an open question whether we have more to fear from those foreign despots who would tyrannize the world or from those domestic zealots who would banish God from our lives. The gravity of the present crisis is such that the doctrinal dis-

inctions between Protestant and Catholic, or among Protestant, Catholic and Jew for that matter, are of minor political significance. A genuine community of interest transcending doctrinal differences can, and must, be created out of a sense of common danger.

American Catholics in particular have a moral and political obligation to undertake such common enterprise; because the United States now more than ever needs the humane wisdom that Catholicism in our time is in a unique position to dispense. It is a wisdom that proceeds from an understanding of the limits of human nature. It is a wisdom which teaches that no civilization was ever called great whose people could not control their passions. It is a wisdom which teaches that the great affairs of the world are but a reflection of those events which take place in the human soul.

Rome, it is said, was not built in a day; but neither, I must add, was she destroyed in a day. I do not have, I must confess, a pocketful of solutions to the present disorders of the world; but I know, as I trust you do, that its disorders are in every important respect disorders of the human soul. The moral crisis of the West did not begin yesterday, and it will not disappear tomorrow. But the work to check, and then turn the tide can no longer be postponed. Because even the man of the dullest moral sensibilities cannot fail to grasp that the western world is on the verge of one of the great upheavals in human history and that, unless we are careful, mankind may be destined to enter the darkest age yet recorded.

"All that is necessary for evil to triumph," Burke reminds us, "is for enough good men to do nothing." Let me therefore suggest, without pretending to offer you any guarantee of success, some specific things that you, as concerned Christians, can undertake—for your own sake, for that of your children, and for that of the nation.

Most of you know better than I the growing menace of drug addiction. It is a menace which chooses its victims without regard to race, creed, color, or income; and it threatens to produce an entire generation of Americans characterized by nothing so much as by mindless degradation. The flow of narcotics into and through this country must be stopped. Those who deal in drugs must be dealt the severest penalties, and addicts must be treated with compassion but firmness. The law, however, can do only so much in its own right. The eradication of this deadly evil depends, in the final analysis, on the willingness of ordinary citizens to give over a part of their lives to community service. I would enjoin you, therefore, to take an active role in your local communities, to find out how pervasive is the drug problem in your area, to pinpoint as best you can the source of supply, and to cooperate with public and private enforcement, education and rehabilitation programs in your locale; and above all, to install in your children that Christian respect for their bodies and minds which is the ultimate defense against the curse of addiction.

Let me turn now to another area in which you, as concerned parents and citizens, can do much: pornography. If there is one contemporary phenomenon in which the moral disintegration of the modern world is most strikingly revealed, it is the new pornography. I say "new" because pornography as such is hardly an invention of the 20th century. What is new is its open appearance in the marketplace; what is new is the attempt to legitimize it; what is new is the effort to convince us that every panderer has a constitutionally protected right to peddle the most sordid filth without restraint; what is new is the argument that man's natural sense of shame is a tyrannical contrivance imposed by a puritanical culture.

There are already indications that a substantial majority of the American public is outraged, as properly it should be, by the

new pornography. The decent sensibilities of civilized men cannot but be offended by this morally corrosive phenomenon. As with the drug problem, there is much that can be done in the way of coordinating the activities of public officials with those of private citizens. In the private sphere, it may be necessary to educate the community, and especially the young, on the dangers of pornography, on the ways in which it destroys the dignity of human sexuality and thereby endangers the family.

On a somewhat larger scale, there are a variety of pressures—some subtle, some not so subtle—which can be applied to distributors and sellers of pornography. I urge you to think of legitimate ways in which such pressures can be brought to bear in your own city or town. Most importantly, I would urge you to bridge the gap between private and public action by petitioning your appointive and elective officials, not merely with an occasional letter of protest, but with a sustained and, if possible, organized campaign.

Lastly, I turn to a problem which demands, indeed, cries out for your immediate attention. I refer to the barbaric slaughter of the innocents which is allowed to pass under the name of "therapeutic abortion." Therapeutic abortion, as it is practiced today in our more liberal jurisdictions—including, I am sad to say, New York—is nothing more nor less than the deliberate killing of a human being. It is fashionable in certain circles—indeed, it has become the cornerstone argument of the antilife lobby—that the only opposition to liberalized abortion comes from a narrow doctrinal bias of a reactionary Catholicism. Nothing, of course, could be farther from the truth. If you seek to protect the rights of the unborn, you need not have recourse to Catholic doctrine. You need look no farther than the preamble to the Declaration of Independence, which states that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, and that among these is the right to life.

In most states of the union at the present time, unborn children have many rights under the law. A mother, for example, may sue for support of her unborn child, and as well for damages sustained by her unborn child as a result of assault or accident. An unborn child may even share in an inheritance or in benefits under workmen's compensation. And a pregnant woman convicted of a capital crime may not be executed until after her child is born.

How is it then, that all of a sudden we are being told that an unborn child is not a person? The answer is not pleasant to contemplate, for it reveals the depths to which the moral sense of the western world has sunk; and it reveals as well the necessity for timely and purposeful action on the part of those who are not yet taken in by the morally deadening spirit of this materialistic and consummately selfish age.

Ladies and gentlemen, I put it to you as a simple logical proposition: those who propose abortion today, will propose infanticide and euthanasia tomorrow. If today we say that a life should not come into this world because it is unwanted, or abnormal, or malformed, then, most assuredly, we shall tomorrow find ourselves saying that a life already in this world which is unwanted, or abnormal, or malformed, should not be permitted to continue in this world.

I put it to you that the time for action is now. Liberalized abortion laws in the states must be repealed, and the federal government must be prevented from ever entertaining abortion as a legitimate means of population control.

Here, it seems to me, is a project worthy of a truly ecumenical movement. It is a project that will require ingenuity, self-sacrifice, and a sustained capacity for hard work. It is a project, if ever there was one, to which a good man can give himself, body and soul not as a Catholic, but as a humane citizen

of a still great nation. And it is a project for which you will have, literally, the undying thanks of generations yet unborn.

Here, then, are just three areas in which you as concerned citizens and Christians can control the course of events. None of these problems is an exclusively Catholic concern; but the solutions to all of them desperately need that humane wisdom that the Catholic Church at the present hour is in a unique position of being able to supply. The fate of the western world, the fate of the United States may well be determined by whether or not we choose to act.

If we do not undertake to stand by what is right; if we too succumb to the spirit of the age; if we too abandon the wisdom of the West; if we too prefer the deceptive security of the moment to the necessary of sacrifice—then it will be recorded that the people of this nation, the home of what was once the noblest experiment in government in the history of man, did not care enough to defend the principles which made them great.

That, I hope and pray, will not be the verdict of history. I firmly believe that the spiritual resources of the nation are adequate to the task. And I ask you to join me in the effort to restore to our public life the understanding of those principles that western civilization has achieved its greatest glory in discovering.

Let history record that at a time of great peril there were enough good men and women who were willing to defend civilization against the Philistine from within and against the barbarian from without. And let us make it possible for some future Thomas Macaulay to record that, in the last third of the 20th century, although it seemed that the Devil himself was loosed, the Catholic Church stood firm and splendid, in undiminished vigor.

SIDNEY P. WHITE SERVED COMMUNITY FIVE DECADES

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the town of Andover, Mass., which I am privileged to represent, is fortunate indeed to have a great number of effective, dedicated, and responsive public servants. One of the most distinguished among this number is Mr. Sidney P. White, who has served his community for some five decades.

Admired and esteemed by everyone who knows him, Sid White was a persuasive and respected member of the Andover Board of Selectmen for 18 years, but one among the many responsible posts which he has held in his town. His career as a public servant who worked tirelessly for his community stands as an outstanding example of dignity, integrity, and responsiveness in local government, and he leaves a record which will be difficult to match.

It was a well deserved tribute which was recently paid to Sid White on his retirement by the people of Andover, whom he has served so well over the years, and I am pleased to have an opportunity to share the following account of this tribute with my colleagues:

SID'S TESTIMONIAL

(By Mary Fitzgerald)

Sid White's testimonial at Andover Country Club Friday night was different.

The tribute to one of Andover's most colorful political figures for almost half a century

had none of the usual trappings, the formal presentations and lengthy speeches oozing with hollow praise.

Almost 350 men and women packed into the club dining room to bid him farewell, a well-dressed convivial cross-section of people who had rubbed elbows with Sid White in his long career as public servant.

Though many of them may have disagreed with White through the years, their mood Friday night was gay as they dined and danced until William A. Dogerty, chairman, rose to open the speaking program.

The mood continued throughout the brief speeches, punctuated by good-natured ribbing.

Selectman Roger Collins, representing the board, referred to Sid White as "the end of an era, one of Andover's 'Last Hurrahs.'"

Collins said that while White had often had differences of opinion with fellow selectmen, he felt these had only made board decisions more meaningful for the community.

He noted that White's vast knowledge of the town and regular attendance at board meetings will be missed, and added that his greatest tribute came when the other selectmen requested he reconsider the decision to retire.

Town Manager J. Maynard Austin said that Friday's outpouring of townspeople was not the normal testimonial for a retiring selectman, and paid tribute to White for assistance since he took over as town manager two years ago.

Arthur Flynn brought the regards of Cong. F. Bradford Morse who had planned to attend until the last minute, and Rep. James P. Hurrell presented the congratulations of the House of Representatives to White "for his years of outstanding service to Andover."

Hurrell paid White the most memorable compliment of the evening, "he disagreed without being disagreeable."

Highway Superintendent Stanley Chlebowski had the principal role, presenting a plaque from the citizens of Andover.

It could have been a sombre moment as he read the inscription citing White's work with the planning board, 1933-1952; department of public works, 1941-1956; selectman, 1949-1961, 1966-1972, and Merrimack River Valley Sewerage Board, 1958-1960. But Chlebowski handled it with unabashed humor, and the crowd responded with spontaneous joshing, whistles and sustained applause.

White's acceptance was modest, light and brief, thanking the people who honored him, calling his years as public servant "a delightful part of my life" and looking ahead to his plans for retirement.

Dr. William V. Emmons, who served as toastmaster, ended with words that became a White trademark during his years in public life. "Let us now go forward."

Twice the audience rose to give White a prolonged standing ovation.

He was pleased. "It makes me feel good to realize so many endorse what I stood for. It's far beyond anything I expected."

The testimonial had been planned by William A. Doherty, chairman; David MacDonald, treasurer; Deputy Fire Chief Albert Cole, secretary; Frederick R. Yancey; Forrest Noyes, Stanley Chlebowski, Dr. William V. Emmons, Thomas Korovas, J. Everett Collins, Stafford A. Lindsay, Francis P. Reilly, George Mazo and Irving J. Whitcomb.

The whole evening had a homey flavor.

Rev. J. Everett Bodge of South Church gave the invocation.

His two sisters, Mrs. Hary Henderson and Mrs. Charlotte Carter, were presented.

Roger Collins had been chosen to represent the selectmen because the Collinses and Whites had been family friends for years, their roots deep in the history of the town.

Seventeen men had come from all over Massachusetts, Aleppo Temple Mounted Patrol of the Ancient Arabic Order of Nobles of the Mystic Shrine of North America because

Sid White serves as secretary of their organization.

As White moved through the audience, people grabbed his hand or clapped him on the shoulder.

It was Sid White's brightest hour in 50 years in the spotlight.

THE 53D ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1972

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the American Legion Day tribute and pay honor to the Nation's largest veterans' organization—the American Legion. I join the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in commending the American Legion. As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, it was my distinct honor and privilege to hear the fine presentation by the National Commander of the American Legion, Mr. John H. Gerger, who presented the American Legion's program for the second session of the 92d Congress.

I extend special greetings also to Mrs. Robert L. Parker, the president of the Legion's auxiliary and the many legionnaires and auxiliary members gathered here in Washington, but particularly to the legionnaires from the great State of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, the American Legion is celebrating its 53d anniversary, commemorating that day when a group of men gathered in Paris, France, to form what has now become the world's largest organization—the American Legion.

War weary and homesick, members of the American Expeditionary Force met March 15-17, 1919, armed with lofty ideals that were to become the Legion's framework of service to God and country.

The doughboys of the AEF brought with them to the Paris caucus a strong desire to create an organization based upon firm comradeship, born of war service and dedicated to equitable treatment for all veterans, particularly the disabled, their widows, and their orphans.

Also uppermost in their minds was the promotion of patriotism and the immediate concern for national security for America for the prevention of future world conflicts.

These same concerns occupy the Legion today and the efforts of some 2.7 million members of the American Legion are channeled toward achieving successful results.

While the Legion is composed of veterans from four wars, Vietnam period veterans in their ranks now number around 425,000 and their number grows daily. The American Legion, with more than 2.7 million members, in 1971 enjoyed the seventh consecutive year of membership growth.

The founders of the American Legion who originally expounded their lofty principles at Paris decided to leave the

definition of permanent policies for a later meeting in the United States. Two months after the original caucus in Paris, 1,100 delegates met in St. Louis, Mo., May 8-10, 1919. Here the blueprint for the American Legion was produced.

The major concern during that historic St. Louis meeting was the plight of the returning veteran, particularly the disabled veteran. The Legion went to work immediately on securing legislation through the Congress to provide benefits to veterans. Today during this 53d anniversary, the Legion is still working toward benefits for the older veteran while taking positive action to care for the new veteran.

The American Legion is deeply concerned with the plight of the Vietnam period veterans as they return to their homes, after having served honorably in the Armed Forces of their country. They are concerned with their complete well-being, but one of the most critical problems facing the new veteran is the matter of suitable employment.

Over a year ago the Legion began its jobs for veterans program by conducting job fairs or job marts in order to bring prospective employers and the veteran together. This has been a meaningful and in many instances a most successful program.

These programs serve more than the purpose of bringing potential employer-prospective employee together as they quickly learned to use them as centers for informing the new veteran of his benefits under the GI bill, particularly the educational benefits which he might need to prepare himself for a competitive job in a tight job market.

Whenever we mention the Vietnam veteran we must recall the fate of those who are either prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia. This is another continuing program of concern for the American Legion.

Their immediate effort has been and will continue to be, to focus the attention of the American people and other peoples of the world on this disgraceful situation. The American Legion will not rest until the ruthless enemy that holds our men grants them the humane treatment to which they are entitled under the Geneva Convention, and until they are reunited with their loved ones.

While the programs I have mentioned are of vital concern to the Legion, their basic blueprint, designed for them by the first Legionnaires at Paris and St. Louis, is their concern for veterans benefits—the total well-being of the veteran.

The Legion has fought long and hard for veterans benefits and one of the most special is the Veterans' Administration medical care program, administered through 168 VA hospitals. However, there is an increasing possibility that Congress, in the foreseeable future, may enact into law a national Health insurance plan which could mean the consolidation of VA hospitals under a single federal agency.

Concern among legionnaires led to the appointment of the American Legion Special Committee on Veterans Medical Care following the 1971 national convention, to recommend a plan of action to

combat any scheme that would restrict, reduce or weaken the VA medical care program. I support them in their efforts to maintain the present system of Veterans hospitals and prevent consolidation of them.

I salute the American Legionnaires for lending the helping hand of brotherhood and friendship to the young and old, the rich and poor, the well and disabled in their service to God and country.

FOXES AND CHICKENCOOPS— PHASE II

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, I made some comments in the RECORD on the manner in which the Department of Labor is carrying out its legal obligation to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment—29 U.S.C. 551. In my previous exploration of what an agency can do in the way of imaginative and inventive legal exegesis, I pointed to the recruiting standards used by the Nixon administration in finding people to "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earner, and so forth."

As phase II of our exploration, Mr. Speaker, let us turn to the Department's record in carrying out its obligations under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, an effort by the Congress to make it public policy to assure so far as possible every working man and woman in the Nation safe and healthful working conditions—section 2 (b), Public Law 91-596.

That obligation has also been assigned to the Department of Labor by the Congress. But the executive council of the AFL-CIO, which organization provided much of the impetus behind the enactment of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, has now reported to the Nation that—

The goals of this law have been debased, and their achievement needlessly delayed.

I include in the RECORD the statement by the AFL-CIO executive council in full at this point:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

More than a year has passed since President Nixon signed the Occupational Safety and Health Act into law. At that time, he termed it one of the most important and far-reaching laws of recent decades, and promised highest priority to its vigorous and effective administration.

We have weighed the President's words against his deeds and found them wanting. The record is one of foot-dragging, flabby enforcement and adulteration of the special provisions of the Act setting forth specific rights and protections for employees.

Organized labor had hailed the act, pledged its full cooperation to the federal agencies responsible for administration, and estab-

lished programs designed to shoulder organized labor's responsibilities in helping make it work.

But the Administration regards implementation of the act as a matter to be worked out among the federal government, business management and the governments of the various states. Organized labor is regarded as an interloper. Its proposals and suggestions are disregarded or opposed. Major policy decisions are discussed with labor only at our insistence or after decisions have already been reached.

Thus the goals of this law have been debased, and their achievement needlessly delayed. We further note that there is a similar lack of enforcement and implementation of the Railroad Safety Act.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration's own summary report on its enforcement actions between July and November 1971 tell the story.

This report shows that 77.4% of all establishments inspected were in violation, a commentary on the abject failure of the states to protect the lives and health of workers during the years when there was no federal law.

According to the report, \$512,000 in fines were assessed against 8,257 employers for violations—an average fine of \$62. That is too cheap a price tag to be placed on the lives and health of workers. More stringent fines are necessary to prevent employers from deciding that it is cheaper to violate the law than to correct the hazard.

On the basis of the present enforcement staff of over 300 plus, with 9,800 establishments inspected in five months, the 4.1 million workplaces covered by the Act would all be finally inspected once in the next 170 years.

In response to an urgent appeal from the AFL-CIO, the OSHA adopted an emergency asbestos standard, but has not undertaken on its own initiative a single inspection of any workplace where asbestos may be a hazard.

The fiscal year 1973 budget authorizes \$67.5 million for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration of the Labor Department, or an increase of 85 percent over fiscal 1972. But of that amount, nearly half is earmarked for assisting the states to regain jurisdiction over occupational safety and health. That \$30 million figure is one-third greater than the budget authorization for federal enforcement programs.

Up to now, few states show inclination to submit plans that will provide programs affording protections to workers equal to those provided by the federal program.

Organized labor in every state must watch with care the development of such plans. Any which do not fully embody the employee protections of the federal law must be opposed.

We urge the Congress to drastically overhaul the Administration's budget for occupational safety and health programs as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

There still are not enough inspectors to provide an effective enforcement program. The AFL-CIO requested 1,000 inspectors in the field by the end of fiscal year 1972. There are only 315.

The AFL-CIO last year urged that there be more than 2,000 compliance personnel. The 1973 budget calls for only 800.

1. The amount for enforcement should be more than doubled in order to provide for 2,500 or more compliance officers, and industrial hygienists.

2. The Congress should remove \$20 million from the state program item and transfer it to enforcement.

3. Budget authorizations for developing occupational safety and health standards, training and education and statistical re-

porting of injuries and illnesses should be at least doubled.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health must be rescued by the Congress from the callous indifference of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Its effective functioning is indispensable to carrying out the intent of the Act.

The budget does not provide authorization for training needed occupational health personnel as required under the Act.

We urge that the Congress more than double the \$28.3 million authorized for the virtually important program of NIOSH. This will enable more rapid development of criteria and recommended occupational health standards, expanded hazards evaluation, and plant surveillance, and accelerated training of critically needed occupational health personnel.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

The Review Commission, which is responsible for adjudicating contested citations for violations of the Act, is both short-handed, and faced with a weekly rate of new cases greater than contested decisions by the National Labor Relations Board. This creates a constantly increasing backlog of unprocessed cases—a bottleneck to the entire occupational safety and health program.

The budget request of \$1.3 million for the Review Commission is only \$220,000 over that of the previous year. That is completely inadequate. We urge the Congress to increase it substantially.

We urge the Congress to appropriate the necessary funds and provide for the necessary staff to enforce the Railroad Safety Act and carry out the intent of that law.

Much progress has been made in the past year by all of our affiliates in meeting the responsibilities of organized labor under the Act. Much is yet to be done—in the plant, in the state legislatures and before the Congress.

All affiliates are urged to let their governors and legislators know that they will accept no substitutes for strong, effective, well-founded state laws and plans. All affiliates should let their Congressional delegations know that they are vitally concerned in adequate appropriations this year to make the act work toward achievement of its great humanitarian aims.

PEACE IN OUR TIME

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, to commemorate President Nixon's recent journey to the realm of oriental despot Mao Tse-tung, and in anticipation of his upcoming visit to the Soviet Union, I would like to insert some newspaper articles which help put the administration's "generation of peace" diplomacy in the proper perspective.

His all-pervading hope was to go down in history as the Great Peacemaker; and for this he was prepared to strive continually in the teeth of facts, and face great risks for himself and his country.

So Winston Churchill characterized British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain in his book "The Gathering Storm," Chamberlain's risk for peace turned out

to be the risk of a great war, which followed shortly.

The following articles on the "successful" 1938 Munich negotiations are from the New York Times of October 1, 1938, and the Washington Post of September 30, 1938:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 30, 1938]
 "PEACE WITH HONOR," SAYS CHAMBERLAIN
 (By Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr.)

LONDON, Sept. 30.—Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain had a hero's welcome on this rainy Autumn evening when he came back to London, bringing the four-power agreement and the Anglo-German declaration reaffirming "the desire of our two peoples never to go to war with one another again."

"For the second time in our history," he told a wildly cheering crowd in Downing Street, "a British Prime Minister has returned from Germany bringing peace with honor."

Mr. Chamberlain was comparing himself proudly with Disraeli, who came home amid similar enthusiasm after the Berlin Congress of 1878.

But to the excited thousands who lined Mr. Chamberlain's five-mile route from the airport at Heston to Downing Street it did not greatly matter whether he had brought peace "with honor" or not. They cared only that he had brought "peace."

They were thankful that bombs were not falling on their little houses, and all their pent-up relief went out to Mr. Chamberlain personally as if he alone had spared them.

There had been nothing like it here since grateful crowds surged around David Lloyd George during the victory celebrations of 1918. London usually hides its emotions and all this, exuberance was more astonishing than a ticker tape parade on Broadway.

WOMEN ALMOST HYSTERICAL

It had more than a trace of the hysterical about it. Most of Mr. Chamberlain's welcomers seemed to be women, who probably had not read the terms of the Munich agreement but who remembered the last war and all it meant to them.

They flocked from little suburban homes to watch the Prime Minister pass in his car along the Great West Road leading into London. They stood outside Buckingham Palace in pouring rain with newspapers over their hats waiting for him to arrive for a welcome by King George and Queen Elizabeth.

The crowd set up such tremendous cheers that Mr. and Mrs. Chamberlain had to appear with the King and Queen on the flood-lit palace balcony as if this were coronation time again.

Whitehall was so jammed that traffic had to be diverted. In Downing Street the crowd was so dense that Cabinet Ministers could not push their way through. Sir Samuel Hoare, Home Secretary, was hopelessly entangled until a Foreign Office usher shouted, "Make way for Sir Samuel Hoare! Make way for Sir Samuel Hoare!"

Malcolm MacDonald, Colonial Secretary, had to climb the iron railing of the Prime Minister's house to get a view.

At a second-story window Mr. Chamberlain and his wife smiled happily at this demonstration. Mrs. Chamberlain looked as if she had been weeping.

"Go home and get a nice quiet sleep," Mr. Chamberlain told the crowd.

But they would not go and for hours they shuffled through Whitehall past government buildings, which had sandbags in the windows, and into St. James's Park, where workmen still were digging trenches by torchlight to give government employees refuges in case bombing planes should come.

CHAMBERLAIN IS CONFIDENT

Mr. Chamberlain seemed to have no doubts about the value of what he had done.

"I believe it is peace for our time," he said in one of his window appearances in Downing Street.

To the crowd at the airport he expressed the opinion that "the settlement of the Czechoslovak problem, which has now been achieved, is only the prelude to a larger settlement in which all Europe may find peace."

There is no question that Mr. Chamberlain holds the British people in the hollow of his hand tonight. He could sweep a general election if he proclaimed one now and he probably could win a smashing victory at any time before the end of the year if—as some of his political opponents suspect—he chooses to capitalize his present commanding position in the country.

The somber background of the Munich agreement and the uncertain future of the next few months were scarcely discussed anywhere today. Debates in the House of Commons next week may bring doubt and dismay into the open, but cool analysis of the situation is impossible here when the public and its politicians are still thinking of the awful ordeals they escaped by such a narrow margin only three days ago. Unused gas masks in almost every house were reminders that Mr. Chamberlain had at least brought back something from Germany, no matter how hard on the Czechs his terms might be.

IMPROVED TERMS ARE SEEN

Informed British opinion finds the Munich settlement a great improvement on the harsh—even brutal—terms of Chancellor Hitler's Godesberg ultimatum. The territory to be occupied is far smaller than on Herr Hitler's map and corresponds more exactly to true ethnographic boundaries.

Plebiscites in other areas are to be held under international auspices instead of under Nazi control and there is a good chance that the Czechs will win most of them. The outcome will depend to some extent upon the interest and helpfulness the Western powers show Czechoslovakia between now and the end of November, when the votes will be counted.

Czech farmers wishing to leave German areas will not be deprived of their cattle or personal belongings under Herr Hitler's ultimatum. Movable property, apparently including armaments, can be carried away.

On the other hand the occupation will be so quick that hundreds of thousands of Czechs and non-Nazi Germans will face a choice between economic ruin in the interior of Czechoslovakia or submission to Nazi rule with all that it implies. The British Government's original desire to protect the "minority within the minority" has not been fulfilled.

Still more thousands of refugees may be added to those from the Sudeten area when the Polish and Hungarian claims come up for consideration. Today's Polish ultimatum to the Czechs was regarded in London as a blatant example of power politics, but as a threat to peace it was not taken very seriously. If it becomes dangerous tomorrow the British Government may use its new friendliness with Germany to request German efforts for restraint in Warsaw.

RUSSIAN STATUS CRITICIZED

The most serious criticism of Mr. Chamberlain was that he had gratuitously excluded Russia from Europe by the four-power negotiations in Munich. Only last Monday an authoritative spokesman here announced that Britain and Russia would "certainly" help France if a German attack brought the Franco-Czech alliance into play.

Yet the time will come before very long when the Russo-Czech alliance will be dropped and Russia may not even be a guarantor of what is left of Czechoslovakia. Britain might some day want a strong anti-German counterweight in the east to the Anglo-French strength in the west and not find it as a result of her new four-power method.

It is understood Viscount Halifax, Foreign Secretary, explained the necessity of the four-power meeting yesterday in a talk with Ivan Malsky, the Russian Ambassador, and it is said Mr. Malsky "was not at all disagreeable" about Russia's exclusion from Munich. The subject may well be asked next week, however, when the Labor and Liberal parties begin questioning Mr. Chamberlain in detail.

The remaining criticisms one heard today were those that followed the Anglo-French "surrender" to Chancellor Hitler a fortnight ago. But since Viscount Runciman's first departure for Prague Mr. Chamberlain and his colleagues have not cared particularly about Czechoslovakia as such. They are prepared to see the strategic barriers of the Sudeten Mountain fall to Germany.

CZECHS' FATE NOW IGNORED

They long ago wrote off the Danube Valley for themselves as a legitimate and natural field of German economic expansion and they are not greatly concerned with the future maintenance of a democratic government in what is left of Czechoslovakia now. Their concern is with the method of Germany's expansion to the southeast.

Their prodigious efforts in the past few weeks have been to prevent Germany from embarking on a military conquest that would almost certainly have had ever-widening consequences. For this Britain very nearly went to war with Germany this week, but in the effort Mr. Chamberlain now feels he has succeeded.

The Anglo-German declaration signed by Herr Hitler and Mr. Chamberlain came as an unexpected footnote to the crisis. So far it has been welcomed sincerely in Britain as one of those gestures which settle nothing but may do a great deal to improve the international atmosphere. If it had been any more than a pleasant declaration of goodwill Mr. Chamberlain would hardly have signed it without first returning to London to consult his Cabinet.

A shrewd observer said today that Mr. Chamberlain had reminded the German people this week that there was some one else in the world besides Chancellor Hitler. The Anglo-German declaration may enable Mr. Chamberlain to go further and "consult" in a friendly fashion on many issues which Herr Hitler might otherwise regard as none of Britains business.

The declaration has satisfied the deep longing of millions of Britons to be friends with Germany, regardless of the regime that happens to be in power there. Its real importance, however, will be seen in the fact that the rearmament effort here will be redoubled and a form of national conscription perhaps will be introduced in the next few months. For in spite of the "desire of our two peoples never to go to war with one another again" every Briton now knows where the real danger to his country lies.

CHAMBERLAIN REPORTS GAINS

LONDON, Sept. 30.—Prime Minister Chamberlain today reported to cheering crowds and an approving monarch two accomplishments, a triumph of his appeasement policy in the four-power Munich conference which averted war over Czechoslovakia and an Anglo-German declaration against war.

With his head uncovered in the rain, the Prime Minister waved, for cheering thousands at Heston Airfield to see, the document which he and Chancellor Hitler had signed earlier in the day at Munich. He then said:

"This morning I had another talk with German Chancellor Herr Hitler and here is the paper which bears his name as well as mine. Some of you, perhaps, already have heard what it contains, but I would just like to read it to you."

He read from the document and then

sped away by automobile to Buckingham Palace.

On Monday Parliament will reassemble and then Mr. Chamberlain will face an Opposition attack charging him with "giving way to dictators." The prospective parliamentary attacks on the "Munich deal" was signaled by the Liberal leader, Sir Archibald Sinclair, who issued a statement tonight saying:

"The power and will of the German dictator has prevailed over the will of the free people of Britain, France and Czechoslovakia. If war has been averted, peace has not yet been established. The forces of resistance to German aggression are weakened."

"The destinies of Europe now rest in the hands not of the League of Nations but of four powers—Germany, Italy, France and Britain—and in that combination of power the will of Hitler is at present the dominant factor."

PEACE AID PLEDGED

Prime Minister Chamberlain and Chancellor Hitler, at a final conference at Munich yesterday, agreed that: "We regard the agreement signed last night and the Anglo-German naval agreement as symbolic of the desire of our two peoples never to go to war with one another again." Terms imposed on Czechoslovakia were found to be milder than Hitler's Godesberg plan. They provided immediate occupation of about half of the Sudeten area, the rest to be allotted by the International Commission or to be subject to plebiscite.

Poland delivered an ultimatum to Prague demanding the cession of the Teschen district, setting 6 A.M. New York time as the limit for reply. Hungary prepared to make a two-point demand for cessions.

Czechoslovakia accepted the Munich terms and Premier Syrový, announcing "We have been abandoned," made a protest to the world. General Krejčí told the army to obey orders.

The first of the German troops crossed the Czechoslovak border from Austria an hour after midnight, or 7 P.M. Friday New York time. Large concentrations were made for the further occupation. The International Commission began sessions in Berlin on the evacuation and allocation of territory.

Mr. Chamberlain met a great demonstration when he arrived in London, and a similar one was accorded to Premier Daladier when he reached Paris.

DALADIER CHEERED BY JOYFUL FRANCE

(By P. J. Philip)

PARIS, Sept. 30.—In this cheering Europe none cheered today from fuller hearts than the French people when at Le Bourget airfield and all along the road past the Opera to the Ministry of War they welcomed Premier Edouard Daladier. There were many who wept as they cheered.

M. Daladier was near tears as he walked into his familiar office in the stern War Ministry, to be greeted by his whole staff, all cheering loudly.

The Premier had had a unique experience. His own people were cheering for peace. So had been the German crowds at Munich, who called him half a dozen times to the balcony of his hotel.

Whatever may be the merits of the settlement he signed it had this one, that the head of each government in Europe must know that his people want peace and that as a bringer of peace he can be sure of a warmer welcome than if he brought victory to mourners.

WELCOMING CROWDS ARE GAY

Since Charles A. Lindbergh came here Le Bourget has never seen such a crowd or such emotion. In the disorganized way the French have, men and women all along the route poured around the Premier's car, in

which he stood with Foreign Minister Georges Bonnet, and laughter, which had been banished from France for days, burst out in rippling waves.

Flags that had greeted the British King and Queen last summer were thrust out of windows and hung from balconies.

There was no need for an elaborate police guard. It would have been swamped if it had tried to hold the back the crowd. As the people waited they cheered every incident—the efforts of single policemen every few hundred yards to keep them on sidewalks, the messenger boy who rode his bicycle triumphantly down the lane reserved for the Premier's car, the old horse cab and its driver which emerged from the last century into this delirious afternoon.

Whatever his political future may hold, and nothing in life is so uncertain as a French Premier's future, nothing can take from M. Daladier this day's experience. His future policy and effort will be influenced by this day of cheering.

Before a microphone, on his arrival at Le Bourget, M. Daladier repeated in part what he has said in Munich, that he believed not only that war had been avoided but also that an honorable peace had been secured all peoples. He said he had found in Germany no feeling of hate or hostility toward France and stressed there was none in France toward Germany.

"These two peoples," he said, "may yet reach a cordial understanding and I am going to do my best to try to reach it."

The Premier's desk and room were banked with flowers sent by schools and societies, most of them anonymously. He sent them to the grave of the Unknown Soldier below the Arc de Triomphe and announced that tomorrow evening he would go at the head of a delegation of war veterans to rekindle the flame that always burns on the tomb.

The Premier's first step was to summon the Cabinet because a great deal must be done quickly. Believing that in the circumstances it would be better to get discussion over before the public emotion and relief died down the government decided to call Parliament together Tuesday for a short special session. There is no doubt that all parties, except perhaps the Communists, will approve what has been done.

There are bills to be paid for the partial mobilization which, judging by the number of men now in uniform, cannot have fallen far below the real thing. Time and business have been lost. There is going to be no end to the trouble of straightening things out.

Critics from all sides of the Chamber of Deputies are certain to be ready to complain that either too much or not enough was done. Fortunately, M. Daladier did not summon the Chamber while the crisis was acute.

One of the first things to be done, it is being argued in political circles, is to appoint at once a French Ambassador to Rome and end that long irritation between Italy and France. Premier Benito Mussolini, it is contended by many, deserves that measure of thanks for his intervention Wednesday and for the part he played at the Munich meeting.

DALADIER PRAISES NEGOTIATIONS

PARIS, Sept. 30.—Premier Daladier said to the welcoming crowd at Le Bourget today:

"The negotiations certainly were difficult, but I have the deep conviction that the accord which was concluded was indispensable to maintenance of peace in Europe."

"I also am certain today that, thanks to the desire to give mutual concessions and the spirit of collaboration which animated the action of the four great Western powers, peace is preserved."

The government ordered the recall of reserve troops who had been mobilized during the Czechoslovak crisis. Officials said the recall would take place progressively "at a

rate foreseen for the security of the national defense." More than 1,000,000 reserves had been summoned to the colors.

On all sides the life of the capital, which had been stilled by fear of war, rushed back to normal. Crowds which had not been buying hurried into stores. Workers began replacing reflectors which had been taken down to dim street lights. Ditches dug in parks for air-raid protection were filled.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 30, 1938]

FOUR POWERS SIGN PEACE PACT FOR CZECHOSLOVAK PARTITION

(By Edward W. Beattie, Jr.)

MUNICH, September 30.—Britain, France, Germany and Italy early today signed a compromise agreement for surrender of Czechoslovakia's strife-torn Sudeten areas to Germany without bloodshed.

The agreement of the "Big Four," racing against time to head off a general war, came only 24 hours before the October 1 "zero hour" fixed by Adolf Hitler for an invasion of the Sudetenland.

Germany's occupation of the Sudeten areas with a "token force" of Nazi troops will begin Saturday—the day that millions had looked forward to with fright as the day of war—and must be completed by October 10.

Announcement of the signing of the agreement was made by Prime Minister Chamberlain of Great Britain at 12:30 a.m. as he emerged, weary and dejected, from the brownstone Fuehrerhaus where the four statesmen had worked through the day and most of the night.

HITLER GETS NEARLY ALL HE DEMANDS

Arrangements were made to dispatch the plan to the Czechoslovak government in Prague before dawn.

Chamberlain's air of dejection as he emerged from the long bartering for peace indicated he was far from satisfied with the deal that had been made, but that any manner of deal was better than war.

The only concessions which he and Daladier appeared to have obtained from Hitler were nonimportant alterations in the map of the Sudeten areas demanded by the German Chancellor, and a slight slowing down of the tempo of German occupation.

Otherwise, it appeared that Hitler's defiant will had prevailed and that he had obtained nearly everything he demanded in his talk with Chamberlain at Godesberg on the Rhine a week ago, even to inclusion of the Polish-Hungarian questions in the terms of the settlement.

One British delegate explained the situation with the statement:

"This is the first major frontier revision ever accomplished without the use of force."

DUCE BREAKS DEADLOCK

Mussolini, who played the major role in bringing about the "last chance" peace conference, broke a deadlock among the conferees over the manner of the German army's occupation of the Sudetenland. Hitler stood by his ultimatum of a Saturday "zero hour." Il Duce finally won him around to an occupation "in stages" extending over a 10-day period.

Daladier defended the pact as "approximately substantially" the original Anglo-French dismemberment proposals to which the Prague government agreed on September 21.

"If there had been any question threatening the sovereignty of Czechoslovakia I would have resolutely refused to consider negotiating further," he said.

Daladier said he won Hitler over to a modification of the latter demand for a plebiscite affecting the Bratislava region near the Austrian Czech frontier.

"I can assure you I have done my best," the French premier said.

"We have avoided war and that is worth a lot. If there had been a war it might have meant the sacrifice of at least 10,000,000 persons over the question of returning 3,500,000 members of the German race to Germany, and who would want to make himself responsible for that?"

Daladier will submit the plan to his cabinet and then to parliament and there was widespread speculation today that he might resign soon because of popular opposition in France to the alleged "sell out" of the Czechs.

PEACE NOW UP TO CZECHS

There were some reports that the official text of the compromise plan already had reached Prague.

Thus the decision of peace or war no longer rests with Hitler, but is up to President Benes and the Czech government.

The Conferees of the four western powers—Hitler, Chamberlain, Premier Mussolini of Italy and Premier Daladier of France—were confident that Czechoslovakia would be prevailed upon to accept the decisions.

Britain and France will be able to tell Prague that, in the nine hours of historic consultation here, they have prevailed upon Hitler to modulate his warlike demands and ultimatums and compromise in the plan of peaceful settlement.

Mussolini, who played a major role in bringing about the eleventh-hour escape from a war that threatened the lives of millions, left for home immediately after the conference, aboard his special train. Chamberlain and Daladier planned to fly back to Paris and London today to report to their cabinets.

DETAILS OF COMPROMISE

The compromise plan provides:

The evacuation of the predominantly Sudeten German regions of Czechoslovakia will begin Saturday and must be completed within 10 days, meaning their occupation by German forces.

The agreement is among Germany, Britain, France and Italy and Czechoslovakia is not included in it.

The Czechs must evacuate the regions without destroying any property, including factories, railroad lines and communications lines. The Czech government is "held responsible for the evacuation without damage to the installations."

The conditions and terms of the evacuation will be laid down in detail by an international commission to be composed of representatives of the four powers whose leaders met here yesterday and tonight, with Czechoslovakia represented.

The occupation of the Sudetenland by German troops will begin Saturday "in easy stages" but will occur only in the predominantly German areas near the frontier where members of the Sudeten minority comprise virtually the entire population.

The territorial claims of the Hungarian and Polish minorities in Czechoslovakia—82,000 Poles and 419,000 Magyars—must be satisfactorily settled within three months by agreement between the affected governments, otherwise the "big four" will be called into conference again to lay down some solution.

After the German occupation of border areas of Czechoslovakia an international commission will be sent to Czechoslovakia to determine the other areas demanded by Hitler for the German Reich and arrange plebiscites in these districts.

These districts of smaller German population, many of them considerably inland, will be occupied by "international bodies" until the plebiscites are completed.

AGREEMENT AFTER MIDNIGHT

The Czech government must within four weeks, release from military and police service any members of the Sudeten German minority of 3,500,000 who wish such release.

Czechoslovakia must also immediately release all Sudeten political prisoners.

Chamberlain and Daladier left the brown-stone Fuehrerhaus together at 12:35 a.m., and Hitler and Mussolini departed together a few moments later.

Mussolini left Munich by train at 1:55 p.m., accompanied by his son-in-law and Foreign Minister Count Galeazzo Ciano. Hitler and Field Marshal Goering bade him warm farewell at the railroad station to the accompaniment of surging cries of "Heil!" from the Bavarian crowd.

Hitler, it was said, agreed during the late afternoon to surrender of his demand for immediate occupation by German troops of all the Sudeten districts which he claims for the Reich.

This concession overcame one of the major stumbling blocks of the negotiations—Czechoslovakia's refusal to give up her border fortifications.

A German spokesman said the German "token" occupation of the predominantly-German borderlands, which include the towns of Asch and Eger, will be completed in easy stages before October 10.

In the Sudeten zones farther in the Czech interior plebiscites will then be held under international control.

The spokesman confirmed the agreement provided for subsequent plebiscites for the Hungarian and Polish minorities.

When the statesmen reconvened tonight at the Fuehrerhaus their discussions were understood to have turned to the whole broad picture of European appeasement—perhaps paving the way for a four-power understanding to banish Europe's recurrent war scares.

Hitler was said to be ready to enter talks with Chamberlain and Daladier on the matter of Germany's demand for the return of her war-lost colonies.

Der Fuehrer has publicly proclaimed that his demand for the Sudetenland comprises his "last territorial claim in Europe."

ACCEPTANCE FELT SURE

Chamberlain told the House of Commons in London Wednesday that, in their talks at Berchtesgarden and Godesberg, Hitler had brought up the "awkward subject" of colonies.

There were widespread indications that the "big four," apparently having dispelled the imminent threat of war, would take advantage of their historic meeting to work toward a settlement of all the outstanding problems contributing to European unrest.

In an hour-and-a-half recess in the conference during the evening Chamberlain emerged from the Fuehrerhaus with a smile on his gaunt face and hurried to his suite at the Regina Palace with his advisers as an honor guard of "S. S." Storm Troopers snapped to salute.

The four statesmen conferred with members of their staffs during the recess, then hurried back into conference with Hitler.

One of the chief difficulties, the German spokesman said, is that of getting the details of the new plan to Prague soon enough to bring about Czech evacuation of the border strip within the specified time to permit occupation by the German "token force."

The plan probably will be handed to the Czech ministers in London and Berlin for transmission to Prague, he explained.

Germany, the spokesman said, is convinced that Prague "must accept the plan" because of its Anglo-French sponsorship.

The main object of the conference was to bring about fulfillment of Hitler's demands "without acts of bloodshed and violence," the spokesman added.

The new lease on European peace will be signed by Chamberlain for Great Britain, Hitler for Germany, Mussolini for Italy, and Daladier for France.

Hitler opened the conference with a firm declaration that Saturday is the inflexible "zero hour" for the entry of his troops into Czechoslovakia.

The eight-point plan, over which the "big four" struggled without pausing to eat or rest, was understood from reliable British quarters to have been evolved mostly from the proposals of the gaunt-faced Chamberlain—the only man among the four who was not in the trenches in the last great war.

London (Friday), Sept. 30 (U.P.).—The Daily Mail's correspondent, Ward Price, now in Munich, said early today Reichsfuehrer Hitler had agreed to permit Czechoslovakia to withdraw war materials from the evacuated Sudeten areas.

Hitler, meeting with Prime Minister Chamberlain, Premier Daladier and Premier Mussolini at Munich, was reported to have declined, however, to guarantee the new Czech frontiers unless the Hungarian minority question was settled at the four-power conference.

Price said Mussolini raised the question of Hungarian minority claims, and the British and French delegations sought to persuade Hitler to give the international guarantee under the express stipulation it would not be operative until settlement of the Hungarian question.

AGREEMENT QUICK

The dispatch said that due to apparent British and French objections to the use of German regular troops to police the areas during evacuation, Hitler had offered the use of storm troopers.

Much to the Germans' surprise, Daladier and Chamberlain replied they preferred the use of German soldiers to police predominantly German areas.

When Hitler first presented the scheme for progressive occupation of distinctively German areas between October 1 and October 10, Chamberlain suggested this proposal should be submitted to the Czech government.

Daladier, however, replied the heads of the four governments assembled to find a solution to the questions, must take full responsibility, and declared himself ready to accept the German plan.

ROME HAILS PEACE PACK; ANGLO-ITALIAN AGREEMENT SEEN

ROME, Sept. 29.—Italians jubilantly received the news late tonight that Premier Mussolini had succeeded at Munich in obtaining a peaceful solution of a seemingly hopeless Sudeten-Czechoslovakia crisis.

While papers were selling as fast as they could be printed, it was apparent the ground had been laid at Munich for an agreement between London and Italy. The Giornale D'Italia put out a special edition with an editorial by Virginia Gayda in which this government mouthpiece stressed the close co-operation between II Duce and Chamberlain.

Political circles saw in this a confirmation of an earlier report the Anglo-Italian agreement; now could be put into force with recognition by Britain of the Italian conquest of Ethiopia and the withdrawal of Italian volunteers in Spain.

CANADIAN PREMIER THANKS ROOSEVELT

OTTAWA, Sept. 29 (Canadian Press).—Prime Minister W. L. MacKenzie King sent messages of appreciation and gratitude tonight on behalf of the people of Canada to Prime Minister Chamberlain, and President Roosevelt for their efforts toward solution of the European crisis.

In his message to President Roosevelt the Canadian prime minister said: "In your messages of the past week (to Adolf Hitler, Premier Mussolini and heads of their nations to strive for peace) you voiced the heart and conscience of mankind. Your words, we believe, have contributed in no uncertain way to preserving peace at a moment when the world's peace itself was threatened."

POPE WEEPS, PLEADING FOR PEACE PRAYERS

CASTEL GANDOLFO, September 29.—Pope Pius XI invited the world's faithful tonight to unite "in the most undaunted and insistent prayer for the preservation in justice and in charity of the peace."

The 81-year-old pontiff spoke in a pastoral message broadcast over an intercontinental hookup from his private library in his summer palace at Castel Gandolfo. Friends said His Holiness was weeping unrestrainedly when he concluded.

As he pleaded for prayer in a voice which was weak and quivered toward the close, an anxious world awaited the outcome of the momentous four-power deliberations in Munich over the German-Czechoslovak dispute.

He called for prayer to preserve peace at a time when he said "millions of men are living in dread because of the imminent danger of war and because of the threat of unexampled slaughter and ruin . . ."

"To this unarmed but unvincible power of prayer," he said, "let people have recourse once yet again so that God, in whose hands rest the destinies of the world may sustain especially in those who govern confidence in the pacific ways of faithful negotiations and of lasting agreements . . ."

The pontiff did not mention Czechoslovakia, but remarked about the coincidence of his message with the feast yesterday of the martyr St. Wenceslaus, patron saint of Bohemia.

Pope Pius offered his own life "for the salvation and for the peace of the world."

Or, he said, if the Lord willed it, "let him prolong still further the laborious days of this afflicted and worried toiler."

The Pope spoke for five minutes in Italian, concluding with his benediction in Latin. Translations of his words in English, German, French, Czech and other languages were broadcast immediately afterward.

THE BUSING ISSUE

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the debate on the busing issue continues, it is clear that it has become the Nation's No. 1 emotional problem, to say the least.

Some of the country's leading columnists are attempting to clarify the issue by defining such terms as "quality education," "the busing of children to school to achieve racial balance," "the concept of the neighborhood school," in the context of school desegregation. In short, these columnists are giving the reading public facts rather than overdone myths. Among these is Tom Wicker, associate editor of the New York Times, a responsible and rational columnist and a long-time observer of the progress of school integration.

Among Mr. Wicker's recent columns on the subject, his remarks in two are, in my opinion, central to this most important point in the busing debate. In his column of February 27, appearing in the New York Times during the week the Senate debated the busing amendments to the Higher Education Act, and again in a March 2 column, Mr. Wicker does an admirable job of separating myth from fact.

Mr. Speaker, I include these two columns at this point in the RECORD and

commend them to my colleagues as clear and thoughtful statements on an issue that seems to be tearing the country apart and for which there is no solution if we in the Congress do not make rational judgments:

SUBSTITUTE FOR BUSING?

(By Tom Wicker)

Many of those who oppose busing to achieve school desegregation say that, instead, they favor "quality education"—a vague concept which seems to mean a program of special education and more spending in schools attended primarily by disadvantaged children. This position—which roughly corresponds to President Nixon's and which was often heard last week in the Senate debate on the issue—raises the questions whether quality education is possible without desegregation, and whether desegregation is possible without busing.

On the second of those questions the answer is not much in doubt. Without busing programs there would be no way to maintain much less extend, the remarkable desegregation already achieved in the Southern states; and without busing there would be no way in the foreseeable future to do anything much about the remarkable segregation that still exists in the major cities of the North and West. That, basically, is why the Griffin Amendment to prevent busing has been passed; the Senate did not want any more desegregation.

The first question is harder to answer. Many critics of busing contend that children in disadvantaged neighborhoods, or children in all-black or nearly all-black schools, can ultimately be brought up to national educational attainment levels by more spending and better instruction.

But the United States Senate's Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, after two years of hearings and study, has found that most available evidence suggests that disadvantaged children perform better in schools that have a majority of advantaged children. This result is not limited to blacks in white schools; disadvantaged white children, Indians, Chicanos—the committee's findings are that the education of all is likely to improve if they attend classes with more advantaged children.

Neither the committee staff nor the chairman, Walter Mondale of Minnesota, argue that this evidence is conclusive or that the proposition holds good in every case; and they concede that the situation in Berkeley, Calif., for instance, can be read in two ways.

There, disadvantaged black youngsters have moved approximately from five-tenths of a year's educational growth to eight-tenths—a 60 per cent rate of improvement since desegregation through a busing program. Nevertheless, at the eighth-grade level, these black youngsters still are at an educational level about five years behind their advantaged white classmates.

That suggests rather conclusively how inadequate, even destructive, education can be in ghetto or all-black schools. Less conclusively, it shows that substantial improvement occurs in desegregated schools. But it is possible to argue—and some do—that the improvement is not great enough to warrant the political and social discontents that busing brings.

On the other hand, staff members of the Select Committee say there is no useful evidence at all to show that compensatory or special education programs in segregated or disadvantaged schools result in even such limited gains as those recorded in Berkeley. "With few exceptions," Mr. Mondale said last week, "an annual Federal investment of \$1.5 billion in compensatory education has little perceptible impact on mounting educational disadvantage."

That has to be measured against the evidence of the massive Federal study called the Coleman Report, which found that the educa-

tional disadvantage of black children was substantially reduced by racial and economic integration; against the similar findings of a study of racial isolation conducted by the New York State Board of Regents; against the educational gains recorded in such successful desegregation programs as Hartford's Project Concern, or in Hoke County, N.C., where the rate of achievement of black students was more than 50 per cent better after a year of busing and desegregation, and against numerous such achievements elsewhere.

All this evidence may not "prove" that desegregation of itself will provide quality education for disadvantaged children; but it clearly does not support those who talk of "quality education" as a substitute for desegregation; and it clearly does suggest that desegregation—and therefore busing—is an essential first step in reaching quality education.

The Select Committee, incidentally, also has figures that reveal George Wallace for the demagogue he is on the busing issue. For Mississippi, South Carolina and Mr. Wallace's own Alabama, there has been a decrease of 2 to 3 per cent in each state in the total number of students bused since the 1967-68 school year. Before that schools in those states were almost entirely segregated, and who was Governor of Alabama?

NO EASY WAY

(By Tom Wicker)

RIVERSIDE, CALIF., March 1.—"To improve the education of kids is a lot harder than we thought it would be." That's one thing Arthur L. Littleworth, the thoughtful young attorney who heads this city's school board, has learned since Riverside became the first city of over 100,000 population to integrate its schools.

That was in 1965, just after the Watts riots in nearby Los Angeles. Racial tensions ran so high in Riverside that the all-black Lowell Elementary School was burned. Black children were boycotting other schools, the National Guard was standing by and black community leaders were demanding integration "totally, now."

Arthur Littleworth remembers that he was shocked by how alienated and "out of things" those black leaders felt—particularly so, because he had been a leader in developing a compensatory education program for the dominantly black and Mexican-American schools that had resulted from years of unofficial but planned segregation. That program had won an N.A.A.C.P. citation for Riverside, but by 1965 there already were indications of what tests were to confirm—that compensatory education had made little, if any, difference in the minority schools.

The burning of the Lowell School, moreover, virtually dictated an integration program. Some place had to be found for the black children enrolled there. Mr. Littleworth and the other board members decided to fit them in small groups into existing schools.

That required busing most of them out of their neighborhoods. Having gone that far, the board also reassigned the kindergarten and first grade pupils from other minority schools into dominantly white schools. In the fall of 1966, two black schools were closed, and its pupils dispersed to other schools; in 1967, Casa Blanca, a Mexican-American school, was closed and the integration program was completed.

As usual in such situations, more "study" had been demanded by opponents. "But we didn't think we were ever going to know much more," Mr. Littleworth recalled, rather dryly. "We thought it was time to act." Ultimately, the opposition faded; a movement to recall the school board never got off the ground, Mr. Littleworth was re-elected in 1966 and a school bond issue later was passed without difficulty.

But has integration worked educationally? Since the inception of integration here, the program has been closely monitored by the

University of California authorities; some of the more important findings are that:

The education of white children has not suffered.

The reading and other achievement levels of minority group children has improved, but not as much as has been hoped.

Education levels improved most when minority children were integrated into schools of the highest socio-economic status. Minority children arriving at junior high school levels after several years of integrated education show greater gains in behavior, language and attitude than in reading scores.

From all this, Arthur Littleworth has concluded that integration by itself doesn't necessarily improve education. "Much more has to be done with the school program, teachers, students," he believes. "You can't do it only with money and goodwill. You have to work at it all the time. Improving the education of children has to have top priority in all your thinking and planning. Nor is there any set formula." The Longfellow School here has remained about half black, half white—usually a situation that produces "white flight." But Longfellow's school population is stable and its students perform at high levels—a result Mr. Littleworth attributes primarily to "high esprit" and good cooperation by parents and teachers "determined to make the program work."

But he believes, too, that the whole Riverside school system has been improved because the integration program has forced the school board, administrators and teachers to greater consideration for the individual needs of each student. "You can't just pay more attention to some students," he says, "and you can't just lump them all together as 'third graders' or 'first graders.'"

Besides, he says, integration is important in itself. "I think the need to bring us together as one people is equal to the need for improved education."

Mr. Littleworth is quick to concede that Riverside is not necessarily a model for the nation. It buses a relatively modest 1,850 students for the integration purposes (and nearly 4,000 more who live too far from school to walk) and the integration busing is "one-way"—out of minority-group neighborhoods into white middle-class schools. Minorities are only 18 per cent of the pupil population.

But that Riverside is different from other communities is exactly why Arthur Littleworth is opposed to a constitutional amendment banning busing, or to rigid legislation like the Griffin amendment just rejected in the Senate. Every community has a different problem, he believes, and so "every situation has to be approached in an individual manner"—which can hardly be done under arbitrary national restrictions.

A FEW FACTS ON BROOKLYN

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, over the years there has probably been more misinformation printed about the borough of Brooklyn than any other place in the world. It has been many times depicted as a ball park with a city built around it, a community that possesses one tree or one that is used to hold up the other end of the Brooklyn Bridge. It is of course, as anyone who has been there knows, many things more. In population it is bigger than Philadelphia, Detroit, or Houston; it produces more

than \$4.3 billion worth of goods in 6,384 plants; handles more than 1,769,878 in long tons of shipping through its piers and marine terminals and is home to over 2,601,852 people. The borough is 81 square miles of which almost 6,000 acres are parks and it has 1,586.5 miles of streets. Recently, the Honorable Sebastian Leone, borough president of Brooklyn, put together a factsheet on Brooklyn detailing some of the things that make this community so unique. I commend it to my colleagues for their information. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore unanimously granted me, I include the remarks of the Honorable Sebastian Leone at this point in the RECORD:

FACTS ABOUT BROOKLYN BY BOROUGH PRESIDENT SEBASTIAN LEONE

The Borough of Brooklyn has an area of approximately 81 square miles or 51,808 acres, of which almost 6,000 acres are park land. There are 1586.5 miles of streets.

The Federal census of 1960 reported Brooklyn's population as 2,627,319. As of January 1, 1970, the count was placed at 2,601,852 by unofficial, but highly authoritative sources.

The borough has long been known as "The City of Homes and Churches." It numbers about 1,200 places of worship within its boundaries; its more than 950,000 dwelling units make it the largest residential community on the entire Eastern seaboard of the United States.

HISTORY

Historically, the community traces its origins back to 1636 when two Dutch settlers—Jacques Bontyn and Adrianse Bennett—left the little colony of Nieuw Amsterdam, forerunner of today's Manhattan, and moved across the river to establish their permanent homes.

In the Revolutionary War, Brooklyn was the scene of bloody fighting during the summer of 1776. It was here that General Washington, after seeing his army defeated by a much stronger British force, was able to evacuate his troops and preserve them for the later battles.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

Economically, Brooklyn is prominent as a commercial and industrial center, as well as one of the world's most important seaports. The 1967 Census of Business, published by the U.S. Census Bureau lists the statistics on these activities as follows:

1. Annual wholesale trade totaled \$2.8 billion.
2. The total retail sales volume exceeded \$2.9 billion.
3. Industrially, its 6,384 manufacturing plants produced \$4.3 billion in finished products.
4. In 1970 the Port Authority reports that the piers and marine terminals of Brooklyn handled 1,769,878 long tons of shipping.

The next U.S. Census of Business report will be published in 1972.

EDUCATION

In higher education Brooklyn has the distinction of being the home of 13 universities and colleges. The downtown Civic Center area, for example, embraces a scientific and technological education center without parallel in the United States, spanning all levels from secondary schools to the doctorate. It is an educational complex servicing many fields including commerce, industry and government. Many of these institutions continue their expansion by means of new building programs.

Brooklyn's public schools system, administered by the Board of Education, is without doubt among the world's largest, based

on the official register of pupils and the size of its plant (buildings and related facilities).

As of October 30, 1970 the official register of pupils and students of these Brooklyn schools reached a total of 411,011. This total consisted of the following: Elementary Schools Registration 227,569; Junior High Schools, 88,382; Academic High Schools, 88,403; Vocational High Schools, 13,981 and Special Schools, 2,676.

The number of schools administered by the Board of Education as listed in "Facts and Figures" published by the Board of Education for 1969-70 includes: Day High Schools, 23; Vocational High Schools, 9; Elementary Schools, 216; Junior High Schools, 56; Evening High Schools, 16; Evening Trade Schools, 20; Evening Adult Schools, 58; Youth and Adult Centers, 10; and Manpower Development Adult Training Centers, 3.

ARTS AND SCIENCES

Brooklyn's cultural institutions are historic and world-famous. In excellence they represent a large urban community's dedication to the arts and sciences.

The extensive Brooklyn Public Library with all its branches is among the largest of the U.S.. Its total book stock as listed in the Statistic Digest published by the Library for 1970-71 is 2,924,319, and its non-book stock (microprints, microcards, films, phonographs records, etc.) is 520,056.

Brooklyn Civic Center—One of America's most successful urban re-development efforts, this "reconstructed" downtown area embraces a complex of public and private structures, housing developments, educational institutions, large retail merchandising establishments, parks, highways and street improvements representing an investment of more than \$250-million in public, quasi-public and private enterprise funds. The Civic Center is the headquarters of the Board of Education of the City of New York and the executive, administrative and operating center of the New York City Transit Authority.

Brooklyn Museum—One of the nation's outstanding art centers, its public galleries offer a wide variety of valuable art collections relating to the cultural history of the Americas, Europe, Africa and the Orient.

Brooklyn Children's Museum—Features scientific and technical exhibits designed to supplement the education of school children. Borough President Sebastian Leone recently unveiled plans for a new children's museum.

Academy of Music—A major auditorium offering opera, symphonic music, recitals, ballet, drama and children's theater.

Botanic Garden and Arboretum—50 acres of botanical and horticultural exhibits immediately adjacent to the Brooklyn Museum. Also widely known for its contributions to medical research.

Coney Island—World-famous public beach, boardwalk and amusement center. Originally built by the Borough President's Office, its boardwalk and public beach are now under the jurisdiction of the Department of Parks.

Aquarium—Located in Coney Island, this is among the largest and most important marine museums of the world. Its exhibits feature more than 1,000 forms of living aquatic animals fished from waters the world over.

Grand Army Plaza—Located at the northern entrance to Prospect Park, this includes the nationally famous Soldier's and Sailor's Memorial Arch, the Bailey Fountain and a new memorial to our martyred president, John F. Kennedy, a project initiated by Borough President Abe Stark.

The Brooklyn Bridge—Completed in 1883, this still holds a place of pre-eminence, both structurally and esthetically, among the world's notable suspension spans.

The Verrazano-Narrows Bridge—Completed in 1965, this is the longest suspension bridge in the world, built at a cost of \$325-million.

Connecting the Boroughs of Brooklyn and Richmond, it forms a vital link in the chain of north-south highways which serve the Eastern seaboard.

Prospect Park—A widely acclaimed example of outstanding landscape architecture. Its 527 acres include historic Revolutionary War battlegrounds, a lake, a zoo, the Wollman Memorial Skating Rink, a Quaker Cemetery, concert grounds and other recreational facilities. Its 100th anniversary was celebrated in 1966.

Assessed Valuation—The total assessed valuation of taxable real estate, including special franchises, in the Borough of Brooklyn for the 1969-1970 fiscal year is \$6,637,049,625.

OFFICE OF THE BOROUGH PRESIDENT

The chief elected official of the Borough of Brooklyn is the Borough President, whose term is four years. He represents the borough on the Board of Estimate, serves as Chairman of the Borough Improvement Board and is a member of the Site Selection Board. He appoints members of the Community District Planning Boards, holds public hearings on matters of public interest and makes recommendations to the Mayor and other city officials in the interest of the people of Brooklyn. He is a Trustee, ex-officio, of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences and the Brooklyn Public Library and serves on the Governing Committees of the Academy of Music, Brooklyn Museum, Botanic Garden and the Children's Museum. The Topographical Bureau of the Borough is under his jurisdiction.

UNFORESEEN PERILS STALK POLLUTED OCEANS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the oceans are vast but we should remember that they are finite and that there are limits on the ability of even the oceans to tolerate pollutants. The Christian Science Monitor of January 17, 1972, carried an article under the heading "Unforeseen Perils Stalk Polluted Oceans," and I insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES WARNING: UNFORESEEN PERILS STALK POLLUTED OCEANS (By Robert C. Cowen)

WASHINGTON.—Mankind is poisoning the sea so fast, it must stop merely reacting to emergencies and develop a long-term cure. So warns America's National Academy of Sciences.

It urges nations to pool scientific resources to identify all possible poisons and their often unsuspected ways of fouling the seas. It says this long-neglected need must be met "before we are surprised by a disaster."

A study group of 50 scientists carried out this latest of many studies that have been made of marine pollution. These scientists, whose study was commissioned by the academy's National Research Council Ocean Affairs Board, were concerned with the profoundly disturbing fact that industrialized man has scarcely begun to suspect the ways in which he is contaminating the world's ocean.

Take, for example, the estimated 100 million tons of oil products that pollute the sea each year. A 100,000-ton spill from an

oil tanker like the Torrey Canyon grabs world headlines. Yet the academy report says most oil pollution, some 90 million tons a year, comes from vaporized gasoline and other volatile petroleum products.

Gasoline vapor gets into the air. Winds disperse it. Rains wash it into surface waters. Thus it finds its way into the sea.

Every time people fill the fuel tank of a car, they contribute to this pollution. But whoever thinks of that in all the alarms raised over oil spills?

Or consider the latest DDT-like chemical to worry environmental guardians—the PCBs (Polychlorinated biphenyls).

Many inks, paints, and plastics have contained them. Many devices like electrical transformers use them for working or insulating fluids. No one thought much of their environmental hazards until a few years ago.

Now the academy team recommends giving them "highest priority" attention as a marine poison.

Insoluble in water, PCBs like DDT dissolve in fat. Marine animals and sea birds concentrate them. Like DDT, analysts find them throughout the marine environment. Although highly diluted, some experts suspect they present a subtle menace.

In the Jan. 14 issue of the Journal of Science, to cite a recent study, a research team at the State University of New York, Stony Brook, reports PCBs selectively inhibit growth of the microscopic plants that sustain all life in the sea. They do this in concentrations as low as 10 to 25 parts per billion.

The researchers note that selective inhibition of such plants "at the base of aquatic or estuarine food webs could profoundly affect higher organisms as well."

In this same issue, Science gives its own PCB assessment. Although data are still spotty, it finds reason to think PCBs can be as dangerous as DDT in terms of long-term, poorly understood environmental poisoning.

The assessment observes that "PCBs, unlike DDT, were seldom deliberately released into the environment." It adds, "Their presence and persistence there reemphasize the likelihood that any widely used industrial chemical may become an environmental pollutant. . . ."

This is precisely the academy group's point. It feels that, by failing to mount major research into all possible marine pollution sources, governments neglect the biggest part of the danger. To attack mainly those sources that are visible today, is only to pick at the edges of the problem.

FIRST REPORT OF THE NATIONAL POLICY TASK FORCE: JANUARY 1972

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the American Institute of Architects has recently issued a report by its task force on national policy which recommends a number of strategies aimed at insuring intelligent use of our dwindling land reserves and providing for creative, humane rebuilding of our crumbling and chaotic urban areas. It is a responsible and imaginative set of proposals for an effective national growth policy, and I highly recommend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The proposals follow:

THE FIRST REPORT OF THE NATIONAL POLICY TASK FORCE: JANUARY 1972

CREATING A NEW NATIONAL POLICY

(A Statement by Max O. Urbahn, FAIA President)

The American Institute of Architects has taken a major step into the future. It is a historic step for our professional society and, to the extent that we persuade our political leaders and fellow citizens to join with us, it will have a major impact on the quality of life in urban America.

I refer to the report of the AIA National Policy Task Force, whose findings and recommendations are set forth in the following pages. The report follows a year's intensive study by a group of distinguished architects with the help of expert consultants. The policies proposed in the report have been unanimously approved by the AIA Board of Directors, including representatives from all geographic regions of the country. They were formally accepted by AIA's Executive Committee on January 3, 1972, and are subject to revision and elaboration at the Annual Convention of the Institute in May.

In brief, the new policies recommended in this report would change the "ground rules" that now shape, and distort the shape, of American communities; create a new and useful scale for planning and building in urban areas; and commit the nation to a major land acquisition policy to guide development in and around key urban centers. These are new policies, but, in the best tradition of American progress, they are built upon the values and precedents of the past.

I am proud to be the president of your Institute at the moment when this new program—the natural culmination of many years of grappling with public policy—comes to fruition. The formal study was begun in the administration of President Robert F. Hastings, FAIA. Yet elements of it have been discussed by AIA boards and presidents over a period of many years.

I urge you to read this report, to communicate with me and with other officers of the Institute, to express your opinions—and, we hope, your dedication to its goals—at the Houston convention. I ask you also to join me in thanking the National Policy Task Force Chairman, Archibald C. Rogers, FAIA; members Leoh Ming Pei, FAIA, and Jaquelin Robertson, AIA, and the body's two distinguished non-architects, William L. Slayton, Hon. AIA, executive vice president of the Institute, and Paul Ylvisaker, professor of public affairs and urban planning, Princeton University. We are grateful for their far-sighted leadership.

AMERICA AT THE GROWING EDGE: A STRATEGY FOR BUILDING A BETTER AMERICA

This report is about America at its growing edge. It outlines a set of policies that can enable this nation—as a responsible member of a threatened world of nations—to shape its growth and improve the quality of its community life.

The strategic objective of these policies is a national mosaic of community architecture designed to be in equilibrium with its natural setting and in sympathetic relationship with its using society.

In brief, the report urges:

A. That changes be made in a number of the "ground rules" (e.g., tax policy, governmental organization, etc.) which presently shape the development of American communities;

B. That the nation develop the capacity to build and rebuild at neighborhood scale (the "Growth Unit") ensuring open occupancy, environmental integrity, and a full range of essential facilities and services;

C. That federal, state, and local governments—in partnership—set the pace and standards for growth policy through a special

impact program affecting 60 of the nation's urban regions and a third of the nation's expected growth between 1970-2000.

THE CIRCUMSTANCES WE ARE DEALING WITH

The nation's population has grown and urbanized dramatically over the last generation. By conventional measures, most of us have prospered. Personal and family incomes have generally increased. Housing conditions have improved. National opinion polls consistently find that most of us feel the quality of our personal lives is better. And amid the flurry of sudden growth, we have staked out a substantial range of free choice.

But a lot of things have us worried and dissatisfied—and properly so.

Millions of Americans have not had this range of free choice. Machines have pushed men off the land into deteriorating cities where they have been imprisoned by rising prejudice and dwindling opportunity. Others have been left behind, trapped in the forgotten hamlets and hollows of rural America.

The nation has been polarizing into richer and poorer, black and white, growing suburbs and declining cities, neighborhoods of higher and lower status and some with no status at all.

Giant urban regions have sprawled into being without the armature of public utilities and services that make the difference between raw development and livable communities.

Jobs have been separated from housing, forcing families to spend more money on highway transportation than on homes and more time on the road than with each other.

Land, money, and building costs have priced more and more Americans out of the conventional housing market, not just the poor, but middle class as well. Construction has lagged for the lower income groups and larger families. Abandonment of existing stock in the older cities has picked up at a threatening rate. Mobile homes have "saved the day" for growing numbers of Americans (though not the minorities), but they have scattered their residents out past the range of regular community life and services.

The technics of our growth have broken loose from the regenerating cycle of nature. The accumulating wastes of this growth—phosphates, plastics, pesticides, heat, hydrocarbons—contaminate our soil, our air, and our water, and cast a growing cloud over our nation and future.

Land has become a negotiable commodity and tossed carelessly into the game of speculation for profit. Once in the market, not only its use but its very existence is subordinated to the highest bidder and shortest-term gain.

The comforts and the hardships, the benefits and the cost of national growth have not been equitably shared. Our tax structure has frequently dumped some of the highest costs on those least able to pay. The education of the nation's children and the general level of community services have been left to the happenstance of local tax ratables and the small politics that exploit them. They breed fiscal zoning, and fiscal zoning has put a damper on the social and economic mobility of the poor and working class.

The social distortions in the development of our communities are reflected in our built environment. For much of what we have built, largely since World War II, is inhuman and potentially lethal. We have created a community architecture which, in its lack of efficiency, its inattention to human scale and values, and its contribution, to chaos, adds up to a physical arena adverse to that "pursuit of happiness" which is one of the fundamental rights that stirred us to create a nation. Surely it is as important to bring our physical fabric into conformity with this goal as it is to do so with our social fabric. We cannot long endure an environment which pollutes air, water, food, and our senses and sensibilities.

At the same time that our growth has created an environmental crisis, the govern-

mental process for dealing with growth has been scissored into bits and pieces. Whatever energies and resolves Americans can muster to shape their growth and salvage their environment are dissipated in an almost infinite chain of separate and conflicting consents which have to be negotiated in order to do the public's business. Just when the nation most needs its enterprise, creativity, and an overriding sense of community, stymie and cynicism become the order of the day.

Now another generation of dramatic growth is about to begin. The numbers of Americans in the 25 to 44 age group—traditionally those who create new households—are increasing at a rate nearly four times that of the past decade. These new households will not likely beget children at the bulging rate of postwar, but they inevitably will touch off a new burst of community formation and urban growth. It is doubtful that these new householders will fit easily into old patterns; many of them will not want to. Families will be smaller; wives will be working; their tolerance of environmental pollution and bureaucratic incompetence will be lower; they will be demanding more for their money and especially the money they are asked to pay in taxes.

And young adults are not the only Americans pressing for places to live—to live better and in many respects to live differently. More and more Americans are living longer; during the seventies an ever growing proportion of our population will have raised their families, retired from their jobs, and started looking for community that will serve their changing needs. There will be another round of kids with mothers asking for day care, new waves of migrants and immigrants searching for something better than ghettos to live in, and alumni of the ghetto—increasing millions of them—who have learned from tragic experience not to let even poverty trap them in bad neighborhoods forever and again.

TOWARD A NATIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY: THE POLITICS AND PROMISE OF DIVERSITY

Sharpening awareness of the flaws in the way we've grown accounts for the rising demand for a national growth policy. Our nation's search for such a policy is a welcome sign of a maturing society, a more civilized and humane America. But just because so many seem to be asking for a national growth policy, doesn't mean that they all want the same policy. And just totting up everybody's unhappiness about how we've grown—and maybe goofed—doesn't necessarily add up to a policy that's better or more consistent or more salable to the American public.

Not until these differences in need and life style are admitted and understood will we really be on our way toward more productive policies for national growth. These diversities are the facts of life that politicians—especially the President and the Congress—have to deal with if the nation is to have governing policy and not just years of fruitless debate.

In fact, it well may be that a diversified nation which values free choice above all may have to live with a national growth policy which is less than coherent, which contains more inconsistencies than it resolves, which turns the power of conflicting forces into creative energy—and which succeeds because it strives toward unity but does not mutilate its freedoms in an all-out effort to achieve it.

We submit this report in that spirit. We are a single profession with our own creative diversities. We have spoken assertively, but only to enrich the national debate, not dominate it. We have tried to convert what we think are legitimate discontents into constructive ideas of how to make America better. And we have taken the risk of translating generalities (this is easy) into specifics (which is tough).

A. THE BELIEFS AND PREMISES WE START WITH

A. A national growth policy is first of all an expression of national values.

B. The values we most cherish are the worth of the individual and his freedom of choice. These values have been constantly stated in national legislation but not so regularly honored.

C. We believe, therefore, that national growth policy should actually commit the nation to these values, not merely restate them. What has been missing is the public competence that makes both our values and our policies credible: laws with teeth; programs with money behind them; public officials with the power to act, and a willingness to fulfill a leadership role. Private freedom and public competence are not incompatible; one needs the other.

D. The goals of national growth policy and the problems it should be concerned with have more to do with quality of life than with numbers. We do not share two of the usual fears: (1) that the American population is too large; and (2) that not enough houses will be built to meet our growing demands. During the past decade, Americans have spontaneously and freely limited reproduction—the birth rate is now at an all-time low. Earlier estimates of how much America will grow in the next 30 years now seem too high—the total may well be as low as 60 million, a number we can certainly care and provide for. Meanwhile, housing starts have picked up; the prospects are that the nation's stated housing goals (2.6 million annually during the 1970s) may be met; and these coals actually may turn out to be too high.

It is not the numbers we should be concerned about but the quality of living and the choice of life style that are opened to Americans whoever they are and however many there may be. This is what we believe Americans mean when public opinion polls regularly report that a majority of them say they would prefer to live in smaller communities. Not that they won't abide living in large metropolitan areas—(despite what they say, most of them have chosen to move and stay there). But they are searching for communities that are more livable. Neighborhoods that are safe neighborhoods that are within easier reach of jobs and a richer mix of community life and services, neighborhoods small enough to have some identity of their own, where no one need be anonymous while attaining the privacy Americans always have yearned for.

E. It follows, we think, that the measuring rod of national growth should be the quality of our neighborhoods, and the assurance that neighborhoods—even when they change—will not deteriorate. The neighborhood should be America's Growth Unit. We have made it the theme of this report.

F. By concentrating on the neighborhood as a Growth Unit, national policy can relate to growth and regrowth wherever it may occur—in rural areas, in smaller towns and outlying growth centers, in metropolitan areas and their central cities, in free-standing new communities. No national policy would be politically salable that did not speak to every condition of America; no national policy would be comprehensive if it did not.

G. Our own guess is that most of America's expected growth from now until the end of the century will occur within existing metropolitan areas—whether all of us would like that to happen or not. The economics and the politics of radically changing that pattern are too difficult; they may be impossible. Marginal changes, yes; and since we, too, have a general prejudice in favor of "more balanced growth" and against overloading the environment (as we have done, possibly, in some of the Great Lakes and coastal regions) we should be of a mind to encourage these changes.

H. Within these areas, we believe the first priority should go toward improving the condition of the older core cities, more especially the condition of those trapped in poverty and the squalor of declining neigh-

borhoods. Until we deal with the deep-seated factors in America life that give rise to such conditions, all growth in America is vulnerable, no matter how much concern and money are lavished on it, no matter how carefully it may be segregated from those neighborhoods where the contagion of decline is more evident.

I. Growth and regrowth—building new communities and restoring old ones—must go together. We think it folly to try urban renewal in the older, denser neighborhoods before moving and relocation room is made ready elsewhere. That means, we think, a deliberate policy of building new neighborhoods on vacant land before renewal of older neighborhoods is begun.

J. We believe that no national growth policy will work unless there is a broader base for financing the facilities and services that are necessary for more livable communities. The local property tax is no longer enough. We have exhausted it, and now it is crippling us.

There are many possible ways of achieving this broader base of financing. Our own preference is for the federal government to assume far more of the costs of social services such as health and welfare, and more of the costs of utilities. We believe the states also should assume a greater share of local costs, especially of schools, and should do so through a combination of broad-based taxes whose impact is less regressive and its yield more responsive to changes in the general level of the economy.

K. Similarly, we are convinced that an effective national growth policy will require broader perspectives and, in many cases, larger governmental jurisdictions. We welcome signs that the states are readying themselves to participate more actively in community development—even when, as in the case of zoning, taxation, and other matters, they have to be prodded into action by the courts. The states are essential to the development of a national growth policy precisely because their jurisdictions (and hopefully their views) are broader, and because they constitutionally control the ground rules of local government and community development.

We also welcome the signs of new life at the metropolitan level. A promising example is the emergence of regional planning, development, and financing in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. If indeed most of America's growth is to occur in these areas, some form of regional control must evolve—and soon.

L. And while these broader capacities are developing, we also see the need for more citizen control and participation at the neighborhood level. Neighborhoods have been swallowed up in the growth and change of urbanizing America. The exact forms and functions of neighborhood government can vary; but national growth policy cannot do without the sturdiness and savvy of grassroots support. We see no contradiction in simultaneous transfer of power upward to broader-based levels of government and downward to the neighborhoods, it is not power which is being subtracted—it is capability which is being added.

M. It also follows from our concern with the neighborhood Growth Unit that the architects who design it, the developers who package and build it, the doctors and teachers and lawyers and merchants who serve it, should be given every honorable encouragement to work at this scale. Urban America may be massive, but it has accumulated in a formless way from a myriad of actions and designs that were of less than neighborhood scale. Thought and habit patterns will have to change if we are to build more livable neighborhoods—neighborhoods that fit as building blocks into metropolitan, regional, and national societies.

N. We wonder whether the time has come

to consider less affluent standards of housing in favor of higher standards of neighborhood environment, facilities, and services—if indeed the choice must be made. "Less affluent," at least, than is explicit in the spiraling requirements of floor space and lot sizes and building codes that are being written defensively into suburban and other exclusionary legislation. The rising cost of exclusion is even higher than the rising cost of building. The product may well be more luxurious houses but less desirable, certainly less open communities.

O. Finally, we are convinced that an effective national growth policy requires that land development increasingly be brought under public control. This is true particularly of land which lies in the path of growth or that otherwise is crucial to the community's well-being—open space, flood plains, coasts and shores, etc.

We favor public acquisition and preparation of land in advance of development. We believe that the appreciating value of urbanizing land should be recycled into the costs of developing, serving, and maintaining it. We believe that, in many cases, leasing rather than outright sale would be desirable for land acquired and assembled by public action.

BUILDING AT NEIGHBORHOOD COMMUNITY SCALE: THE "GROWTH UNIT"

The Growth Unit is first of all a concept—a general way of saying that America's growth and renewal should be designed and executed not as individual buildings and projects, but as human communities with the full range of physical facilities and human services that ensure an urban life of quality.

The Growth Unit does not have fixed dimensions, its size in residential terms normally would range from 500 to 3,000 units—enough in any case to require an elementary school, day care, community center, convenience shopping, open space, and recreation. Enough, too, to aggregate a market for housing that will encourage the use of new technology and building systems. Also enough to stimulate innovations in building maintenance, health care, cable TV, data processing, security systems, and new methods of waste collection and disposal. Large enough, finally, to realize the economies of unified planning, land purchase and preparation, and the coordinated design of public spaces, facilities, and transportation.

This general scale is consistent with likely trends during the 1970s which will encourage the filling in of open land and the renewal of older neighborhoods within existing metropolitan areas—as well as the expansion of outlying communities (Growth Centers) within the population range of 25,000 to 250,000. It also coincides with the trend toward "miniaturization" which seems to characterize emerging patterns of consumer behavior and demand and which is producing a new range of facilities such as community health centers, neighborhood city halls, and convenience shopping centers.

Life styles, housing types, and residential densities could vary according to local markets and circumstances.

Larger communities—up to and including free-standing new towns—should be built as multiples of these Growth Units—allowing, of course, for an emerging hierarchy of additional services and facilities such as high schools, community colleges, hospitals, regional shopping centers, mass transit, and utility systems.

The neighborhood Growth Unit relates just as much to the rebuilding of America's cities as it does to new growth on open land. We have learned the hard way that urban renewal and the rehabilitation of older neighborhoods cannot succeed when done piecemeal, house by house, problem by problem. The job is much bigger than that,

and the Growth Unit is a more appropriate scale and way of doing it.

The Growth Unit is based firmly on the principle of open occupancy and equal access to facilities and services. Moreover, by linking growth and regrowth both outside the central cities and within them, the nation can find an orderly way out of its segregated living patterns and the haunting tragedy of its older cities.

Finally, the Growth Unit offers a valid measuring point for environmental performance. It can be planned and judged as a "package" rather than a disjointed accumulation of activities, some of which do and some of which do not meet going standards of ecological innocence.

USING THE GROWTH UNIT IN A NATIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY

Concentrating on the Growth Unit is a practical and incremental way of approaching a national growth policy. But it is not a retreat from major and even radical changes—as those who recently have ventured into large scale development painfully can attest. Architect after architect, developer after developer, large company after large company have tried their hands at building new communities at larger scale. Only a few have survived—and even for them the experience has been bloody. Listed below are some of the constraints and hazards and some of the changes and reforms we think are necessary if this nation is to achieve the capacity to produce livable neighborhoods without all the traumas (and mischief) that presently are involved.

A. HOUSING AND LAND USE POLICY

Growth Units of the sort we propose will not be built at the rate and scale we propose unless:

1) there is an assured flow of credit at stabilized rates of interest over a sustained period of time;

2) low- and moderate-income families are directly subsidized (through income supplements, housing allowances, "235" and "236" type interest reductions, etc.) at levels equivalent to the housing subsidies now provided higher income homeowners in the form of tax deductions of mortgage interest and local property tax payments (plus what economists call "imputed rents");

3) state governments retrieve sufficient control over local building, zoning, and health regulations to insure an adequate supply of land for large site development—and also land permanently reserved for open space, ecological balance, and communal use.

B. FRONT LOADING

Building at neighborhood scale requires front money equal at least to 40 per cent of the total investment, with no appreciable return on that early investment coming until the fifth to the 15th year. Few are in a position to advance that kind of money and wait so long for a return. Public money and guarantees are still scantily and hard to come by. Except for New York State, they are available only through one limited program of the federal government. These public supports will have to be expanded greatly, both at federal and at state levels.

C. AGGREGATING SITES

The assemblage of large sites is a problem, but probably less so than obtaining the many consents necessary to develop them—zoning, building codes, etc. For the private developer, time is money; one major developer is reported to have incurred interest costs of \$5,000 per day over a year while awaiting the necessary consents. Too many developers have been led into dubious practices in an effort to offset these costs and find ways around these constraints.

The passage of legislation which authorizes planned community development promises some relief. Probably more important will be an arrangement that allows for someone

other than the developer to hold the land until the consents have been negotiated and the developer can move immediately to build.

D. THE PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE

Another barrier is the shortage of public funds for the necessary infrastructure and community services. We propose that the federal and state governments plan and construct networks of utility corridors, including transit, water, sewage, electricity. These would constitute the skeleton of utilities on which Growth Units could be fastened.

At the level of a single project, the scale of development that we propose requires a long-term and disciplined schedule of public spending geared closely to the efforts of the builder.

E. REMOVING TAX DISINCENTIVES

Both federal and state tax systems are replete with impediments and disincentives to building and rebuilding at neighborhood scale. The Internal Revenue Code encourages a quick-build-and-sell posture for the developer; it discourages his staying around to make certain that the costs and concerns of management and upkeep are given equal attention as the cost of construction.

F. TAX INCENTIVES

Building communities is far more complex than the single missions which become manageable profit centers for a business enterprise. Congress might declare the building of Growth Units to be in the national interest, and make special tax and other provisions to enable American enterprise—under tight performance standards—to make the long and broad commitments that the job requires.

G. PROPERTY TAX

America's dependence on the local property tax is especially hurtful. By tying practically all costs of community development to local ratables, it causes undue hardships to the builder and the citizen alike. The apparent answer is to move toward broad-based taxation at state and federal levels. It also suggests moving certain costs from local to state and federal governments.

H. REVENUE SHARING

Any sharing of revenue by the federal government with the states should be conditioned on certain reforms, including a restructuring of the property tax system, zoning and building codes, and reallocation of infrastructure costs.

I. GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES AND PROCESS

Governments in America—federal, state, and local—are not organized to facilitate the kind and scale of development we propose. Major changes and innovations are in order:

- (1) at the federal level, some analog of a national development corporation capable of negotiating the necessary bundle of federal grants and consents; dealing with counterpart state, local, and private development agencies; and tapping national money market;
- (2) at the state level, development corporations emulating and going beyond the pioneering example of New York State;
- (3) at the metropolitan level, public and public/private corporations subject to regionwide planning and participation, and oriented both to redevelopment of the inner city and to new development on open land.

J. CATEGORICAL GRANT PROGRAM

The tradition of categorical funding that long has been followed in American government needs to be modified. Above all, the Highway Trust Fund, we think, must be converted into a general fund for community development and greatly expanded. If this self-regenerating fund is not refashioned to serve our highest priority needs, the nation will place itself in bondage to the automobile and superhighway.

USING THE GROWTH UNIT IN COMMUNITY DESIGN

A national strategy based on the Growth Unit requires the use of tactical stepping stones in the design of communities which will be a harmony with human needs and the natural environment. Such a strategy must be a long-term commitment. Its integrity must be maintained consistently, although it may require continuous updating to accommodate changes we cannot foresee. Commitment to a long-term strategy based on such fundamental principles as freedom of choice and the worth of the individual demands tactics that emphasize flexibility and diversity.

Community design based on the Growth Unit should embrace the following principles:

A. EQUILIBRIUM

The design should be economical in its consumption of natural resources. It should minimize the emission of harmful effluents and encourage emissions that tend to replenish natural resources. The need for transportation should be reduced by intermingling of residential and other uses. Community services (health care, education, security, etc.) should be consciously designed as systems and subsystems.

B. SYMBIOSIS

The design should provide a beneficent and nourishing relationship between the physical environment and its using society. The surest means of attaining this relationship is to encourage community participation in the design process.

C. SATISFACTION OF SPIRITUAL NEEDS

The design must satisfy the individual user's need for reassuring symbols that speak to him from the natural setting and from architecture within this setting. It must satisfy his need for symbols of place and personality which distinguish one person and one community from another—his need for an environmental order that denotes purpose in life.

D. EXPANSION OF LOCATIONAL OPTIONS

Just as the national strategy emphasizes freedom of choice of location, design of Growth Units should reduce barriers based on economics or race or age. This means that transportation, industry, and commerce must be placed within attention to their social consequences.

E. EXPANSION OF QUALITATIVE OPTIONS

The design mosaic must provide a rich variety of living environment matching the variety of life styles within our society.

F. OPEN SPACE PRESERVATION

Community design must preserve open space at all geographic scales from the national to the local. Certain areas should be precluded from development either because of natural features that are hazardous to residents or where development would threaten ecological balance or recreational values.

G. HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Our historic heritage must be preserved from destruction or erosion if a sense of individual and community identity is to survive. Preservation of historic buildings and communities will require the discovery of new uses as original uses become obsolete. Some historic structures may have to be altered and modernized to accommodate contemporary functions. We also must look to the values in contemporary architecture that may in time have historic significance.

H. PUBLIC INVESTMENT AS A KEY TO DEVELOPMENT

Public utilities and facilities can be used to determine settlement patterns, both nationally and at the level of the single Growth Unit. The network of transportation and communications corridors should be the essential basis for comprehensive planning

within the proposed communities and for their external connection with the existing community fabric. It should be designed and put in place incrementally in accordance with the largely private development of housing, commerce, and industry. Since this infrastructure is relatively permanent, it should be generous in its dimensions in order to permit accommodation of future technological developments. It should be seen as the opportunity for expression of great civic art and architecture.

I. AMENDABLE ARCHITECTURE

The design should provide a physical fabric that is amendable by its occupants to accommodate changes in life styles, technology, and economic circumstance.

J. REDUCED COST OF SHELTER

Design should seek to reduce the cost of housing. Off-site manufacture is one method of pursuing this goal, but care must be taken to produce a kit of parts that can be assembled in many differing ways to provide environmental variety. The design should take maximum advantage of the reduction in governmental constraints which must be a part of a national growth strategy. Better quality and workmanship can be attained once such constraints are removed. The unearned increment in the value of the land should be recaptured by the public, instead of becoming part of the inflated cost of shelter, as it does now.

K. EXPERIMENT WITH CHANGE

We must deliberately experiment with change. This, in turn, will require that public funds be available to finance experimentation. Each Growth Unit can be a laboratory for new applications of technology and design. Procedural experimentation could involve the using community and public/private and multidisciplinary development teams in an open "Dialogue." The behavioral sciences can be involved in the development of a more sophisticated basis for establishing user needs. New ways of determining costs and benefits could take into greater account intangible factors and qualitative benefits.

THE GROWTH UNIT AND THE URBAN CRISIS*

The neighborhood Growth Unit applies to all America. But some parts of the nation's society and landscape have been, and will continue to be, especially impacted by growth. We believe a more specific and concentrated response should be made to the problems of the nation's declining central cities and their fast-growing metropolitan areas.

There are approximately 60 metropolitan areas in this country with 1970 populations of 500,000 or more. These 60 urban regions accounted for half the nation's total population, over half of the nation's black population, and half of the nation's total growth during the decade 1960-70.

Currently, 80 per cent of America's growth is taking place within existing metropolitan areas. In all probability, the metropolitan areas cited above will continue to absorb the lion's share of national growth and the problems that go with it.

Without foreclosing (actually it could be planned as part of) a national strategy that might attempt to shift growth from these urban regions, we propose that the federal government join immediately with the affected state and local governments in developing growth plans for these critical areas.

These plans should include the following elements:

A. Governments involved immediately should assemble one million acres of land for community development within the core cities and in the metropolitan periphery. (We

* This builds upon a forthcoming paper by Bernard Weissbourd.

would estimate the cost of acquiring this at \$5 billion.) The appreciating value of this land—realized by lease and sale over the next 30 years—would be enough to cover its original cost plus a large proportion of the costs of preparing the land for development.

B. A third of the nation's growth (20 million) during the next 30 years could be accommodated on these one million acres at average densities of 20 persons per acre—far under the present densities of troubled core cities, and within range of current consumer choice and economic feasibility.

C. The building block of this development would be the neighborhood Growth Unit—500 to 3,000 dwelling, 2,000 to 10,000 persons—built either singly or in multiples which over time would be fitted together into larger satellite communities.

D. The development of these Growth Units should be staged to provide relocation and elbow room for the restoration of older neighborhoods in the core area. Open occupancy would be ensured—with the end result that no one sector of the metropolitan area would be—or feel—overwhelmed.

E. The social mix of these neighborhoods would be further ensured by housing subsidies and allowances covering housing rental costs exceeding 25 per cent of family income. These subsidies also would be available to families filtering into existing housing throughout the metropolitan area.

F. The federal, state, and local governments would join in planning and paying for the necessary into the picture—particularly transportation and utility corridors which would weave these Growth Units into the existing fabric of metropolitan life: jobs, education, health care, etc.

G. The economics (and for that matter, the politics) of these selected metropolitan areas should be pooled—benefits (such as new rates) as well as costs. As a matter of first principle, new growth should not be allowed to occur as an escape from, or at the cost of, the revitalization of older neighborhoods.

H. Zoning and building codes for these Growth Units should be developed jointly by the three levels of government, with the states taking a strong initiative.

NATIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY AS AN INVITATION TO CREATIVITY

Community building of the sort we propose is a many-sided challenge.

A. A challenge to developers, planners, and architects to anticipate and give creative expression to the emerging life styles of a richly diversified American people. The trends clearly are moving in the direction of smaller families with working mothers. The trends seem also to be moving toward residential densities lighter than those of the central city but heavier than those of existing suburbs. They also are moving toward the requirements, certainly an expectation, of a rich array of critical services, such as day care health, and continuing education. They also are pointing toward a greater degree of privacy and security. The art will be to put all these together into a working and livable community: the Growth Unit invites that art.

B. A challenge to those committed to the integrity to the environment; to produce increments of growth that are less hostile to man and nature, which continuously reduce the pollution of land, air, and water; and maintain open spaces and green belts for recreation and tranquility.

C. A challenge to all of us who must exact more and more resources which—at least relatively—are dwindling. Multiple purpose space and reusable resources will be the order of the day and will require all the inventiveness and ingenuity we can command.

D. A challenge to restructure the financing and delivery of critical services, especially

health, education, and security in the face of escalating costs and consumer dissatisfaction. We believe strongly, for instance, that electronic information systems should be incorporated routinely as part of the community's infrastructure. There is also the prospect that imaginative use of cable television can reshape public education.

E. A challenge to each of the special skills, disciplines, and professions which historically have worked in isolation and are now being forced by the logic of complexity to meld their activities.

F. A challenge to develop new forms of joint enterprise, both within the private sector and between business and government.

G. A challenge to find new ways of resolving the dilemma of dividing trends, on the one hand, toward more distant government of greater resources and scope and, on the other, toward neighborhood control.

It is not easy to develop governing policy for a diverse nation in the full cry of its existence. It would be much easier to let the cup pass and continue to build the world's first throw-away civilization.

But if we are to achieve some coherence and not let freedom vanish into chaos, we have no alternative but to deal with all the tumbling forces and facts of the here and now, and then find levers that have the power not only to move but to win majority consent.

We have chosen the neighborhood Growth Unit as one such lever. It is within the grasp and values of every American. What we urge that the nation see and grasp it as part of a national strategy—to make of this country what it can and must be—a society confident and united enough to enjoy the richness of its diversity. Livability of that kind does not come by accident; even free choice requires design.

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Members of the Task Force on National Policy are:

Archibald C. Rogers, FAIA, chairman; Chairman of the Board of RTKL, Inc., Baltimore. He developed planning guidelines for a team approach to highway planning, which led to establishment of the Urban Design Concept Team assembled to plan Baltimore's expressway system.

leoh Ming Pei, FAIA; principal, I.M. Pei and Partners, New York. His firm was responsible for planning and design of Philadelphia's Society Hill redevelopment; a renewal plan for Oklahoma City's central business district; Montreal's Place Ville Marie, and a master plan for redevelopment of downtown Boston.

Jaquelin Robertson, AIA; currently director of the Office of Midtown Planning for New York City; formerly head of the urban design group within the city's planning commission.

William L. Slayton, Hon. AIA; executive vice president of the Institute; formerly Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency; later president of Urban America.

Paul N. Yivlsaker, professional adviser; professor of public affairs and urban planning, Princeton University; formerly commissioner of community affairs for the state of New Jersey.

FAR EAST

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, with the eyes of the world now focused on China our

attention is turning more and more to the entire Far East.

The following letter was sent to some of my constituents: Mr. and Mrs. James Beene of Greensburg, Pa., by a Holy Cross missionary living in Bangladesh.

I thought it might be interesting to my colleagues in the House to have the views and impressions of someone who is still on the scene:

DT. DACCA, BANGLADESH.

DEAR NANCY AND CHARLIE: All I got for Christmas was my life—a gift from Mrs. Gandhi. We endured eight months of terror while the nations of the world did nothing. Finally India came to our aid. You may question her motives but this war has saved millions of lives; and one of them was mine. For eight months the West Pakistan Army carried out a program of extermination, with orders to loot and burn and rape and kill until they had destroyed forever the courage of the Bengali people. This savagery was not against a rebel army, but against the unarmed men, women and children of Bengal. I was in the middle of it. I saw them die; women and children deliberately shot by the most savage and cowardly army in modern times. I saw their homes put to the torch. I saw thousands fleeing in terror. In our instant hospital for bullet wounds only, I watched a five year old boy take a month to die, in pain and in fear. Every time a gun went off, he whimpered, "Mummy, will they shoot me again?" And this is the brutality that, incredibly, the U.S. Government supported. Father Bill Evans was brutally murdered by the Pak Army. We hoped the U.S. Government would protest strongly; but he was just one more of a million human sacrifices offered on the pagan altar of State Department policy.

I'm still a Republican, but my party loyalty stops at murder. Nixon is a National Disgrace. He put America on the side of savagery. Yahya Khan terrorized and murdered millions; yet Nixon supported him, and even allowed the shipment of military supplies to help in the slaughter. The question is not whether Nixon should be re-elected in 1972, but whether he should be tried for complicity in mass murder in 1971. Through malice or through stupidity, this man's hands are bloody. He used the prestige of his office to help a murderer, degrading the presidency as no man before him has done. When India intervened to stop the slaughter, he tried to block her, in the U.N. The U.N. resolution demanding a cease fire without doing anything to stop the massacre of Bengali civilians by the Pak Army, was reversion to barbarism. In effect it gave tacit approval to the slaughter of a million people, and told India to withdraw and let the slaughter go on. Had India listened, the Pak Army would have been freed to continue the extermination of the Bengali people. And I would be dead along with my people.

What a mockery Vietnam is now. American boys died to save Vietnam from the Communist camp. Now, with incredible stupidity, Nixon has forced 75 million Bengalis into the same camp; he has pushed 500 million Indians into the Russian camp. And he has even put West Pakistan more firmly on China's side. Alger Hiss was labeled a traitor. I doubt that Hiss did near as much harm to the U.S. as did the diplomania of Nixon and his advisors.

Our agony isn't over yet. If the past is unbelievable, the present is unbearable and the future uncertain. Our people's homes are destroyed; they are hungry; they are mourning their dead. They need massive help. But at least we no longer live in terror of the Pak Army. And the kids will be fleeing and screaming and dying, only in their sleep.

FATHER ED GOEDERT,
Holy Cross Missionary.

A NUCLEAR-POWERED ARTIFICIAL HEART?

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, any one of us can labor long in this legislative "vineyard" without much in the way of tangible results to point to—or, at least, so it seems all too often.

However, now and then, there are developments—there are breakthroughs—making those labors very worthwhile.

In my case, accordingly, I was elated to read in Friday's New York Times of the progress being made by both the National Heart and Lung Institute and the Atomic Energy Commission toward realizing success in achieving a totally implantable, nuclear-powered artificial heart. This is a project that captured my interest some 6 or 7 years back, and with which I have been closely associated as a member of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which handles the AEC's portion of the Federal budget along with many other matters.

For a time, a few years back when budgetary priorities assumed the importance they did with the escalation of the Vietnam war, it appeared that this research work—to which I assigned such a high priority—might have to be shelved, or cut back so sharply in funding as to virtually be shelved. There were some cutbacks—or stretch-outs—that affected this joint endeavor, but the essential momentum the project deserves has been maintained and, as the Times article indicates, it appears that eventual success is in sight.

AEC's involvement in the artificial heart program began in late fiscal year 1967, with its initial efforts being directed to the conduct of radioisotope-engine concept studies for artificial heart devices in conjunction with the National Heart and Lung Institute. One of the concerns has been to insure against any ill effects from either radiation or the accompanying heat-input occasioned by placement of such a device in a living body. The fuel form to be depended upon has been selected—medical-grade plutonium-238—and animal studies with such implanted radioisotope sources have, so far, shown no adverse physiological effects. Since then, the thrust of the AEC portion of the program has been to develop sufficient analytical and experimental data to permit a judgment to be made as to the practicability of achieving a fully implantable radioisotope-powered artificial heart device having a minimum life of 10 years; and completion of this phase of the project has been planned for completion by the end of fiscal 1973.

Then, if all goes on well—as it seems to be doing—it would be AEC's purpose to develop, with the Heart Institute, a prototype nuclear-powered artificial heart system for implantation studies in both animals and humans, which further work may take another 4 years. If cost is a factor—and it always is—AEC's over-

all research work is estimated to have a price tag of about \$16.5 million, which is a lot of money, of course, but not so much when measured against what we are spending to find a cure for cancer, or when measured again against the human cost of heart disease, which remains as one of our major medical frontiers to cross.

As I have noted, I see great possibilities in this work, not the least of which is the manner by which such a device would enable us to get around those tantalizing moral questions that are involved in transplants of human hearts, from one body to another, and which have never been wholly answerable. I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues on the Public Works Subcommittee who have joined me in support of this endeavor share my enthusiasm for what has been—and, hopefully, can be—achieved therefrom.

The Times story follows, for further details:

NUCLEAR ENERGY POWERS HEART-AID PUMP IN CALF

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 2.—The first use of nuclear energy to power an artificial heart pump in a living animal was announced today by the National Heart and Lung Institute. The institute is sponsoring a major research effort to make such devices eventually available to man.

The institute also announced the development and use in animals of the first complete artificial heart that is totally implantable. This, too, is designed for use with a nuclear power source, but it has not yet been tested in that way in an animal. It has been tested with non-nuclear electrical power.

At a news conference today, Dr. Theodore Cooper, director of the heart institute, said that nuclear-powered artificial heart devices might become available for use in humans by the end of this decade. He said that much research would be required to perfect the devices for human use.

Estimates of how many people might need them range from 15,000 to 100,000 a year.

Dr. Cooper called the development of the nuclear power system a major milestone in a research program that began in 1964. The aim was, and is, to develop a whole family of artificial devices to help patients who suffer from heart disease, the nation's leading cause of death.

The nuclear-power system was tested for a total of about 5,000 hours in the laboratory before being tried in an animal, said Dr. Lowell T. Harmison, who heads the artificial heart program at the institute.

Its first use in an animal, to power a heart booster pump, was on Valentine's Day at Boston City Hospital. The research team from Harvard Medical School and the Thermo Electron Corporation of Waltham, Mass., kept it operating for about five hours in a calf before ending the experiment and removing the device.

During that time it replaced the action of the heart's main pumping chamber, the left ventricle. Dr. John C. Norman of Harvard said the artificial device was tested with a non-nuclear power source in 12 calves before the test on Valentine's Day. He said the safety of the nuclear power source had been tested extensively in several animal species.

CAPSULE TESTED

There have also been elaborate tests to insure that the capsule holding the roughly three ounces of radioactive plutonium 238 would not break open in an accident.

The plutonium provided heat that drove the specially designed miniature steam engine which, in turn, activated the pump. The

engine is so small, said Dr. Fred N. Huffman of Thermo Electron, that only a single drop of water is vaporized at a time while it is operating.

Dr. Harmison said four different engines had been developed for use with the nuclear power source. In the total replacement artificial heart, which he designed, one version has the power source placed between the heart's two pumping chambers. Although the experimental devices are somewhat bigger and twice as heavy as a natural human heart, he said it should be feasible to bring them down to the size of the natural organ in later development.

Already the pumping efficiency of the artificial devices surpasses that of the natural heart, he said. The implantable device includes a miniature computer that matches the artificial heart's action to the body's needs. Experiments have demonstrated that some drugs that affect normal heart action have a similar effect on the artificial device. The computer responds to the drugs' effects on blood vessels.

The complete artificial heart, linked to conventional electric power sources, has been used in calves for as long as two days at a time, totally implanted and completely replacing the animal's natural organ. Dr. Harmison said these experiments were performed at Travenol Laboratories near Chicago. The National Heart and Lung Institute's program is a collaborative effort between the institute and many university medical research groups and industrial research organizations.

Several other centers are doing artificial heart research independent of the institute and also have advanced designs. In some of their experiments animals have been kept alive as long as 10 days with artificial hearts, but these have not been totally implanted, Dr. Harmison said. The power source and instrumentation are usually external.

Although production of a durable, efficient power source has been one of the major problems of artificial heart development, the crucial obstacle has been that of developing a material sufficiently compatible with blood. Dr. Harmison said that present designs use a special dacron material that is highly promising.

While most artificial materials provoke blood clots or damage to blood cells, the dacron material seems relatively harmless. It allows the body to lay down a layer of living tissue on the artificial surface, thus protecting the blood from any further contact with artificial components of the substitute heart.

Artificial heart pacemakers, devices that regulate the heart beat, have been designed with nuclear power sources and a few have been installed in patients in France. The amount of nuclear energy, however, is far smaller than that needed for a heart pump. The power level of the device described here today is 2,000 times as great as that needed for a pacemaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, I am proud to have had a part in bringing this project along, and shall continue to stand by it because I believe it can be of inestimable benefit to mankind for reasons further described in another article about it, this time by Judith Randal, as the same appeared in yesterday's Washington Evening Star:

A-DRIVEN HEART KEEPS ON BEATING

(By Judith Randal)

"On Valentine's Day we dropped it into a calf and the bloody thing worked . . . It's fantastic, once you start running it, you can't stop it."

The man speaking is Dr. John C. Norman of Harvard Medical School who is a surgeon in Boston City Hospital. He is talking about the first partial artificial heart ever to be driven by atomic power and tested successfully in an animal.

Unlike other such devices which derive their energy from unwieldy external sources or batteries that have to be recharged, the prototype nuclear-propelled steam engine that drives the partial heart can be made small enough to be implanted in the body and it has enough fuel to run for at least 10 years.

It needs less water than a teardrop to generate the electricity to power an hydraulic system—also implantable—that takes the load off the heart.

Thus, just as thousands of lives are now prolonged for years by pacemakers regulating the heartbeat, thousands more someday may be prolonged by man-made parts that do the work of the lower left heart chamber or ventricle that actually pumps the blood. Left ventricular failure accounts for a major portion of the heart disease that kills a million Americans annually and is the nation's leading cause of death.

The atom-driven motor is one of four announced at a news conference Thursday by officials of the artificial heart program begun in 1964 by the National Heart and Lung Institute—a part of the National Institutes of Health. Two of them are miniature steam engines. Two operate on a different principle which generates electricity through the use of pressurized helium gas to prevent wear and tear, all are without valves or moving parts.

Also shown at the news conference was a self-contained plastic heart run by electricity, not much bigger in size and only a few pounds heavier than the natural organ. It is not yet at the point where it can be linked to the atomic engines with which it is compatible, but, powered by conventionally generated electricity, has undergone preliminary trials in animals. In the tests, a battery can be implanted and recharged from the outside by means of an induction coil under the skin.

Like the nuclear engine, the electric heart is part of a family of instruments being developed under government sponsorship which will range from assist devices for patients whose hearts are weakened, but not hopelessly crippled, to total replacements for severely damaged hearts. About \$7 million has been spent in the last five years on the project which has awarded contracts to universities and industry.

Thanks to sophisticated engineering of the instruments the heat generated by their operation is dissipated over a wide surface and has a minimal effect on blood and surrounding tissues. Many of its parts are as easily replaceable as the ink cartridge in reloadable ballpoint pens.

The nuclear fuel crucial to these devices is four ounces of a dioxide of plutonium 238, a long-lived isotope. It decays slowly and has little penetrating radiation. It is housed in a metal capsule which has been tested under extreme conditions to preclude posing a health threat in event of accident.

Although the capsule and its fuel alone now cost about \$70,000, government officials hope that current research and development efforts will make the entire system, exclusive of hospital and surgical casts, available for about \$5,000 by the end of the decade. Assuming an instrumentation lifetime of 10 years, this would bring the annual cost of the devices down to \$500.

At last week's news conference, heart and lung institute Director Dr. Theodore Cooper said both the heart and motor components could be implanted in the chest cavity in the normal position or that it may prove better to implant the artificial heart there and link it through the diaphragm to a motor in the abdomen.

Cooper made it clear, however, that the 1980 heart is far from reality. The dacron and polyurethane fabric now used for lining the prototype heart seems to damage red blood cells less than earlier versions of the material. "But we are not satisfied that compat-

ibility is established for a 10-year stand," he said.

"The biomaterials phase (of artificial heart technology) lags behind the control and power phases . . . and is not sufficiently advanced." In addition, no part of the system has yet been tested on any but animals with healthy hearts.

THE BOSTON GLOBE—100 YEARS OF JOURNALISTIC EXCELLENCE

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Boston Globe—a newspaper rivaled by few others for the depth and scrupulous accuracy of its coverage—celebrated its 100th anniversary yesterday. First published in early March 1870, the Globe has now brought to its New England readership a full century of uniform and uninterrupted journalistic excellence. Widely read outside New England—indeed, outside the United States—the Globe is among the handful of American newspapers known and respected everywhere.

One of the Globe's most celebrated editors, James Morgan, pointed out a quarter century ago that the newspaper's goal is "to conduct, in season and out, an unending campaign of education in the enduring principles which underlie the political, economic, and social questions of the day."

More than anything else, Mr. Speaker, the Globe is known for its balance—for its sober and straightforward treatment of the news, for its lively and entertaining features, for its closely reasoned editorials, for its broad range of opinion in its bylined columns. The Globe's investigative reporting, moreover, has brought to light—and helped solve—a host of problems in fields ranging all the way from drug abuse to politics.

I can testify personally to the skill and judgement of the newspaper's Washington staff—Charles Claffey, Darius Jhabvala, Salvatore Micciche, Martin Nolan, and Thomas Oliphant.

In its 100th anniversary edition yesterday, the Globe published an editorial evaluating its performance over the past century and looking ahead to the future.

I commend the editorial to my colleagues:

THE GLOBE—AT THE 100-YEAR MARK

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

In 1872 people had no phones, electric lights, stereos, automobiles, movies or television. All of these brought change. Yet it was nothing compared with what is now happening.

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

The Globe, which battled through the last century, will continue to dedicate itself to finding these answers, and to building a

New England, an America and a world community where people can live together in peace and plenty.

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

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

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

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

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

We want to thank our readers and our advertisers for making possible our 100th birthday this weekend.

THE PLIGHT OF THE BULGARIAN PEOPLE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost a century since the Bulgarian people have known freedom. Her people have not lived these 94 years in passive acceptance and submission, but have continually fought for the opportunity to build a life of their own choosing. Theirs is a continuous history of defeats and disappointments. Oppression has taken various forms—the faces and accents have ranged from Turkish to Greek to German to Russian.

Soviet troops entered Bulgarian soil on September 9, 1944. Communist power was completely consolidated within 3 years. We are all familiar with accounts of the feelings and thoughts of those living under Soviet occupation. The execution and trial of Nikola Patkov, leader of the Fatherland Front who died for the right of men to hold and express their own political convictions, stands as a symbol of protest against all such silencing acts to the Communist regime. The Fatherland Front has been retained as an organization providing a democratic facade for the Soviet-sponsored dictatorship of postwar Bulgaria. We voiced our anger during the entire Petkov incident and have continued to vocalize our thoughts while professors, politicians, journalists, teachers, and other Bulgarian citizens have been cruelly punished for openly expressing the feelings that had been held within for too many years. March 4 marks the observance of Bulgaria's Liberation Day. I wish to restate and reemphasize at this time my support for the goals of freedom and justice for the Bulgarian people.

RADIO FREE EUROPE

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the deadlock between the House and the Senate over legislative authorization for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty still continues, and it is a matter of widening concern. An article by Flora Lewis in the Boston Evening Globe illuminates the problem from an American viewpoint, and an editorial from the London Daily Telegraph expresses British concern for the fate of the two radios. The latter editorial correctly notes that the present impasse is in no way the fault of this body.

Editorials also appeared today in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal. The text of all these editorials follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Feb. 25, 1972]

FULBRIGHT SILENCES TWO U.S. VOICES
(By Flora Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—Unless Congress acts by the end of the month, the semi-official American radio stations broadcasting to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe will be shut down.

That is precisely the aim of Sen. Fulbright (D-Ark.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who has maneuvered to kill the stations by legislative impasse cutting off their funds.

"These radios should be given an opportunity to take their rightful place in the graveyard of cold war relics," Fulbright told the Senate.

The two are Radio Free Europe, which own languages, and regularly publishes careful research on those countries in broadcasts from 12 to 20 hours a day to the nations of Eastern Europe in their English. Radio Liberty performs the same functions but focuses on the Soviet Union.

Both were started at the beginning of the '50s and, as Fulbright says belatedly, they were major weapons of the cold war. Further, they were secretly funded by the CIA, although Free Europe also received public contributions.

The irony of Fulbright's position is that both these faults have been corrected. The two radios now operate aboveboard. More important, they have come to provide a vital, straightforwardly informative service far superior to the U.S. Government's own foreign broadcasting system, the Voice of America.

Last year, Sen. Clifford Case (R-N.J.) finally made Free Europe and Liberty honest radios with a bill ending their dependence on the CIA budget. They are now financed through State Department appropriations open to public scrutiny. That was not ideal, since it exposed them to more political and propaganda controls than the previous secret, but essentially autonomous, arrangement with the CIA.

State wisely decided that it would be better to set the radios up as quasi-independent systems, similar to the domestic Public Broadcasting System. In that way, the professional judgment of their excellent and sober staffs would be better insulated from improper influence.

A bill to this effect passed the House. But Fulbright got a bill through the Senate keeping State in charge until the end of the fiscal year, when he hoped to cut off the funds altogether. The two houses have failed to reach a conference agreement, so the radios are due to be silenced this week.

It would be a grave loss, both to the people of Eastern Europe and the scholars and researchers of the United States. The radios are no longer the strident propaganda trumpets of their early years. Since the Hungarian revolution of 1956, when they reviewed their role and drastically changed their policies, they have been serious and reliable sources of information and analysis which the people of Eastern Europe are totally denied by their governments. Of course, Moscow and its allies don't like that.

Silencing Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty would simply amount to collaborating with those governments to silence dissent and keep their peoples ignorant.

The annual appropriation required for both is \$36 million. Sen. Fulbright compared it to the \$44 million which Voice of America's worldwide operation cost. But VOA broadcasts only a few hours a day, and very different material—banal, official sometimes biased governmentese.

If the point is economy, then it would be far better to drop VOA and let the two effective radios keep broadcasting. A special Library of Congress study, asked to evaluate Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty by Fulbright's committee, came up with the answer that they were very good indeed, no doubt the opposite of what Fulbright hoped to hear.

And if the point is to call off the cold war and deal more openly and sensibly with the Communist countries, then it would also be better to preserve the two autonomous radios and kill the US government propaganda service.

If Fulbright's purpose is achieved, the result would not be to bury cold war relics but to help preserve the dark silence of the cold war in Eastern Europe.

[From the (London) Daily Telegraph,
Feb. 23, 1972]

FREEDOM'S VOICE IN PERIL

A disgraceful surrender of the West's right to broadcast objective news and comment across the Iron Curtain is about to take place unless the American Government acts quickly and firmly to stop it. Funds have been cut off from Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, both based in Munich, which for over 20 years have been transmitting to the satellite countries, and also to Russia in the main languages of the Soviet Union. As was recently nearly the case with American foreign aid, the cut-off is a result of a dispute in Congress.

Senator FULBRIGHT is in his usual role of leading the appeasers. A year ago he succeeded in stopping the provision of funds for the two stations by the Central Intelligence Agency. The State Department took over the responsibility on a year-to-year basis. The Senator now seems within an ace of blocking the voting of funds for the coming year, in which case the stations would have to close down within a fortnight. He says that this would put them "in their rightful place in the churchyard of cold war relics."

Is it "cold warfare" to broadcast the truth to the peoples of the Communist dictatorships? Is it wrong to give them samples of Western culture and entertainment, to seek to correct the dangerous, perverse and malicious slanders about the allegedly aggressive war-like West with which they are fed by their governmental propaganda machines? Do the Communist regimes, in the barrage of vicious propaganda against the West with which they crowd the channels day and night, ask whether they are offending the susceptibilities of the societies it is their intention to disintegrate? The West has the obligation, to itself and to subject peoples everywhere, to testify to democracy. Radio, as millions behind the Iron Curtain will gratefully confirm, is the ideal means of communication in the circumstances. It must not be silenced.

[From the New York Times]

A SENATE MAJORITY SPEAKS

A majority of the members of the United States Senate has sponsored a resolution designed to back continuation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

What makes the move extraordinary is that the primary immediate aim of the sponsors is to put pressure on the Senate's conferees to end their deadlock with House conferees on this issue, a stalemate that threatens the swift demise of both these major communications links to Eastern Europe. Now that a majority of the Senate has spoken, there can be no moral basis for the continued obduracy of that chamber's conferees.

Their present tactics, if successful in terminating these broadcasts, can only benefit the Kremlin. Its bitter enmity to these radio voices has long emphasized their importance in filling a communications void by providing information otherwise unavailable.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

THREAT TO RADIO FREE EUROPE

We have difficulty understanding why Senator Fulbright is trying to deny Congressional appropriations to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. We are aware of his animus toward "cold war relics," but both stations have earned virtually unanimous praise for broadcasting objective news and impartial analysis.

There is obviously a crying need for such information, which RFE broadcasts in native languages to five Eastern European nations and which Radio Liberty broadcasts to the USSR in 17 Soviet languages. In effect, the stations function as a free press for some 300-million fettered people. Contrast that with the Communist bloc's unrelieved propaganda broadcasts, 900 hours a day in some 80 languages to every continent.

In the early and mid-50s, both stations were accused of adding to the tensions of the cold war. If so, that charge has not been true for at least 15 years. Indeed, former ambassador to Poland John Gronowski praised the accuracy and detail of RFE's coverage of the Polish uprisings of 1968 (uprisings that were ignored by the Polish media). And both stations gave factual reports on such important issues as the ouster of Khrushchev, the Cuban missile crisis, and the Nixon visit to China, stories that the Communist world ignored or downplayed.

There was a minor flap last year when it was revealed that the Central Intelligence Agency had secretly been subsidizing both stations, even as Washington insisted that they were privately financed. There was no evidence that the CIA ever interfered with program content, but such deception is inexcusable nonetheless—which is why President Nixon proposed that the stations be financed directly by Congress but run by an 11-member nonprofit corporation independent of government control.

Yet Mr. Fulbright objects even to that. And although both houses of Congress have passed authorization bills, he has managed to delay any conference for resolving the differences and thus keeping the stations alive. It is this opposition that we find hard to fathom. Does he also object to the Voice of America?

Although Senator Fulbright argues that the stations have no place in a period of East-West detente, we suspect that they have actually contributed to detente by helping to erode ideological suspicion born of ignorance and misinformation, and that abandoning them may prolong the East-West tension the Senator so passionately denounces. In any event, what's wrong with wanting to contribute to the free flow of ideas across international borders?

FAMOUS HYMN WRITER LIVED IN CLEVELAND

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Earl R. Hoover is an outstanding history buff, a student of Americana. A trustee of the Western Reserve Historical Society and president of the Early Settlers Association of the Western Reserve, he has unearthed a number of little known, but fascinating, items of historical lore.

Among his latest is an article published in the *Ohioana Quarterly* this winter which tells the story of the Reverend Jeremiah Eames Rankin, author of the much loved hymn, "God Be With You 'Til We Meet Again."

I would like to share this interesting and well-written article with readers of the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE FAMOUS HYMN WRITER WHO LIVED AND IS BURIED IN CLEVELAND

(By Earl R. Hoover of Cleveland, Ohio, who is Senior Vice President of the Shaker Savings Association, Cleveland, Ohio, and former Judge of the Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Court. He is a graduate of Otterbein College and Harvard Law School, trustee of The Western Reserve Historical Society and President of The Early Settlers Association Of The Western Reserve)

Through the courtesy of the Shaker Savings Association, this article is reprinted from the *Ohioana Quarterly*, Columbus, Ohio, issue of Winter 1971, volume 14, number 4.

The small brown book I bought at a second hand sale, *History of Hymns and Authors* by L. F. Mellen, revealed the surprising information that the writer of the words of the world-famous hymn, *God Be With You 'Til We Meet Again*, once lived in Cleveland and is buried in Cleveland's Lakeview Cemetery.

Here Rev. Jeremiah Eames Rankin lies buried in a grave with a humble marker, which reads: "Jeremiah E. Rankin 1828-1904."

This renowned minister is buried in the cemetery plot of Harvey D. Goulder, wealthy Cleveland who was the outstanding admiralty lawyer of the Great Lakes.

Mr. Goulder's sumptuous home, 1561 Euclid Avenue, became Rankin's Cleveland address. The story explaining how Rankin happened to write his famous hymn, and to take up residence in Goulder's home, and later be buried in his cemetery lot, is a fascinating one.

Three New England states figured prominently in Rankin's early life. He was born at Thornton, New Hampshire, January 2, 1828, in a Congregational minister's home. In 1848, at the age of twenty, he graduated from Middlebury College, Vermont. Later Middlebury bestowed a D.D. and a LL.D. on him. He received his theological training at Andover's Seminary, Massachusetts, class of 1854.

In 1869, Washington, D.C. became Rankin's home. Here he became a national and international figure as "a preacher, author, college president, the personal friend of four presidents" (Ulysses S. Grant, Benjamin Harrison, William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt), chaplain of the House of Representatives and "probably the best known minister of the Congregational faith".

He held a pastorate in the Capital's First

Congregational Church. Here the handsome, dynamic Rankin preached for about fifteen years, attracting a large congregation and important public officials.

Sunday nights Rankin held gospel meetings, and for these there was need for a benediction hymn—a song to conclude Christian gatherings. For this purpose he wrote his now-famous hymn, *God Be With You 'Til We Meet Again*. It was first sung at one of these Sunday evening services, and published 1880, in a song book, *Golden Bells*, which he edited.

People were certain that some emotional or romantic seizure inspired Rankin to write this hymn. He rejected that, saying it "was the product of cool purpose." It has been called "the hymn that was taken from the dictionary," and one based on "etymology."

Since a benediction involves a parting—a "good-bye"—Rankin referred to the dictionary for the meaning of "good-bye". He was surprised at the original definition from which it had changed into a perfunctory phrase. "Good-bye" is a contraction of "God be With Ye." In his hymn, Rankin has restored "good-bye" to its religious meaning.

He wrote the one stanza. Then the 52 year old clergyman searched for someone to write a tune for it. He sent the stanza to two composers. One, C. C. Converse, was already famous for his song *What A Friend We Have In Jesus*. The other composer, unknown, was William G. Tomer, then in charge of music at the Capital's Grace Methodist Episcopal Church. Rankin chose the melody of the unknown composer, because it was so perfectly wedded to his words. After his blind church organist, J. W. Bischoff, had made some minor changes, Rankin then wrote the other seven stanzas.

What was responsible for Rankin's hymn becoming known throughout the world? Not his own church! He said that except for the Sunday night service, it was almost never sung there, but that the Methodists at the Ocean Grove, N.J. camp, began to glorify it. Next it was adopted by the Christian Endeavor movement and became a favorite of young people. Dr. F. E. Clark, founder of Christian Endeavor, said that it followed him as a benediction hymn around the world.

The hymn was published in that celebrated English hymnal *Sacred Songs and Solos*, edited by Ira D. Sankey, the American evangelical singer of the world-renowned American evangelist, Dwight L. Moody. While in Seoul, in 1970, I found Rankin's hymn translated into the Korean language.

It would be impossible here to recount the countless dramatic situations in which Rankin's hymn has been used—as in Memphis, when 3,000 people, bidding goodby to President Theodore Roosevelt, spontaneously burst into the song; or during the Boer War, when the British soldiers used number "494" as a password, which was the hymn's number in Sankey's famous hymnal.

In 1889 Rankin became president of Howard University. Frederick Douglass, eloquent Negro leader, said, "He has done more to secure the rights of my race than all the legislation of Congress."

In 1902, because of failing health, Dr. Rankin resigned Howard University's presidency and moved to Cleveland to live with his daughter, Mary Rankin Goulder, who in Washington had married Cleveland's Harvey D. Goulder, in 1878.

It was on beautiful Euclid Avenue in the palatial Goulder home that Rankin spent his last days.

The Goulder mansion no longer stands. Today the premises are occupied by an automobile dealer.

Rankin died of pneumonia on his 50th wedding anniversary, November 28, 1904, at the age of 76. At his funeral in Cleveland two days later, a quartette sang *God Be With You 'Til We Meet Again*. He was buried

in the lot of his distinguished son-in-law, Harvey D. Goulder.

Dr. Richard Storrs of Brooklyn, N.Y., acclaimed the "model preacher of America," wrote: "The greatest privilege which God ever gives to His children upon earth, and which He gives to comparatively few is to write a noble Christian hymn, to be accepted by the churches, to be sung by reverent and loving hearts in different lands, and in different tongues."

Dr. Rankin had been given this "greatest privilege."

LIBERIA: SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, two important events of direct interest to the United States took place in the West African country of Liberia in January. The first was the inauguration of Liberia's 19th President, William R. Tolbert, Jr., January 3. Following the death of his eminent predecessor, President William V. S. Tubman, in July, the then Vice President Tolbert succeeded to the presidency in a peaceful and constitutional change. Conscious of the historic ties between the United States and Liberia, I take great pleasure in congratulating President Tolbert, the Liberian Government, and people on this significant occasion which manifests the political and economic stability Liberia enjoys and the outstanding leadership of President Tolbert.

The second event was the sesquicentennial celebration on January 7 of Liberia's founding by American freemen in 1822. During the first 100 years of Liberia's existence, Liberia defended its independence, struggling against attempts—some successful to encroach on its territory, to become a member of the League of Nations, an ally in the Second World War, a member of the United Nations, and a leader in the Organization of African Unity.

The friendship between the United States and Liberia is not only longstanding but, more importantly, based on Liberia's very early beginnings. Our mutuality of interests and concerns reflects our historic ties. As Liberia celebrates a century and a half of longevity and of signal accomplishments in nation-building, I share the pride and joy of the people of Liberia and wish them and their nation every success in the years ahead, and hope that the strong bonds of friendship between Liberians and Americans will continue to prosper.

TAX DOLLARS SQUANDERED BY HUD IN ST. LOUIS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as April 15 and the income tax deadline draw near,

taxpayers will not find it reassuring to read how over 200 million of their tax dollars went down the drain in an environmental housing experiment in St. Louis.

I include this most interesting report by Shirley Scheibla, as contained in the January 24, 1972, issue of *Barron's*:

ST. LOUIS BLUES—OVER \$200 MILLION IN U.S. HOUSING SUBSIDY IS DOWN THE DRAIN

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), recently ordered a start on demolition of the huge \$52 million Pruitt-Igoe public housing project in St. Louis, in which, owing to vandalism and crime, all but 10 of 33 buildings stand vacant and sealed up. He called for demolition of two of its 11-story buildings to test various techniques. (The order came two days after an Assistant Secretary of HUD complained to *Barron's* that the first article in this series, on Pruitt-Igoe, gave an erroneous impression that demolition tests would begin soon). Thomas Costello of the St. Louis Housing Authority told *Barron's* he expects to sign a contract early this week and that the demolition of the two buildings will begin immediately thereafter.

EMBARRASSING POSITION

Meanwhile, Secretary Romney finds himself in the embarrassing position of being chided by his own officials for failing to take prompt and adequate corrective action on HUD reports which indicate that:

(1) Besides Pruitt-Igoe, many buildings in other St. Louis public housing projects increasingly are being abandoned and sealed. Some are riddled with bullet holes, while plumbing, hardware and copper have been removed by vandals. "If present trends continue," much of the city's 8,000-odd public housing units soon will be beyond recovery.

(2) Though many slums have been leveled, public housing has not been built, as promised, to accommodate those made homeless.

(3) Adequate relocation services for the housing available have not been provided as required by law.

(4) About half the families offered public housing refuse to move into it.

(5) Of those who do live in public housing, many families pay no rent, and others pay either too little or too much.

(6) HUD money has been used to undertake urban renewal without the feasible program required by the Housing Act.

(7) Federally-financed rehabilitation appears to have violated federal statutes and HUD rules as well as building codes, resulting in excessive costs and shoddy work.

Barron's could find no one at either HUD headquarters or its St. Louis office who knew exactly how much money HUD has poured into St. Louis. Director Elmer Smith, who opened the Department's first area office there in August 1970, said that until then HUD kept track of spending program-by-program, rather than on a city-by-city basis. He now is compiling figures for St. Louis. Meantime he gave *Barron's* some rough estimates: \$80 million for urban renewal, not counting projects completed in the early 'Fifties before HUD was created; \$111 million for public housing construction (exclusive of land costs), plus annual operating subsidies, which came to \$2.5 million for the last fiscal year; \$16.5 million for model cities; \$4.5 million for code enforcement, demolition and interim assistance grants.

The U.S. Attorney in St. Louis, Daniel Bartlett Jr., told *Barron's* he is investigating all HUD programs in the city and so far has referred 11 cases to the FBI. "We may have people making false statements to the government to obtain money," Mr. Bartlett de-

clared. If the FBI finds evidence of this, he said, he expects to start criminal prosecution. He also foresees civil action regarding other irregularities.

According to a HUD official, a grand jury is looking into HUD programs in St. Louis, largely owing to the agency's failure to take decisive action after irregularities had been brought to its attention over a year ago.

Source material for the various investigations undoubtedly will come from HUD's own Comprehensive Consolidated Management Review of the St. Louis Housing Authority, covering November 30, 1970, through December 11, 1970 (completed May 4, 1971). The study found that all public housing in St. Louis, except for the Bleumeyer and Euclid Plaza projects, is in substandard condition and is plagued by inadequate care and protection, vandalism and theft. Conditions, added the Review, "have been allowed to reach chaotic proportions."

AXES AND SLEDGE HAMMERS

Here are some of the Review's findings regarding the Vaughn Apartments, composed of 28 buildings of nine stories each: "The flush hollow metal dwelling unit doors were found to be in various states of disrepair and vandalism. Apparently axes and sledge hammers have been used to damage and force entry. In addition, numerous bullet holes were noted throughout the project. . . . Roof membranes were found to be in very poor condition. . . . The original copper counter flashing and gravel stops have been removed by vandals, and this has contributed to the penetration of water into the top level of apartments. No evidence was found that any repairs or patching has been done to alleviate this problem. . . ."

COMPLETE BREAKDOWN

"The lack of security to unoccupied and abandoned dwelling units has led to widespread vandalism and removal of essential equipment such as plumbing, hardware, copper. . . . The stairways were found to be filthy. . . . Exhaust fans were . . . 100% inoperable. . . . The large amount of trash and debris in halls, corridors and stairwells . . . indicates a complete breakdown in the custodial services. . . . Of first priority in maintenance is to secure unoccupied dwellings, so that the essential services of heat and water will not be damaged by the elements and result in flooding and freezing such as in the Pruitt-Igoe project."

Of the high-rise buildings of the Darst-Webb housing project, the Review deemed only one in good condition. At the other structures, it found severe vandalism and neglect, with five buildings completely vacated. At the nine buildings of the Cochran Apartments, the Review found that use of guards reduced vandalism. Nevertheless, it said that three of the buildings are either closed or about to be. "One completely vacated building was noted to still have power, water and steam service. . . . All of the fire hose cabinets . . . have been vandalized of brass nozzles, hose and door assemblies."

UNSUCCESSFUL AT EVICTIONS

The study also reported "all efforts . . . to secure evictions from public housing have been unsuccessful. It appears obvious that until evictions for non-payment of rent can be achieved, more and more tenants will conclude that it is unnecessary to continue to pay rent." In addition, "while the Brooke Amendment of the Housing Act of 1969 requires that HUD pay the difference between the rent charged in public housing and 25% of income, adjustments for all families entitled to rent reductions have not been computed. . . ."

Back in November 1969, Hazle I. Gibson, director of HUD's Relocation Division, wrote Fred C. Hottle of HUD's Region V that a review of records of 93 families displaced

during the year ended August 1969 showed over half refused public housing. She said the relocation staff believed this was due chiefly to "the apparent black eye that Pruitt-Igoe has presented to the general public concerning all public housing." Consequently it was suggested that the local authorities "conduct an educational program . . . explaining in detail the application and assignment process, the benefits available to them, particularly financial, if they would move into public housing."

On March 3, 1970, in a memo to HUD Regional Administrator W. W. Collins, H. Earl Rosamand of Region V explained that when the West End rehabilitation project was started, it was estimated that 1,468 families would be displaced and that 1,300 new public housing units and 350 privately built low-income units would take care of them. But "since that time relocation housing has not been produced in accordance with these plans, and families have not accepted public housing. . . . Few private rental or sales housing units have been made available . . . relocation services were not being provided as required by HUD rules and regulations."

CHARGES FAILURE

A HUD memo from Relocation Representative Edgerton A. Taylor to Program Manager Leonard S. Weiss on December 21, 1970, charged that relocation operations in the West End project were a failure. It added that staff requirements for the local planning agency never were completely filled and noted a lack of training and planning by those on the staff. The memo, which ran barely one and a half pages, was supposed to constitute the review of relocation required by Section 105(c)(3) of the Housing Act. HUD's regional counsel ruled, however, that it did not meet the statutory requirements.

Besides financing public housing through the St. Louis Housing Authority, HUD also funds the Land Clearance for Redevelopment Authority of the City of St. Louis (LCRA). As early as March 11, 1970, a HUD audit report of LCRA, covering October 1, 1968, to September 30, 1969, disclosed the disastrous local conditions. Yet a HUD attorney expressed concern that by June 30, 1971, "administrative actions have not been completed upon the audit findings." On July 2, 1971, Thomas Corwin of HUD's Finance and Mortgage Credit Section wrote Lowell Johnson, HUD Associate Regional Counsel, about the audit covering the year ended September 30, 1969. "The audit findings and the LA's written replies," according to Mr. Corwin, "have been reviewed and discussed in several meetings by Area Office Personnel. The results of these discussions is that some of the cost should be allowed and some costs should be disallowed. The exact amounts which are to be recommended for acceptance or disallowance have not been determined."

The report found that "Due to inadequate planning and unsatisfactory management practices, the (West End Urban Renewal) Project is in serious financial condition . . . We believe that the feasibility of continuing this project should be reappraised in prompt and concerted manner, with appropriate consideration given to determining whether the original urban renewal objectives of this project can ever be attained."

FIGURES OVERSTATED?

The West End project was launched in 1965; at the time of the audit, more than half of the time for completing the venture had elapsed, and 75% of the budgeted funds of \$25 million had been spent, but only 18.8% of the rehabilitation had been accomplished. Indeed, only 61% of the necessary land had been acquired. Moreover, the study said even that figure might be overstated, because "properties are continuously being vacated, vandalized and boarded up, and the

Authority may have no other alternative but to acquire and demolish them."

Today, according to HUD St. Louis Director Smith, all the money is gone, and only a small fraction of the work is completed. Extensive vandalism has required much demolition instead of rehabilitation. According to a recent report to HUD by the architectural firm of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, the last of the residents are leaving the area, and the value of the land has declined to about one-fourth of what it was when the project began. To finance the project, HUD gave an outright grant of \$20 million and agreed to back \$10 million worth of housing bonds.

According to the audit report, the West End project began with the rehabilitation of 32 dwelling units. The auditors found that the Authority, with HUD financing, awarded three contracts for a total price of \$335,826. But it did so before completing plans and without including all known work items. As a result, subsequent change orders upped the ultimate price to \$470,884, "and thereby negated the advantages of competitive bidding." Moreover, no detailed cost estimates were made prior to the change orders, which "were not executed until the work was either substantially or totally complete." Again, on a contract for \$283,558 with Right Craft Builders, the Authority "priced change orders allowing 15% for profit and overhead on subcontracted change work rather than the 6% limitation stipulated in the contract."

DUPLICATE ORDERS

The HUD review also disclosed that in the Right Craft contract, "various items of work in the basic contract were duplicated in change orders, and work items included in some change orders were duplicated in subsequent change orders. As a result, the contractor received duplicate compensation for the same work."

In addition, inspections of properties rehabilitated by Right Craft "disclosed 166 instances of contract work which was not performed and 58 instances where materials used did not comply with contract specifications or where the workmanship was unsatisfactory. Although not as numerous, similar deficiencies were disclosed in the inspection of the properties rehabilitated under Contract Nos. 95 and 96" (for \$101,586 and \$85,739 with Biltwell Construction Co.). Also, Right Craft was paid "for security services which either were not provided or were duplicated."

Continuing its chronicle, the report noted nine instances in the West End project in which interim inspections, even though required by HUD rules, had not been made during construction to ascertain that it was being done in conformance with contracts.

Inspections of seven properties rehabilitated by SLCRC revealed that all violated property rehabilitation standards. Some of the deficiencies noted included a porch roof column leaning, rain water running into a basement floor, a corner downspout rusted with holes at the point of connection to the gutter, and failure to replace part of a basement ceiling removed by an electrician.

Describing SLCRC as "a non-profit organization that hires hard-core unemployed and trainees in the construction field," the report declared: "This contractor . . . may not have been qualified to do rehabilitation work. . . . Because of the type of employees hired by the SLCRC, we believe the LA (Authority) acted imprudently in awarding rehabilitation contracts without first making a positive determination as to whether the contractor was qualified." While the Authority eventually removed the SLCRC from its list of approved contractors, the report declared the work done indicated a "serious lack of management controls over rehabilitation activities."

LAW SUIT

A suit to enjoin further HUD funding for the West End project has been brought by black citizens and two neighborhood groups, the West End Community Conference and the West Neighborhood Advisory Committee Inc.

In a memo on the case last July, Arthur J. Gang, Assistant General Counsel of HUD for litigation, wrote that "the Secretary's litigation posture could be substantially improved by taking additional measures to improve the operation of the program in this area by applying sanctions unless improvements are made on a specific time schedule." He warned that otherwise, HUD might be forced to take action by court decree.

On September 29, HUD suspended for 90 days the acquisition and selling of land and initiation of capital improvements in the project without specific HUD approval, which so far has not been forthcoming. The suspension now has been extended an additional 30 days to enable Secretary Romney, after Congress reconvenes, to meet with the two Missouri Senators, Stuart Symington and Thomas Eagleton, and the three members who represent parts of St. Louis, Reps. William L. Clay, James W. Symington and Leonor Sullivan.

GEORGE MCGOVERN FOR PRESIDENT

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, a fine article concerning Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, appeared in the *Progressive* recently. The text of that article, which I commend to my colleagues, follows:

[From the *Progressive*, March 1972]

GEORGE MCGOVERN FOR PRESIDENT

It was just a year ago, March, 1971, issue, that the Editors of *The Progressive* welcomed Senator George McGovern's refreshingly unambiguous announcement of his candidacy for the Democratic Party nomination for President. We did not endorse him then; for us it was a time to listen and learn. Now, a year later, on the eve of the first primaries, it is a time for decision. We support Senator McGovern without reservation. He stood tall when he stood alone a year ago; he stands even taller now in a field of candidates that has proliferated so remarkably during the past year. So tall, said Julian Bond, that he rises "head and shoulders" above all his opponents.

What we find so admirable in Senator McGovern is not only his superb record in public office, not only the power and depth of his indictment of things as they are in a system and society stacked so strongly in favor of the Establishment; what also compels us to McGovern's side is that unlike many candidates, he dares propose specific alternatives to present policies—and to make them radical enough, to use that word in its most affirmative sense, to strike at the roots of the urgent problems that confront us. George McGovern is not content to curse the darkness; he is forever lighting candles to illuminate the progressive path he proposes to follow should he become President.

The overriding issue in this campaign divides those who would prop up the status quo and those who are committed to nothing less than the reversal of the nation's priorities. We are summoned in this year of decision to

choose whether we shall go on tinkering and temporizing in the face of the now not-so-distant rumblings of disaster—or whether we are prepared to harness all our resources and all our energies in a great national effort to achieve a society that provides equal opportunity for every American, and a society which seeks to improve the quality of life rather than mindlessly increase the quantity of goods.

Alone among the candidates, McGovern has come forward with a wide-ranging program of creative proposals designed to achieve this goal. Not for him the bland generalities and the platitudinous hokum cranked out by professional ghost writers. His campaign speeches, like his record in the Senate, reveal an extraordinary amount of homework in digging for the causes of our crisis and in proposing a specific, hope-inspiring program to meet that crisis. Not for him the all-things-to-all-men approach of the conventional politician straddling his portable fence. McGovern dares to speak truth to power, to challenge the forces of special privilege by advocating fundamental change.

One need only turn to the Senator's record in opposing the militarization of American foreign policy to judge the range of his attack, the depth of his alternative, and the courage with which he bucks the brass. Not content to strike out in the usual vague terms against the swollen Pentagon budget, McGovern has come forward with a detailed substitute to the Nixon Administration's proposal for soaring military spending. What other candidate has bothered or dared to go beyond the most generalized comment on arms spending?

All his opponents, the Senator has pointed out, have "promised new priorities—new money for such urgent problems as education, housing, transportation, environmental protection, and poverty."

But, he correctly added, "whether they come from candidates or from Nixon apologists, the talk of new priorities is no more than empty talk without a plan to find the funds to make them possible." McGovern has made it clear that much of the needed revenue could be obtained by his proposals to eliminate the multi-billion dollar layers of fat in the military budget, and by closing the tax loopholes which enable special interests to escape their fair share of the tax load.

Step by step, Senator McGovern shows how his military budget would cut total appropriations for the Pentagon by nearly forty per cent, and, said the much decorated World War II bomber pilot, still leave the United States with enough nuclear and conventional forces "to fully protect this country." His alternative defense budget runs to fifty-six pages of statistical data, solidly reasoned analyses, and hard-boiled judgments. We plan to review it in an early issue.

The difference between his budget and the one presented by the Pentagon, McGovern emphasized is that "between conservatism and paranoia," between a "buy-when-we-need" approach and a "wasteful arms race." "Paranoia consists of thinking we're stronger when we can kill the enemy ten times over instead of killing the enemy five times over."

Senator McGovern's commitment to a significant reduction in military spending and a major overhaul of our entire security system is no sudden conversion induced by political ambition in a Presidential election year. The Senator began to dispute the sacredness of the military budget in his first year in the Senate. His history, corroborated by the record, is this:

"Why back in 1963 I challenged the military budget," McGovern points out, "I started offering amendments then, calling for substantial cuts. I challenged the whole assumption of the Defense Department that you measure the defense of a country in military

terms only, and I argued that you had to begin to develop a criterion of defense which includes some measure of how strong we are in education, in health; how strong the economy is; what is the condition of the cities; what are the relations between various groups in our society—are they at peace with each other or do we have an internal war going on that weakens the country as much as any threat from abroad?"

And, McGovern has correctly noted, "All during the decade of the 1960s, these other Democratic candidates for President were voting for every appropriation the Defense Department sent to the Hill. I was voting consistently to reduce military outlays."

Senator McGovern's attack on the constantly expanding Pentagon budget has been motivated by a double purpose: (1) to strike at the growth of American imperialism and its indispensable ally, the militarization of U.S. foreign policy, and (2) to divert billions of dollars to meeting the social and economic challenge here at home.

For example, in the bitterly controversial field of welfare, McGovern was not content to criticize the inadequacies of President Nixon's family welfare program. Instead, he came up with a viable alternative to the President's plan. The South Dakota Democrat, whose searching inquiries into the scandal of poverty in America have provided him with excellent insight into the plight of the poor, proposes to have the United States adopt the basic welfare device long since instituted in every other industrial nation—a universal children's allowance. He suggests a payment of \$50 to \$65 a month per child—a sum sufficient to lift many families out of the poverty bracket.

In addition, Senator McGovern's comprehensive program calls for a guaranteed job at a decent wage for every able-bodied citizen of working age; expanded Social Security benefits, and a Federally administered public assistance plan for those few who would still be in need of additional income to escape from grinding poverty. Unlike the President's program, Senator McGovern's envisions the total elimination of hard-core poverty, while Mr. Nixon's would merely provide new palliatives to the perpetually poor.

Critics have dismissed the McGovern plan as "unrealistically expensive." The children's allowance would cost an estimated \$10 billion in the first year, and the cost of the total program would amount to about \$35 billion a year by 1976. But, as the Senator has emphasized, the entire cost could readily be financed by bringing the military budget down to the more sensible size he proposes.

On another major domestic front, Senator McGovern, again alone among the contenders for the Presidency, was deeply concerned from the beginning of our miserable war in Vietnam that the United States would be faced with an employment crisis and economic slowdown when the war ended. Eight years ago, with the same remarkable foresight he showed in opposing the war itself, he introduced a bill which would have required defense and space contractors to undertake conversion planning as a condition of doing business with the Government. More recently, he sponsored a New National Conversion Act providing that 12.5 per cent of each defense contractor's profits should be set aside as a reserve and used either to finance the contractor's conversion to peacetime production or to pay benefits to workers who might suffer hardship during the conversion.

On the issue of the Vietnam war itself, Senator McGovern, of course, has stood out in the pack of Senators seeking the Democratic Presidential nomination. It was during those

early years when he and *The Progressive* were among the lonely voices raised in opposition to the war that we came to know him and admire him for his courage and foresight. His militant opposition to the war, indeed, antedated that of Senator Eugene McCarthy, who led and symbolized the peace forces in the Presidential primary campaign of 1968. Certainly McGovern's record stands in sharp contrast to those of Senators Edmund Muskie, Hubert Humphrey, and Henry Jackson. Until 1969 there was no appreciable difference among those three. They were all Administration supporters of the war in Vietnam. Muskie has said that he had some private reservations about it, but it was McGovern who dared express them publicly.

It is not even wholly accurate to say that McGovern's rivals for the nomination among his Senate colleagues have now seen the light and are acting and speaking accordingly. Ramsey Clark, writing in the *ADA World*, pointed out that only last October Muskie and Humphrey voted against an amendment proposed by Senator Mike Gravel to prohibit bombing of Indochina (except where the President determines that such activity was directly related to safe withdrawal from Indochina). Clark concluded: "If, late in 1971, a man is still voting for that bombing, then I don't really think he's sensed yet—and that means he's an awfully slow learner—what the deep national anguish over the war in Indochina really is."

On the related issue of amnesty for those who evaded or resisted conscription for service in Vietnam, McGovern still stands as the only candidate who has declared flatly that if he were President he would not only end the war but he would follow that with a declaration of amnesty—an Executive Order covering young men who have stood up against the war either by going to jail or by going into exile.

The contrast between the South Dakotan and his primary campaign foes turned up in another vital area of foreign policy: the Mansfield resolution to reduce American forces in Western Europe by fifty per cent. Jackson, Humphrey, and Muskie all voted to continue American forces at their present level—twenty-seven years after the end of World War II.

It seems clear to us that McGovern's record decisively confirms his impeccable credentials as a progressive leader at the very moment in history when our country most urgently requires new direction and new leadership. If this is so, why do some, indeed many, forward-looking Democrats and Independents who admire his record and share his convictions hold back from supporting the South Dakotan? The answer for many is simply that they feel he does not have a chance to win and that it is important to be practical and fight for someone who will be able to overthrow the Nixon Administration.

Some of our best friends are progressive Democrats and Independents and we have listened endlessly to their lament that McGovern "can't win." Indeed, this myth, fostered by some political writers, has achieved a life of its own as a self-fulfilling prophecy. But recent developments combine to expose the myth for what it is.

During the past two months, McGovern has shown that he commands a considerable following, especially among the progressive forces in the Democratic Party. He swept the Massachusetts Citizens Presidential Caucus, rated by *The Boston Globe* as "the best political workers in the state," by piling up sixty-two per cent of the vote of 2,600 progressive Democrats present despite the fact that he was not there to make a direct ap-

peal to the delegates. Shortly thereafter, in Philadelphia, where 1,350 delegates attended a meeting of the Pennsylvania New Democratic Coalition, McGovern captured the endorsement of sixty-three per cent of the votes on the first ballot.

On the same weekend, he amassed eighty-three per cent of the votes cast at the Florida caucus of the Concerned Democrats, and he received the overwhelming endorsement from New York State's New Democratic Coalition that four years ago supported Senator Eugene McCarthy. His feat of rolling up sixty-nine per cent of the vote at the Coalition's state convention led McGovern to express confidence that the New York state delegation to the Democratic National Convention would be committed to his bid for the nomination in July.

While this showing of four victories in four contests added up to an extraordinary expression of progressive support, Senator McGovern made a good enough showing in the two Democratic caucuses held in January to cause even his detractors to concede his vote-getting prowess. In the Iowa precinct caucuses, Senator Muskie won the largest share of the delegates, but, reported *The New York Times*, in a January 26 dispatch from Des Moines: "The victory of the Maine Democrat, widely considered the front-runner for his party's Presidential nomination, was clouded by the unexpectedly strong showing of Senator George McGovern," whose vote-getting ability was shown in at least this instance to be seven times better than his most recent standing in the Gallup Poll. Muskie received only 35.5 per cent, even with the backing of Senator Harold Hughes, Iowa's most popular Democrat, and McGovern 23 per cent, with Humphrey, McCarthy, Chisholm, and Jackson trailing far behind with less than two per cent for each.

Shortly thereafter, Arizona state caucuses gave Muskie first place, but by a margin far smaller than had been expected in view of his strong support by organization Democrats. New York Mayor John Lindsay also did better than had been expected. But it was McGovern's strength at the rank and file level that led to *The Christian Science Monitor's* report that "Muskie enjoyed the support of most prominent Democrats in the state. In the light of that, Lindsay and McGovern showed well—McGovern especially. McGovern neither had the Muskie muscle nor the Lindsay-style media campaign. Lindsay's face gazed from billboards across the state," but he won "only sixteen more delegates (out of 500 chosen to the state convention) than McGovern, who had no media campaign at all. The McGovern drive was a quiet one, behind the scenes, and it worked surprisingly well."

These developments in six widely scattered states represent the total of popular expression in this campaign up to the time we went to press in mid-February. They go far, in our judgment, to explode the myth that McGovern can't win, and to refute the insulting nonsense suggesting that the American people will not support him because he is "too decent."

Recently, John W. Gardner, chairman of Common Cause, expressed the conviction that the people "demand that the candidates mention the unmentionable." The "unmentionable" consists of the issues—as opposed to show-biz humbug that has become such a dominant fixture in American political campaigning. No candidate in sight has shown a wider understanding of the issues, a greater courage to raise them, and a deeper wisdom to cope with them than George McGovern. He has earned our support. He deserves yours too.

RONALD GLASSER'S BOOK,
"365 DAYS" WINS AWARD

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, February 29, 1972, Ronald J. Glasser, author of the widely acclaimed book, "365 Days," shared the Washington Monthly's annual political book award for 1971.

Glasser's book, which includes his accounts of Vietnam combat as he heard it described in Japan by U.S. casualties of the war, was recognized along with Julian K. Prescott's "A History of the Modern Age."

Glasser's book is reviewed by the distinguished American author, William Styron in the March 1972 Washington Monthly. I can add nothing to Mr. Styron's sensitive review which follows:

THE RED BADGE OF LITERATURE

(By William Styron)

Why is it that the war in Vietnam has inspired tons of journalism, most of it ordinary, yet such a small amount of imaginative literature? Could this be merely the continuation of a negative trend which began during the Korean War—a conflict which also produced little that was notable in the way of fiction, drama, or poetry? For up until the past two decades the wars America engaged in proved to be the catalyst for memorable work from some of our finest writers. In the best of these works—those of Whitman and Melville, Hemingway, Dos Passos, e. e. cummings, Mailer, James Jones—the writers seemed possessed by an almost Euripidean need to demonstrate the eternal tragedy and folly of warfare, its persistence as a mysterious and destructive force dwelling in the very matrix of our nature, its stupidity, its boredom and anguish, and the glorious heroism it sometimes calls forth in spite of itself. In retrospect, it may be that both the appeal and the vitality of these novels and poems—and of lesser yet beautifully crafted works like John Horne Burns' novel of World War II, *The Gallery*—had to do with a kind of residual unconscious romanticism. After all, the Civil War and the two World Wars of this century, whatever their horrors and whatever the historical blunders and idiocies that propelled them into being, possessed moral aspects which could make an individual's participation in the conflict not entirely ignoble. Both Stephen Crane and Hemingway were conscious of the insanity, the brutalization of war, but there were still a few idealistic principles embedded in the Civil War and the First World War, thus lending to *The Red Badge of Courage* and *A Farewell to Arms* certain ironies and contradictions which helped give to each, finally, a romantic and tragic resonance.

It is possible, then, that the further we remove ourselves from wars in which a vestige of idealism exists or—to put it the other way around—the more we engage in waging wars which approach being totally depraved, the less likely we are to produce imaginative writing which contains many plausible outlines of humanity. It is a long leap, both historically and aesthetically, from the clear, frightened, distinctive identity of the hero of Stephen Crane (to whom, incidentally, Ronald J. Glasser's book is dedicated) to the blurred, undifferentiated, curiously one-dimensional 20th-century victims

wandering or staggering through the Vietnamese landscape of *365 Days*; yet it is a tribute to Glasser's great skill as a writer that from this most morally loathsome of wars, which has in some way degraded each person who has been touched by it, he has fashioned a moving account about tremendous courage and often immeasurable suffering. It is therefore a valuable and redemptive work, providing as it does a view of the war from the vantage point of a man who has not only been there but has himself, obviously, seen and suffered much.

Glasser is a physician, a former Army major who found himself assigned in 1968 to the U.S. Army hospital at Zama, in Japan. It was here that he first encountered the evacuated wounded from Vietnam, "the blind 17-year-olds stumbling down the hallway, the shattered high-school football player being wheeled to physical therapy." Trained as a pediatrician, Glasser relates how he began to feel a special empathy for these blown-apart, uncomplaining, sometimes hideously mangled casualties of war. "I soon realized," he writes, "that the troopers they were pulling off those med evac choppers were only children themselves. . . . At first, when it was all new, I was glad I didn't know them; I was relieved they were your children, not mine. After a while, I changed." In the act of changing, in the process of becoming involved with these boys, Glasser listened to many stories about the horrors of combat in Vietnam. They were grim stories mostly, touched with the cold hand of mortality and having to do with slow or sudden death and unspeakable wounds, yet some of the tales were wildly improbable and overlaid by the graveyard hilarity that inevitably accompanies any chronicle of warfare.

Recounted in a dry, dispassionate, superbly controlled and ironic voice, these anecdotes mingle at random with Glasser's own vividly observed, first-hand sketches of hospital life in Japan. The effect is disorganized, laconic, rather unsettlingly fragmentary, until one realizes that such a disjointed technique is perfectly suited to the outlines of the lunatic war itself: its greedy purposelessness, its manic and self-devouring intensity, its unending tableaux of helicopters crashing on missions to nowhere, futile patrols ending in bloody slaughter, instantaneous death in some remote mess area miles behind the action. Glasser's yeoman soldiers, aided by modern technology, are as miserably up to their necks in war as were those of Shakespeare. They trip over mines and are reduced to vegetables; after a night of grisly hand-to-hand murder they are enraged when the cook runs out of cornflakes; they nervously conspire to kill their swinish senior officers, and then chicken out. These awful vignettes are rendered with splendid understatement. It is a banal and senseless war, lacking either heroes or a chorus. Perhaps only an ear exquisitely attuned to the banal and senseless, like Glasser's, could do justice to such a nightmare: certainly many of these pages of callow, dyspeptic dialogue—uttered out of young souls quite trampled down with despair and fatigue—are as authentic and as moving a transcription of the soldier's true voice as any written in recent memory.

But if the war has been a war made up of victims and has been denied its true heroes, it has nonetheless had its moments of great sacrifice and courage in the face of incredible suffering. It is through Glasser's calm, unsentimental revelation of such moments that we are able to shake off some of the horror with which these pages are so often steeped and to see *365 Days* as the cleaning and redemptive document it is. Nearly all of Glasser's stories of combat, although admittedly second-hand (as was *The Red Badge*

of *Courage*), are remarkable miniature portraits of men at war. It is in the hospital episodes, however, where the force of Glasser's professional concern melts with the compassion and sensibility of a gifted storyteller, that we are given scenes of wrenching power.

In the last story in the book, Major Edwards, a doctor in the hospital burn unit, is faced with the hopeless task of saving a young soldier cruelly burned across 80 per cent of his body. The tale is simple, the situation uncomplicated; a dedicated physician, through no other motive than that resulting from the mighty urge to hold back death, trying against all odds to salvage someone who himself is suffering, without complaint, ecstasies of pain. Two human beings, then locked in the immemorial struggle against inexplicable fate. This is a familiar story and one that could have been both clinical and cloying, but Glasser's hand is so sure, his eye so clear, that the moment of the boy's imminent death and his last cry to the doctor—"I don't want to go home alone"—seem to rise to form a kind of unbearable epiphany to the inhuman waste and folly of war.

It is this quality, reverent at its best, enormously touching in its concern for the simple worth and decency of life, that gives *365 Days* its great distinction and may cause it—one hopes—to become one of those rare chronicles we can use to help alleviate the killing pain of this war, and its festering disgrace. For it shows that in the midst of their most brutish activity there is a nobility in men that war itself cannot extinguish. As Glasser says, in one of the most poignant of his passages, about the "medics": "In a world of suffering and death, Vietnam is like Walt Disney True-Life Adventure, where the young are suddenly left alone to take care of the young. . . . A tour of Nam is 12 months; it is like a law of nature. The medics, though, stay on line only seven months. It is not due to the good will of the Army, but to their discovery that seven months is about all these kids can take. After that, they start getting freaky, cutting down on their own water and food so they can carry more medical supplies; stealing plasma bottles and walking around on patrol with five or six pounds of glass in their rucksacks; writing parents and friends so they can buy their own endotracheal tubes or quite simply refusing to leave their units when their time in Nam is over."

"And so it goes, and the gooks know it. They will drop the point, trying not to kill him but to wound him, to get him screaming so they can get the medic too. He'll come. They know he will."

PRESS SAYS OMB CUTS UNDERMINE
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES OPERATIONS
IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the beefed-up Office of Management and Budget continues to expand its pervasive influence in the internal management of the independent agencies created by Congress.

Mr. Stephen M. Aug, in an excellent study and analysis in an article in the Sunday Washington Star, points out that OMB is holding a heavy hand over fund-

ing of the independent regulatory agencies which are legally arms of the Congress. Many are concerned that OMB virtually dictates to our regulatory agencies and commissions, and limits their powers and effectiveness by budget restraints. The OMB, thus continues to assume more and more power in the White House bureaucracy.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place the article from the Star in the RECORD herewith.

The article follows:

[From the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star, Feb. 27, 1972]

DOES OMB UNDERMINE AGENCY INDEPENDENCE?

(By Stephen M. Aug)

The White House-controlled Office of Management and Budget may be the greatest single factor influencing policies of the seven so-called "independent" regulatory agencies—even more of a factor than Congress—according to hitherto secret figures and correspondence.

The figures, which show just how much OMB has been trimming from the budgets of these small but highly sensitive agencies—which regulate everything from planes and trains to communications and hot new stock issues—have been made available to a Senate subcommittee.

Such figures, along with correspondence from top officials of OMB and its predecessor, the Bureau of the Budget, provide a rare insight into how the activities of these vital agencies are influenced by White House budget makers.

The agencies are the Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Maritime Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission and Securities and Exchange Commission.

The budgets of all these agencies total only \$155 million out of a total federal budget of about \$230 billion. But, like all federal agencies, their budgets are sent through OMB before reaching Congress as part of the administration's government-wide request.

There is some question as to whether these agencies, which are not really part of the executive branch of the government like cabinet-level departments, and which are supposed to be as independent of political influence as possible, ought to be subject to the control of a White House office.

Documents made available by the agencies show some of the results of this control by OMB:

The deputy director of OMB sought openly to urge the CAB to cut back on subsidies to local service airlines, despite the fact that this is a policy determination left by law solely to the agency's five-member board.

Sharp reductions made by OMB in additional staff sought by the SEC's Division of Corporation Finance could result in less protection for investors. It is this division that examines all registration statements for new stock issues and other statements made by corporations to be certain they are telling the whole truth to the investing public. Additional staff members would have sped up the currently slow registration process.

Personnel cuts at the Federal Trade Commission were aimed by OMB at commission activities in protecting consumers and regulating anticompetitive activities of businesses (these could include mergers and price-fixing activities).

The figures from these agencies show that in most cases their budget requests are trimmed sharply by OMB and less so by Congress. In some instances—the ICC and CAB for example—Congress has given the agencies more than the administration had sought.

LEGISLATIVE POWERS

So pervasive is OMB influence, that all of these agencies—with the exception of the ICC—must submit to it proposals for legislation in areas in which they are supposed to be the experts.

Further, any time one of these agencies wants to issue a form to conduct a survey involving more than 10 companies it must have OMB authorization to issue the form. Even the statements made by the commissioners themselves before a Senate Government Operations subcommittee were examined by OMB—although there appears to be some question whether OMB censored or otherwise cleared them.

Much of this influence by OMB over the regulatory agencies would be eliminated under legislation proposed in the Senate by Lee Metcalf, D-Mont., and in the House by Rep. John Dingell, D-Mich. The bills would allow the seven regulatory agencies to send their budgets directly to Congress, by passing OMB.

Metcalf, whose subcommittee is holding hearings on the legislation, believes there's a continuing threat to the independence of these agencies because of OMB action on their budgets.

"SEVERELY HANDICAPPED"

"Projects and surveys and policing of the various industries with which they're concerned have been so severely handicapped by the activities of OMB that they cannot do the job that's been assigned to them by Congress," Metcalf said.

He believes Congress is willing to give the agencies "substantially greater appropriations" to do the job that it has assigned them. At the same time, Metcalf is critical of Congress for relying too heavily on OMB to present the budget in past years.

So far, the chairmen of four of the agencies—FCC, ICC, FTC and FPC—have testified during Metcalf's hearings. Only the Federal Trade Commission has openly endorsed the legislation, although ICC Chairman George M. Stafford has appeared to lean towards it. The chairmen of all seven agencies are Republicans.

GREATER WORKLOAD

The four who testified—as well as some of the other chairmen who wrote to Metcalf—indicated that the workloads of their agencies had increased markedly in recent years, especially as a result of increased activity by consumer groups and environmentalists.

John N. Nassikas, the power commission chairman, said that since he joined the agency in 1969 its workload "has at least doubled, if not tripled." He added that "as energy shortages developed . . . we have been confronted with a great many more rule-making cases . . . rate increases . . . certifications . . . than any other commission previously was," plus environmental problems.

Perhaps the most obvious attempt by OMB to influence a regulatory agency policy was contained in a letter dated Aug. 2, 1971 from Caspar W. Weinberger, deputy director of OMB, to Secor D. Browne, chairman of the CAB. The letter was similar to those sent to agencies every year before budgets are prepared urging them to be frugal.

But Weinberger's letter said that in 1971 "the board reversed the seven-year trend of local service air carrier subsidy reduction by raising the level of subsidy by more than \$20 million. There are indications that the board

will investigate all possible measures which would have the effect of reducing the subsidy requirement both in 1972 and in future years."

In 1970 the CAB had paid \$36 million to airlines to make up for losses they sustained on certain necessary but unprofitable routes. The subsidy soared to \$64 million in 1971.

The reason for the increase was substantially the same as that which caused financial reverses on the major trunk lines—rapid increases in costs of providing service without growth in traffic.

FEDERAL OBLIGATION

Under federal law subsidies are paid to make up for losses on specified routes and allow for a return on investment. CAB auditors do not automatically accept airline figures, and frequently disallow some expenses for reimbursement. But once the five-member board determines that a subsidy is to be paid, it constitutes an obligation on the part of the federal government, whether or not Congress appropriates the money. In the past when Congress sought to disallow a CAB-authorized subsidy the airline involved won the subsidy anyway after a U.S. Court of Claims ruling.

Thus, the Weinberger letter could be taken only as an attempt to influence pending CAB business.

Hard-hit, too, by OMB has been the Federal Communications Commission. For the current fiscal year it had sought \$34.5 million. OMB chopped this to \$31.5 million, which Congress authorized. Still, according to FCC Chairman Dean Burch, OMB continues to withhold \$629,000 of this. OMB had been withholding \$1.3 million, but some money was released to allow the commission to replace a radial monitoring station.

One result of the sharp cut in the 1971 request was that the commission had insufficient trained personnel ready to continue with a lengthy investigation into the economic structure of AT&T and its subsidiaries in the Bell System.

DROPPED PROBE

The FCC announced last December it was dropping the investigation but, after considerable pressure from Capitol Hill and elsewhere, announced recently it is reinstating the investigation—and has transferred funds from elsewhere in the agency.

It is open to question whether OMB decisions are based on political motives—whether, for example, it would be politically more expedient to give less service to consumers, or to cut back on a major investigation of a big industry.

Those in OMB would say it's not true—that you simply have to build a budget on national priorities.

One who has the opposite view—and who supports Metcalf's legislation to remove OMB from regulatory agency budgets—is Sen. Fred Harris, D-Okla.

"It is easier for a Henry Ford of the head of AT&T to slip the right word into the ears of a single man in the White House than into the ears of all our senators and congressmen," he said in support of Metcalf's bill.

And he added, "I am certain that if we already had such a system, we would not have seen earlier this year the sorry spectacle of an FCC chairman, appointed of course by President Nixon, attempting to quash an investigation of the rate structure of AT&T, the first in history, on the grounds that staff was lacking."

Here is how the seven independent regulatory agency budgets were trimmed by the Office of Management and Budget, and what they finally got from Congress (in millions of dollars):

Fiscal year	CAB request	OMB approved	Congress allowed
Civil Aeronautics Board:			
1970	\$10.9	\$10.4	\$13.2
1971	12.0	11.1	11.1
1972	13.5	12.8	13.3
1973	14.5	13.5	
	FCC	OMB	Congress
Federal Communications Commission:			
1970	33.6	26.3	24.6
1971	37.8	26.8	26.8
1972	24.5	31.5	31.5
1973	36.7	32.8	
	FMC	OMB	Congress
Federal Maritime Commission:			
1970	3.7	3.7	3.7
1971	4.1	3.9	3.7
1972	5.5	5.4	5.3
1973	5.8	5.4	
	FPC	OMB	Congress
Federal Power Commission:			
1970	19.8	18.4	18.1
1971	21.4	20.4	19.9
1972	24.0	22.6	22.2
1973	27.5	22.8	
	ICC	OMB	Congress
Interstate Commerce Commission:			
1970	25.9	21.8	20.9
1971	29.9	23.6	22.5
1972	25.9	25.2	25.2
1973	31.9	27.0	
	FTC	OMB	Congress
Federal Trade Commission:			
1970	29.3	28.1	27.7
1971	32.1	27.0	28.4
1972	34.3	28.9	30.6
1973	34.6	29.4	
	SEC	OMB	Congress
Securities and Exchange Commission:			
1970	20.7	29.4	20.4
1971	22.5	22.0	21.0
1972	28.7	26.3	26.3
1973	30.7	28.4	

¹ 4.6 after supplemental request.

STATE PLEASED WITH MANAGEMENT REFORMS

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, as one who has served many years on the State Department Organization and Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am pleased to have this opportunity to call attention to the extraordinary achievements of the Department of State over the past several years, under the imaginative and energetic leadership of its Deputy Under Secretary for Management, William B. Macomber, in overhauling and modernizing its management system so that the Department is better equipped to operate in the changing diplomatic climate of the 1970's.

The changes instituted by Bill Macomber represent the most far-reaching and significant management reforms ever undertaken by that Department.

They were in large part necessitated by an appreciation of the State Department's burgeoning administrative responsibilities in an interdependent world, and were accomplished largely under duress, during a period of intense and unprecedented public criticism of the State Department. The impacts of these changes now are being felt in both the policymaking and human relations areas.

In the policymaking area mechanisms have been created which improve the flow of information and ideas, and enhance the process of policy examination and resource allocation, so that talents up and down the line will be more creatively and effectively used.

In the human relations field, long needed modifications in the Department's "selection out" procedures have been introduced, along with effective grievance procedures, which make the system much more equitable. Recently, in fact, the Department's newly created Foreign Service Grievance Board ruled in favor of five out of seven employee/complainants in an unprecedented move.

I feel that it is also significant that these achievements were not made through the efforts of private consultants; rather, all of the changes implemented were based on the recommendations of State Department employees themselves.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Macomber will be the first to say that his achievements to date are but a beginning; that a great deal remains to be done. I would like, however, to commend to my colleagues two articles which have recently appeared in the Federal Times showing clearly that an enormous amount of progress has been made, and that the remaining task will undoubtedly be easier, because of it.

The articles follow:

STATE PLEASED WITH MANAGEMENT REFORMS

WASHINGTON.—The State Department has come a long way in modernizing and implementing management reforms during the past two years, according to a report just released by William B. Macomber, deputy under secretary of state for management.

In a two-year look at departmental operations since the publication of a self-critical analysis titled "Diplomacy for the 70's, A Program of Management Reform for the Department of State," Macomber outlined a number of the reforms already implemented by the department.

Macomber's two-year anniversary report, titled "Change in Foggy Bottom," notes that the department indeed has moved "towards a more equitable and effective system of human relations."

In a look at the program of management reform and modernization, Macomber described the progress in this area as involving a "unique and far-reaching" effort.

It has been unique, Macomber said, in the sense that Secretary of State William P. Rogers did not, as is traditional in an effort of this kind, turn the job over to a team of experts from outside. Instead, in an unprecedented step, he chose the career professionals themselves to draw the plans for reform.

As a result of implementation of certain management reform measures, Macomber added, the following programs have been implemented within the department:

Created for the first time, a policy analysis

and resource allocation system—known as PARA—a process for identifying issues, interests and priorities, the allocation of resources in accordance with those priorities, and the periodic review of the department's policies.

Established a new concept of team operation "among the seventh floor" principal officers which affords increased control of the department's planning, decision-making and allocation of resources. This team is served by common staffs, operates under the aegis of the Secretary and is directed by the under secretary.

Put into effect a new management evaluation capability in the expanded Inspector General's staff, which now will evaluate departmental policies as well as performance.

Introduced a new balance between competition and job tenure in the foreign service officer promotion system which preserves its competitive nature—but provides increased stability and security in the middle years of an officer's career.

Made major changes in the department's recruiting activities which already are bringing a much wider range of skills into the foreign service officer corps than ever before.

Adopted the concept of a new Foreign Affairs Specialist Corps (FAS). More than 870 career specialists reportedly have applied for entrance into this new corps, despite legal objections that have been raised by opponents of the FAS concept. Macomber expressed hope these objections will be overcome shortly "so that this important innovation will play a key role in our modernization effort."

Established a "mustang" program to identify clerical and staff support employees with unused talent or undeveloped potential and provide opportunities to them for advancement to officer-level positions through special training and assignments.

Encouraged flow of information, new ideas, divergent opinion and creative dissent within the department—and at posts abroad through the mechanisms of special message channels, new staff functions and the continued use of the Secretary's "open forum panel."

In singling out areas of modernization and reform, Macomber acknowledged that much of the success in this area depends on the "development of an increasingly effective, fair and enlightened system of human relations within the department."

Here too, Macomber said the department experienced "a remarkable two years, with much progress being made—and with much still left to be done."

As one example, he cited the progress made in providing equality for women within the department, enabling them to hold down responsible jobs not previously open to them. According to Macomber, women now are assured equal consideration for assignments, training opportunities and prerequisites without regard to sex or marital status.

Indeed, Macomber added, one of the more interesting aspects of programs to enhance career possibilities for women is the development of working family teams in which both the wife and husband are career foreign service employees. According to Macomber, "over 30 such teams are now in the department's foreign service—and more may be expected soon."

Macomber also noted that efforts are under way to accord increased recognition of the professional status and rights of secretaries—still one of the largest and most important groups of women in the department's civil and foreign services.

Concerning minority groups, Macomber said that in the past two years the department continued to emphasize its minority recruiting program despite personnel cuts and

the resultant reduction in overall recruitment.

Of overriding importance in the area of human relations, the Macomber report said, is the creation of a formal employee-management relations system for the foreign service.

Noting that the President recently signed an executive order called for an employee-management program within the State Department, Macomber added that "for the first time members of the foreign service will have an important and formal voice in the development of all personnel policies—policies which play such an important part in their lives and careers."

Under this system, members of the foreign service can elect an organization to be their exclusive representative—and administrative officials in the department are required to consult with that organization on personnel policies which either the department or the employees wish to change.

If these consultations fail to result in agreement, the employee's representative can appeal over the heads of the department's administrative officials to the Board of the Foreign Service. The Board of the Foreign Service will have two subgroups to help it carry out its responsibilities. Both of these groups are independent of the administrative side of the State Department.

First is the three-member Employee-Management Relations Commission made up of representatives of the Department of Labor, the Civil Service Commission and the Office of Management and Budget. This commission will have the final say with respect to the supervision of elections and the adjudication of unfair labor practice complaints.

The second group, working directly under the Board of the Foreign Service, is known as the disputes panel. It is made up of one member from the Department of Labor, one from the Federal Services Impasses Panel, one from the public and two from the foreign service. Thus, the Macomber report notes, the majority of this Disputes Panel comes from "outside" the Department of State.

Moreover, the two foreign service representatives who sit on the panel cannot be part of the department's management.

When the administrative authorities of the department cannot reach agreement on their consultations with the representatives of the foreign service employees, it will be the function of this disputes group—acting on behalf of the Board of the Foreign Service—to establish the facts and seek a solution through mediation. If this fails, then the Panel would have to recommend an appropriate solution to the Board of the Foreign Service.

"With the development of this employee-management relations system," Macomber said "we have passed an historic milestone in the continuing development of the foreign service." He noted too that this milestone was not reached easily—and that it involved strong difference of opinion and much hard bargaining and public controversy.

"But what has emerged in the judgment of both the management of the department and the leadership of the American Foreign Service Association," Macomber added is "a system well adapted to the foreign service—and a system under which the men and women of the foreign service can have a real voice in the politics and regulations affecting their careers."

Noting that there also exists a need for a "meaningful grievance procedure independent of the department's personnel authorities and in which the individual's rights are clearly defined and understood," Macomber said that until recently, such a system did not exist.

There was in its stead a formal system of limited scope and an informal system in which every effort was made to be fair—but

which was neither independent of the personnel authorities nor characterized by any specific definition of the rights of an aggrieved employee.

According to Macomber, the department now has instituted an interim grievance procedure, chaired by William Simkin—who from 1961 to 1969 served as director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

Unlike the earlier arrangements, Macomber said, the interim grievance program—made up of distinguished public members as well as career officials with considerable foreign service experience—is set up and operates independently of the personnel and administrative officials of State, the Agency for International Development and the U.S. Information Agency.

This interim procedure reportedly will be replaced by a permanent one to be bargained collectively following the elections of an organization to represent employees in employee-management relations.

Another crucial area of the department's human relations involves that of involuntary retirement or "selection out" as it is more commonly known.

According to Macomber, such a system—presently required by law—is an essential ingredient of a strong foreign service. He added that he believed this view also was shared by "the great majority of foreign service officers."

Acknowledging that this system has come under increasing attack, Macomber said that "we now have in the employee-management relations system a particularly appropriate means for the representatives of foreign service employees to sit down with the department's management for a careful and thorough reexamination of the selection-out system."

"I am confident that out of the reexamination," Macomber said "will come a reaffirmation of the need for a continued involuntary retirement system—and I am equally confident that in this reexamination we are going to find ways to make it a fairer and stronger system."

Macomber noted that fewer than 10 officers are presently scheduled for involuntary retirement between now and June 30. In view of this upcoming reexamination, Macomber added, the State Department has suspended all final selection-out actions between now and that date.

Noting that the past two years has been a time of "tumult, criticism, disagreement and public controversy," Macomber said that he did not believe the old system was as unfair as has sometimes been alleged. In a highly competitive system such as ours, he said, there are bound to be disappointed persons.

Indicating that modernization is a process that will continue in the department, he also lauded the young career officers who in increasing numbers preceding January 1970 pressed for reforms.

GRIEVANCES OF FIVE IN FOREIGN SERVICE UPHOLD; RAP AT AGENCIES UNPRECEDENTED (By Bill Andronikos)

WASHINGTON.—In an unprecedented move, the Foreign Service Grievance Board has ruled in favor of employees in five of seven complaints filed in major foreign affairs agencies.

The decisions involved complaints from employees serving with the Department of State, the Agency for International Development and the U.S. Information Agency.

Some sources believe the grievance board actions may take the sting out of arguments by critics that the department's newly implemented interim grievance system is indifferent, inept and callously management oriented in its handling of grievance cases.

The board upheld the agencies in only two instances. In one case, the board upheld the agencies' uniform interpretation of a regulation and in the other case, it ruled against the grievant because the individual had failed to comply with all aspects of certain regulations governing his claim.

Concerning one of the five other cases the board found that a secretary with an outstanding performance record had been placed at a serious disadvantage for promotion by failure of supervisors to submit efficiency reports on her in accordance with the regulations.

To offset the damage, the board recommended her for prompt promotion.

Moreover, to prevent recurrence of this type of grievance, the board urged the uniform adoption of a policy that would make delinquent efficiency reports a matter of record in supervisors' performance files, as currently is the case in matters involving security violations.

In the second case, the board ordered the removal from an employee's performance file of a falsely prejudicial memorandum written on him by a visiting senior official.

Also, the board recommended that the employee be promoted and that the practice of placing such memoranda in performance files under similar circumstances be discontinued.

Similarly, in two other cases, the board ordered other falsely prejudicial material, including an efficiency report, removed from performance files—and in one instance, noted its belief that the employee had been "the victim of repugnant and obnoxious treatment."

In the fifth case, the board ordered an employee's performance file expanded to include a statement to counteract any possible negative impact arising out of the employee's having to work under conflicting dual authorities.

The board notified nine other employees earlier this month that their cases merited formal hearings. The first of these hearings is scheduled for airing later this month.

The State Department's relatively new interim grievance procedures for foreign service officers and employees went into effect last summer. It is the latest in a series of personnel reforms introduced by Deputy Under Secretary of State for Management William B. Macomber Jr.

The regulations apply to State, U.S. Informational Development.

These temporary grievance regulations apply only until a permanent grievance system is set up under the recently implemented presidential executive order—EO-11636—which grants foreign service personnel the right to hold elections to determine whether they want to be represented in employee-management relations by an organization that would serve as exclusive representative.

The new executive order—which replaced EO-11491 because it was determined that the new order better adapts itself to foreign service than did the old one—also leaves it up to the foreign service employees to decide which organization they want to represent them.

In accordance with a departmental announcement on Aug. 12, 1971, regarding interim grievance procedures, one of the first items on the agenda for employee-management consultations after an election to determine the employees' preferred bargaining exclusive representative, if any, will involve the development of a definite grievance procedure for State, USIA and AID.

TP date, the State Department had come under attack over alleged insensitivity to grievance and appeals matters from the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE). Spearheading the criticisms have been AFGE Locals 1534 and 1812, the

former representing State-AID employees and the latter USIA employees.

In the past, lack of grievance procedures in the foreign service brought outcries for reform from the American Foreign Service Association, a professional organization.

However, AFSA recently announced it is

pleased with the new executive order which gives foreign service employees the right to organize unions.

During the past year, some congressmen also expressed concern over shortcomings in grievance and appeals matters within the foreign service.

Consently, Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Ind., introduced a bill to provide an appeals procedure within the State Department while Sens. Jack Miller, R-Iowa, and Frank Moss, D-Utah, both offered legislation designed to set up an appeals review board outside the State Department.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 7, 1972

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

O magnify the Lord with me and let us exalt His name together.—Psalms 34: 3.

Almighty God, our Father, amid the changes of this swiftly moving age and troubled as we are by many things, we would be sure of Thee, without whom all our labor is in vain. During these days which try our souls as we seek to lead our Nation in just and good ways, help us to strengthen the spiritual foundations of our national life, for we know that only with Thee can we continue to be a channel of liberty to those who seek to be free.

May Thy special blessing rest upon our beloved colleague, DICK WHITE, in his sorrow, and upon these representatives of our people as they face the difficult problems of this troubled time. Enable them by Thy grace to be true to Thee, true to the high ideals of our democratic faith, and true to the brightest and best within themselves.

In the spirit of Him who was always true to Thee 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 PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2067) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MARIA LUIGIA DI GIORGIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2070) for the relief of Maria Luigia Di Giorgio.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. ANNA MARIA BALDINI DELA ROSA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3713) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Baldini Dela Rosa.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CHARLES COLBATH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4310) for the relief of Charles Colbath.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. CARMEN PRADO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6108) for the relief of Mrs. Carmen Prado.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RENE PAULO ROHDEN-SOBRINHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5181) for the relief of Rene Paulo Rohden-Sobrinho.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CATHERINE E. SPELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7312) for the relief of Catherine E. Spell.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FRANK J. McCABE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1862) for the relief of Frank J. McCabe.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DONALD L. BULMER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1994) for the relief of Donald L. Bulmer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MARINA MUNOZ DE WYSS (NEE LOPEZ)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5579) for the relief of Mrs. Marina Munoz de Wyss (nee Lopez).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CARMEN MARIA PENA-GARCANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6342) for the relief of Carmen Maria Pena-Garcano.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM H. NICKERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4064) for the relief of William H. Nickerson.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ANTONIO BENAVIDES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2394) for the relief of Antonio Benavides.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.