

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 14028. A bill to support the price of milk at 90 percent of the parity price for the period beginning April 1, 1972, and ending March 31, 1973; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SKUBITZ (for himself, Mr. Saylor, Mr. Udall, Mr. Steiger of Arizona, Mr. Lloyd, and Mr. McKay):

H.R. 14029. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer franchise fees received from certain concession operations at Glen Canyon Recreation Area, Ariz., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 14030. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for 3 years the authorization for grants for communicable disease control and vaccination assistance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14031. A bill to provide increases in railroad retirement benefits comparable to those provided by the Social Security Amendments of 1972; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THONE (for himself, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Collins of Texas, Mr. Dennis, Mr. Griffin, Mr. Melcher, and Mr. Schmitz):

H.R. 14032. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 14033. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of physical or mental handicap in employment an unlawful employment practice, unless there is a bona fide occupational qualification reasonably necessary to the normal operation of that particular business or enterprise; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Badillo, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dellums, Mr. Elberg, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Gibbons, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Hosmer, Mr. Koch, Mr. Podell, Mr. Rodino, and Mr. Charles H. Wilson):

H.R. 14034. A bill to repeal the meat quota provisions of Public Law 88-482; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself, Mrs. Dwyer, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Kastenmeier, Mr. Burke of Massachusetts, and Mr. Hicks of Washington):

H.R. 14035. A bill to authorize the President, through the temporary Vietnam Children's Care Agency, to enter into arrangements with the Government of South Vietnam to provide assistance in improving the welfare of children in South Vietnam and to facilitate the adoption of orphaned or abandoned Vietnamese children, particularly children of U.S. fathers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEGICH:

H.R. 14036. A bill to restore to Federal civilian employees their rights to participate, as private citizens, in the political life of the Nation, to protect Federal civilian employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 14037. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the duty-free entry of mica films; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Mr. Hogan, and Mr. Broxhill of Virginia):

H.R. 14038. A bill to facilitate the resolution of medical malpractice suits in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14039. A bill to permit collective negotiation by professional retail pharmacists with third-party prepared prescription program administrators and sponsors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. Cederberg, Mr. Gerald R. Ford, and Mr. Puppe):

H.R. 14040. A bill to promote development and expansion of community schools throughout the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 14041. A bill to provide a startup tax adjustment program for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN:

H.J. Res. 1126. Joint resolution to pay tribute to law enforcement officers of this country on Law Day, May 1, 1972; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H. Con. Res. 570. Concurrent resolution: The Northern Ireland Resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Dent, Mr. Pucinski, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey, Mr. Brademas, Mr. O'Hara, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. William D. Ford, Mrs. Mink, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Meeds, Mr. Gaydos, Mr. Clay, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Biaggi, Mrs. Grasso, Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts, Mr. Mazzoli, Mr. Badillo, and Mr. Reid):

H. Res. 905. Resolution urging supplemental appropriations to implement the President's message of March 17, 1972, calling for equal educational opportunities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BADILLO:

H. Res. 906. Resolution calling for an increase in appropriations for title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Res. 907. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies

authorized by House Resolution 819; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 908. Resolution providing expenses for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 909. Resolution to provide funds for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 20; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 910. Resolution providing for the expenses of the House Select Committee on Crime; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 911. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by rule XI(8) and House Resolution 304; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 912. Resolution to provide for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 201 for the Committee on Armed Services; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

342. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to the recent report of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 14042. A bill for the relief of Jose Carlos Recalde Martorella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 14043. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Horace Hill, U.S. Air Force Reserve (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 14044. A bill for the relief of Richard Burton, SFC, U.S. Army (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 14045. A bill for the relief of Tino Cattabiani, his wife, Caterina Cattabiani, and their minor son, Pier Maria Cattabiani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

203. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, Alexandria, Va., relative to placing the Liberty Bell on tour of the 50 States, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### THE NEW OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable interest in possible revision of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, and I thought this recent analysis in the "American Bar Association

Journal" of March 1972 should be helpful:

#### THE NEW OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT

(By William B. Spann, Jr.)

After extensive committee hearings and floor debate, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 was passed by Congress in December of 1970 and signed into law by the President as Public Law 91-596. The effective date of the act was April 28, 1971. Standards were promulgated on May 29, effective August 27; thus, aggressive enforcement of the act began on that date. With

several exceptions, the act applies to all employment throughout the states and possessions. It is expected that it will apply to more than 4.1 million businesses and 57 million employees.

Legislation of the application of this breadth deserves, indeed demands, the study and attention of lawyers, for there are few practitioners who will not have occasion to give advice that should take this act into account. Ignorance of the application and provisions of the act could be disastrous. The act has teeth; its penalties are severe; criminal sanctions are provided, including imprisonment if a death occurs; and no one

would want to advise a calculated risk under the act.

#### THERE ARE THREE BASIC ELEMENTS OF THE ACT

The act contains three basic elements: (1) the issuance of occupational safety and health standards by the Department of Labor; (2) provisions for federal enforcement of these standards; with (3) effective and in some cases severe sanctions or penalties when violations occur. Its primary purpose as defined in Section 5 of the act is that each employer "shall furnish to each of his employees employment and a place of employment which are free from recognized hazards that are causing or likely to cause death or serious physical harm . . .".

The heart of the act insofar as the need for legal advice is concerned is Sections 8 through 13 and Section 17, which deal with inspections and investigations, the issuance of citations, procedures for enforcement, judicial review and penalties. In the various steps entailed in the issuance of citations and notices and the procedures for enforcement, arbitrary and rather short time limits are established: While it is too soon to have authoritative court interpretations of those limitations, we may assume that they will receive the same strict construction the courts have applied to other acts protecting employees. A company that wants to protect itself under the act must do so within the confines of the act or not at all.

#### ACT IS A VALID EXERCISE OF POLICE POWER

Under the present status of the law, the act will be upheld under the commerce clause as a valid exercise of the police power for the protection of the health and welfare of the public. While the enforcement proceedings appear to be somewhat harsh and almost summary in nature, they do afford due process. I would expect any contest over constitutionality to fail.

Section 8 deals with inspections, investigations and record keeping. It provides that an agent of the Secretary of Labor may enter, without delay and at reasonable times, any establishment, construction site or other area where work is performed. The agent is required to present appropriate credentials, to the owner, operator or agent in charge, but inspection cannot be avoided by hiding out or by being indefinitely out of the city. In the Congressional debates, it was suggested that if after a reasonable time no one shows up admitting to be the agent in charge, the inspector may regard any employee as the agent in charge for the purpose of presenting his credentials. No advance notice of inspection will be given, and, indeed, Section 17(f) of the act provides that any person giving advance notice without authority from the secretary or his designees may be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment of not more than six months, or both.

#### EMPLOYER MUST KEEP ACCIDENT AND ILLNESS RECORDS

Section 8 also gives to the secretary subpoena power over a witness for the production of evidence enforceable in the United States district courts and requires certain accident and illness records to be kept by the employer.

During the inspection a representative of the employer and a representative authorized by the employees must be given an opportunity to accompany the inspector, and if there is no authorized employee representative, the inspector may consult with a reasonable number of employees. The inspector may also question privately any employer, owner, operator, agent or employee.

Inspection may also be requested by employees or employees' representatives by giving written notice to the secretary or his authorized representative of the claimed violation or danger. A copy of this notice is

required to be provided to the employer at the time of inspection, but the names of those giving the notice may, upon their request, be eliminated. Upon receipt of this notice, the secretary must determine whether reasonable grounds exist to make a special inspection and, if he determines there are no reasonable grounds, he must advise the employees or their representative in writing of this determination. There are also procedures for employees to give written notice of alleged violations while an inspection is going on.

Section 9 deals with the issuance of citations. If, as a result of the inspection, the secretary's representative believes that an employer has violated the provisions of the act, he must issue with reasonable promptness a written citation setting forth the nature of the violation, including a reference to the provision of the act, standard, rule, regulation or order alleged to have been violated. In addition, this section fixes a reasonable time for abatement of the violation and provides that a notice in lieu of citation may be issued for *de minimis* violations. The report of the conference committee of Congress suggests that reasonable promptness for issuance is not more than seventy-two hours from the time the violation is detected (Conference Report 91-1765). It is required that the citation be posted prominently by the employer at or near each place of violation, and the failure to do so is subject to a civil penalty of \$1,000 for each violation.

#### CITATIONS NOT CONTESTED ARE NOT SUBJECT TO REVIEW

Section 10 sets forth the procedure for enforcement. If a citation issues under Section 9(a), the secretary within a reasonable time after termination of the inspection or investigation must notify the employer by certified mail of the penalty, if any, proposed under Section 17, and the employer has only fifteen working days from receipt of the notice to notify the secretary that he intends to contest the citation or proposed assessment of penalty. Under Section 10 (c), any employee or representative of employees may within fifteen working days of the issuance of the citation contest the time allowed for the abatement of the citation as unreasonable. If the employer fails to give notice of an intention to contest within fifteen working days of the receipt of the notice of the penalty or the employees fail to give notice within fifteen days of the citation contesting the time allowed for abatement, "the citation and assessment as proposed shall be deemed the final order of the [Occupational Safety and Health Review] Commission [established by Section 12 of the act] and not subject to review by any court or agency".

If an employer contests a citation or penalty in good faith, the time permitted by the secretary for abatement does not begin to run until the entry of a final order by the commission. If the citation is not complied with within the period for correction allowed, the employer then is notified of the penalty for failure to comply, and he has fifteen days to contest this proposed penalty.

It should be made clear that there are two penalties. Upon the issuance of a citation, a penalty is involved and the penalty as proposed is enforced in some amount even though the violation is corrected within the time allowed. More about the nature of this penalty later. If the violation is not corrected within the time allowed, a second and more severe penalty is assessed. Under the act, the violation when cited incurs a penalty, the theory being that the employer himself should maintain safety standards without the necessity of an inspection.

In case of any contest, the secretary must immediately advise the commission, which consists of three members appointed by the President by and with the consent of the

Senate. The commission affords the opportunity for a hearing, following which the commission, based on findings of fact, issues an order affirming, modifying or vacating the secretary's citation or proposed penalty or directing other appropriate relief. This order becomes final thirty days after its issuance. Rules of procedure before the review commission have been issued, but are too detailed and complex for explanation here.

#### PROVISION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEWS IS LIMITED

Judicial review is provided by Section 11 of the act for any person adversely affected or aggrieved by an order of the commission. The parties seeking review must file a petition in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the violation is alleged to have occurred or where the employer has its principal office, or in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, within sixty days following the issuance of the commission's order. The court has authority to grant temporary relief or a restraining order and has power to enter, upon the pleadings, testimony and proceeding in the record, a decree modifying, affirming or setting aside the order of the commission and enforcing it to the extent that the order is affirmed or modified.

The provision for judicial review is sharply limited. No objection which has not been urged before the commission can be considered by the court unless the failure or neglect to do so is excused because of extraordinary circumstances, and the act provides that the findings of the commission with respect to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive. This writes into the act the rule with regard to the findings of fact by the National Labor Relations Board of *Universal Camera v. National Labor Relations Board*, 340 U.S. 474 (1951). It is provided, moreover, that the commencement of the proceedings in the circuit court do not operate as a stay of the order of the commission unless the court expressly so orders.

It appears that the judicial review provided will furnish very little relief to employers from an order by the commission. Even if a party can establish the need for additional evidence before the court, the court must return the case to the commission to take this evidence and make it a part of the record, and the commission may then modify its own findings or make new findings. The substantial evidence rule would apply to any further review by the court after the additional hearing before the commission.

Section 11(b) gives a right to the secretary also to obtain review of a final order of the commission by filing in the circuit court and, if no petition for review is filed with a court of appeals within sixty days of the commission's order, the commission's findings of fact and order are conclusive in connection with any petition for enforcement filed after the expiration of the sixty-day period. When the secretary files with the circuit court for enforcement, the clerk of the court, unless otherwise ordered by the court, enters as a matter of routine a decree enforcing the order, thus permitting contempt proceedings before the court to implement enforcement. In these enforcement proceedings the court of appeals may assess all of the penalties provided in Section 17 of the act in addition to invoking any other remedies available to it.

#### WHEN EMPLOYEES CAN BRING AN ACTION

Section 11(c) provides protection against discharge or discrimination to any employee who files a complaint. Should an employee complain to the secretary of this action against him within thirty days of the alleged violation, and if the secretary determines



that a violation has occurred, he may bring an action in a United States district court for all appropriate relief for the employees, including rehiring or reinstatement with back pay.

The commission's principal office is located in the District of Columbia, but it may hold hearings or conduct proceedings at any other place. The chairman of the commission is authorized to appoint hearing officers, and the report of the hearing officer becomes a final order of the commission within thirty days after he reports unless a member of the commission directs that the report be reviewed by the commission. Thus, there is no certain right of review of the hearing officer's findings by the commission and, under the substantial evidence rule applicable to court review, the hearing officer's findings of fact frequently will be the ultimate findings.

Section 13 provides for a special procedure that gives the United States district courts jurisdiction on petition of the secretary to restrain any conditions or practices that are found to be such that a danger exists which could reasonably be expected to cause death or serious physical harm either immediately or before the danger can be eliminated through the routine enforcement procedures. The district court may, on the filing of this petition, grant a temporary restraining order immediately, but this can be effective for no longer than five days. A hearing must be set within that period if an ex parte restraining order is granted.

#### HOW EXISTENCE OF IMMINENT DANGER IS DETERMINED

Section 13(c) places determination in the individual inspector as to whether imminent danger exists. The inspector is required immediately to inform the affected employees and employers of the danger and that he is recommending to the secretary that relief be sought. Section 13(d) provides that if the secretary arbitrarily or capriciously fails to seek relief, any employee who may be injured by reason of this failure or the employee's representative may bring an action against the secretary for a writ of mandamus to compel him to seek such an order. Translating the language of the act to plain parlance, this means simply that if an inspector advises an employer that an imminent danger exists which may cause death or serious physical harm and that he is recommending that a temporary injunction be sought by the secretary, the secretary can be expected to act almost immediately to obtain a restraining order that would shut down the entire operation or that portion of it which threatens death or serious physical harm. This section has not been used yet, and it is anticipated that its use will be rare.

A recapitulation of the penalties in Section 17 is in order. Subsection (a) provides that any employer who willfully or repeatedly violates the act or any court rule or order promulgated or regulations prescribed, may be assessed a civil penalty of not more than \$10,000 for each violation.

Subsection (b) provides that any employer who has received a citation for a serious violation shall be assessed a civil penalty of up to \$1,000 for each violation, and Subsection (c) that if the employer is cited for a violation not deemed to be a serious violation, he may be assessed up to \$1,000. The only difference between the serious and non-serious violation is the permissive nature of the penalty if it is regarded as nonserious. From this point on, the penalties become more severe, adding strong teeth to the act.

Subsection (d) provides that any employer who fails to correct a violation for which a citation has been issued within the period permitted for its correction, may be assessed a civil penalty of not more than \$1,000 for each day during which the civil violation continues.

Subsection (e) states that an employer who commits a willful violation that causes death of an employee shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or by imprisonment of not more than six months, or by both, and after the first conviction, the penalty is doubled, that is, a fine of not more than \$20,000 or imprisonment of not more than one year, or both.

Subsection (g) provides for any person making any false statement, representation or certification in any document filed or required to be maintained under the act, upon conviction, a fine of not more than \$10,000, imprisonment for not more than six months, or both.

Subsection (j) gives to the commission authority to assess the civil penalties. Recall that the secretary's office first proposes the civil penalties and, if they are not contested within fifteen days, they automatically become the order of the commission. If the matter is contested, then the commission would have authority to set the penalties within the limits stated.

This short review of the new Occupational Safety and Health Act should make it clear that all lawyers, not just those who regularly advise employers or labor organizations, should know the major provisions of this legislation and how it affects clients who will come for guidance. It is a major step on the part of the Federal Government into the national employment picture.

#### MERCY COLLEGE OF DETROIT

#### HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I place into the Record an article on the new president of Mercy College of Detroit, Sister Agnes Mary Mansour. Sister Agnes Mary not only is a Detroitite but a graduate of Mercy itself, which I am proud to say is a part of my 17th Congressional District. The sister's outstanding work as a teacher and scholar is recognized throughout the country and her new plans and projects for Mercy offer much promise to the Detroit community. The article written by Katherine Sudomier, which appeared in the Detroit News Sunday magazine, follows:

#### A QUIET NUN WANTS TO REVOLUTIONIZE HEALTH EDUCATION (By Katherine Sudomier)

By the time dark-eyed Agnes Mary Mansour graduated from Mercy College of Detroit and had gone on to become a Sister of Mercy, she had some very distinct ideas about what was wrong in the training of hospital personnel.

Many were being "over-educated" for the jobs they were doing; some were attending college for four years for a position they could learn in a single year. The educational waste was discouraging to students and added to hospital costs of patients.

Today—with a doctorate in biochemistry, several years of college teaching experience and a year's fellowship in administration to boost her along—she is in a position to do something about it. She was inaugurated Friday as Mercy's president, but her plan already is in motion.

A five-year experiment underwritten by \$445,000 in Federal Health, Education and Welfare funds promises to revolutionize the preparation of students in the field of allied health sciences. The sum spread over five years was part of \$2½ million given in 1971.

In short, Sister Agnes Mary's approach to education of students in associated medical fields provides education in at least two stages, allowing a student to get off at an early level with potential certification in his or her study area.

It is designed to reduce college dropouts and prepare needy students for a job sooner; lower medical costs may be an added bonus. Most of all, the concept may be workable in a whole variety of academic fields outside medicine, even engineering.

It has special attraction to the high school graduate who is not sure he wants to spend four years in college. Under the Mercy plan he can spend two or four years and leave at either stage with a specific job capability. Still the program is built into the context of a four-year liberal arts curriculum.

The basic concept of the program appears so simple that it seems amazing no one has done it before.

Since its announcement, Mercy has received a flood of applications from people of all ages anxious to participate in the program.

There is one hitch: In the program financed by HEW, Mercy necessarily must limit the number of students able to participate. Sister stresses that the HEW grant basically finances a test run of the concept.

The first year is being spent in gathering additional faculty and planning the curricula. The next four years will test its merit. So, at the moment, Mercy must encourage many applicants to enroll in other areas of study.

Because of its innovative nature, it immensely improves the job advancement prospects of health field technicians and professionals.

Sister believes for better health care, greater responsibility must be given to well prepared but lower ranked medical personnel, who are left dilly-dallying with test tube cleaners and low salaries.

Recognizing her capability, HEW this month named her as consultant in the development of allied health manpower in the department's special area which assesses the merits of health education programs seeking federal funds.

Mercy, perhaps best known until now as the alma mater of a recent Miss America (Pamela Ann Eldred), will try to alter the entire U.S. medical caste system with this new approach. What attracted HEW interest was the plan's basic belief that many people in medical fields are overtrained for the jobs they perform. Also, important allied health jobs could be filled more quickly.

Initially, Mercy's program will mean more graduates in the three fields included in the HEW-funded project—medical technology, medical record library science and dietetics. The college hopes to add others as the experiment proves itself.

Sister Agnes Mary's fondest hopes are tagged to her theory for the next stage: Graduates of two-year programs will do the more routine technical tasks now done by those with baccalaureate degrees. These latter professionals are expected to relieve doctors of many duties they now perform, allowing them more time to spend on greater medical problems.

Under current practice a medical technologist isn't allowed to release test results to patients, even though he makes and evaluates the test in many instances. More of the routine, semi-skilled jobs now being performed by over-qualified graduates will open up to undergraduates who are trying to pay their way through college.

Moreover, the upgrading of the lower-rank job will open job opportunities for those who want a skill they can learn quickly and cheaply.

"Better distribution of the health services is absolutely vital for better health care," Sister warns, adding that if professional

groups don't help raise the status of these fields, the government might.

In Michigan there is one doctor for every 933 people, with an even higher ratio in rural areas. This compares favorably to South Carolina, with one physician for 1,341 residents, but unfavorably with New York, with one doctor for each 518 people.

"In one clinic I know of there is no difference between the job performed by the four-year graduate medical technologist and the two-year certified lab assistant, except the pay," says Sister.

Sister Agnes Mary admits she had great reservations about assuming the new job of president. "If Mercy is going to have a bad administrator, it may as well be someone who loves the college, too," she says, with unconvincing meekness, in her super-tidy office.

To understand what she gave up to be college president, you have to know what she had: She had a rare kind of partnership with her students, where college was not only fun but a shared learning experience, instead of an advise and consent forum.

Sister was a resident advisor in Manning Hall, the only girls' dormitory at Mercy. It is the only dorm, except for a small house which harbors a handful of Mercy's male students. Mercy went co-ed in 1964, now has 400 full and part-time male students.

Her room in Manning had snatches of poetry on wall posters. One poster read: "Life is Big."

"You always knew she would welcome you," says a senior student, "despite countless chemistry tests. And if you had a problem, she always came up with some kind of solution, at least something to grab onto."

When Sister joined the students for card games or sports, she gave her all. "She's fantastic at cards," says a student, "and she likes all sports... volleyball, baseball, touch football, horseshoes." In fact, Sister is a basketball coach for the college's women's team, a sideline she hopes to continue in spite of the multiple demands of her new office.

Most of Mercy's students are first generation college goers who commute, as did Sister Agnes Mary when she attended Mercy 20 years ago. They are from middle class families which have worked hard to afford college. (Over 60 percent receive some financial assistance.)

Mercy is a "practical" liberal arts college. You don't go there if your chief goal is to learn cocktail party chatter. That's another reason she thought so hard—and so successfully—about a step-ladder approach to education: Some students simply couldn't last out a four-year course. They'd need to get off, and get jobs and, maybe, finish later.

"Most of our students come with a strong desire to serve," says Sister Agnes Mary. "They come asking: 'How can I best learn to give of myself?' It puts an obligation on us educators to foster this desire, to let it grow."

As Josephine ("Jo") Mansour she attended St. Charles Elementary and High School on Detroit's East Side. Her father worked for Murray Body Corp. and her mother came from the Mabarak real estate family. Her parents still live in the neighborhood around Townsend and St. Paul. "It's always a kiss on the cheek when you go there," says a friend of Sister's.

"Her mother and father say: 'How'd it go today, Jo?' And she says: 'Oh fine.' And that's all. They don't make anything big out of her job. But they are sweet folks, and so proud of her they beam all over."

Sister Agnes Mary says she felt the call to a religious vocation during high school and her undergrad years at Mercy, but: "I wouldn't admit it." After college graduation she admitted it and began to prepare to become a Sister of Mercy. She says: "I knew by then it was what I wanted for sure, and I've never been sorry. I had plenty of time to make up my mind."

Stymied as a med tech grad, Sister got her master's degree at Catholic University in Washington, D.C., returned to Mercy and taught chemistry, got her doctorate in biochemistry at Georgetown University in Washington, returned to be chairman of Mercy's Chemistry Department and then the Natural Science Department.

In 1970-71 school term Sister Agnes Mary was an American Council on Education administrative intern at the University of Kentucky in Lexington.

Mercy offers all its professional programs within a liberal arts context. Besides its interest in the health field, the college has special programs aimed at civic betterment. Among these are preprofessional social work and a law enforcement and protection program, coordinated by former Detroit Police Commissioner Johannes Spreen, and featuring present Commissioner John Nichols and his wife, Jean, as lecturers.

"I want the corner of Southfield and Outer Drive to be truly a college of Mercy," Sister says, reflecting on her own philosophy.

"We want to prepare students who are intellectually competent, deeply compassionate and committed to serve their God and their fellow man."

"We want to learn enough so it just all flows into their profession."

If all goes well, the training of medical personnel in the country may be vastly changed because of her.

## THE TAIWAN CONCESSIONS: A RED CHINESE VICTORY?

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, in times like these we need to recall the words of Patrick Henry on the eve of the American Revolution, in response to the appeasers of his day:

They cry Peace, peace! when there is no peace. Is life so dear, and peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God!

Fortunately there are still voices in our land that will not let us forget the reality of chains and slavery, the reality of a tyrant government's unending war against its own people, that lies behind all the talk of peace and understanding with the Red Chinese regime in Peking. Fortunately there are still voices that will not let us forget that our President, in his recent visit to Peking, took a very long step toward forcing the last 15 million free Chinese into subjection to these same Communist tyrants. Here are two of those voices—William F. Knowland's and Tom Anderson's. The editorial "The Taiwan Concessions: A Red Chinese Victory?" appeared in former Senator Knowland's newspaper, the Oakland Tribune, on February 29. The article "All-Time Murderer" was one of Tom Anderson's widely syndicated "Straight Talk" columns early this month.

The articles follow:

## THE TAIWAN CONCESSIONS: A RED CHINESE VICTORY?

When President Nixon revealed last July he was going to Peking for a face-to-face summit with the leaders of Communist China, the question of Taiwan was generally

acknowledged to be the starting point for any accord that might be reached.

At that time, we labeled the whole venture a "gamble where the odds are heavily against (the United States) from the start." Our concern for the integrity of this nation's solemn treaty obligation with the Taiwan government was shared by many diplomatic observers familiar with the powerful, conflicting forces churning about in the frothy geopolitical cauldron of Asia and the Far East.

Now that the President's epic journey to the heartland of Chinese communism has ended, the worst fears of last summer seem fully confirmed, and the "gamble" appears only to have paid off in terms of a signal diplomatic victory for Premier Chou En-lai and his Marxist government in Peking.

By failing to confirm in the joint communiqué with Chou the U.S. commitment to protect Taiwan against external attack, the President even seems to have gone far beyond the previously announced Nixon doctrine abdicating the U.S. role of a global anti-Communist force. Remaining aloof and neutral in another's dispute is one thing, ignoring a promise to protect a friend is quite another.

The United States now acknowledges Chou's long-standing claim that Taiwan is part of China, and the promise of eventual withdrawal of all U.S. troops from the island seems to portend the day when an armed invasion will be launched by Communists secure in their knowledge that there will be no U.S. response.

Chou promises to "liberate" the 15 million Chinese on Taiwan, but as the reporters who accompanied Mr. Nixon related, there are already precious few liberties under the Chinese Communists. All mainland Chinese life is so closely controlled that true freedom and true liberty, even approximating the American meaning, are simply not known and not permitted.

But all this Mr. Nixon has known for many years. Is the President now prepared to sacrifice the Nationalist government and the Taiwan people to a life of Marxist slavery in order to find an accommodation with Chou En-lai?

There were no counter-concessions by Chou or by Red party Chairman Mao Tse-tung, and until these Red leaders show evidence beyond mere words of a true intention to work towards Asian peace, then the President's virtual disavowal of a solemn American treaty obligation seems both unprofitable and potentially dangerous.

Indeed, the people of Taiwan may be excused for reacting with the same uncomfortable nervousness as did the people of Czechoslovakia after Britain's Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain returned from Munich with the proud announcement of his "peace in our time" deal with Chancellor Adolph Hitler of Nazi Germany.

## ALL-TIME MURDERER

(By Tom Anderson)

Measured in terms of murders, Mao Tse-tung is the greatest criminal of all time. He has been responsible for the murder of an estimated 64 million people. Millions of them were his enemies. Other millions were merely unfortunate enough to be old, sickly, unable to work. Mao Tse-tung had them killed, like we would kill chickens or hogs, and then had their bodies ground up and spread on the land for fertilizer.

Our President is thus now planning a gigantic "Marshal Plan" for Red China. Since they have no gold, or even dollars, and virtually nothing to sell us, the President plans for us to give them billions of dollars worth of fertilizer and other goodies. Our government, of course, will pay our Big Business a good price for the food, fertilizer, trucks, tires, farm equipment, computers, cars, elec-



tronic equipment, etc., sent to Mao. Thus Big Business will have more profits and we can delay the coming financial crash. Also our Tycoons can be more generous in their donations to the Administration in the coming Presidential campaign. And, we might even have a favorable balance of trade once again. Most important of all, however, this gigantic aid to Mao Tse-tung will save his regime from toppling and enable them to defeat that old warlord Chiang Kai-shek and conquer Formosa.

These grants will also make Russia jealous and this will open the door for us so we can give them more billions of dollars in goods and equipment to make their brand of tyrannical work too.

With China and Russia fat and happy and us bankrupt, we have thus postponed the anticipated conflict between them and assured ourselves that the only war between them will be the one they fight over our grave.

Have you wondered why you have not read any report or seen any TV news by the commentators who accompanied Nixon, which told you the truth about Mainland China? The answer is simple. No honest reporter was allowed to go.

The following truth from *Review of The NEWS* gives us the real story:

"Correction, Please!—Item: From an article in *Reader's Digest* for February 1972:

"Despite a flint-like quality of mind and body, Chou (En-lai) can be very human. Once he stopped at a rural commune to chat with some school-girls who were taking their turn at farm work. 'Did you cry when you first arrived here?' asked the Premier, noticing their muddy clothes. The answer was 'No.' But Chou continued, 'It would not have mattered if you did. It's only human to cry when you are not used to something.'"

"Correction: One might as well depict Adolf Hitler as a lover of small animals; This maudlin effort by the *Digest* to portray a Communist cutthroat as a man of compassion is a betrayal of the trust of millions of its readers. And it is especially outrageous since the *Digest* has itself published numerous articles over the years about the horrible conditions which are the norm in Chou's China.

"The scholarly journal *Issues And Studies* for March of 1971 carries a review of a recent biography of Chou En-lai in which the reviewer states: 'The author further points out Chou's genteel and elegant manner is in extreme contrast to his ruthless way of handling the Communist Party's secret service. The most shocking example known was the case of Ku Shun-chang's in 1931. . . . Ku Shun-chang, a top secret agent and captain of the assassination team under Chou's command, was arrested by, and then defected to, the (Nationalist) government in 1931. After defecting, Ku revealed important information. This led to a massacre of Ku's whole family, who were all buried alive on the instructions of Chou En-lai. In the official files of the French Concession in Shanghai, where the murder took place and was later disclosed, Chou remained a wanted murderer.' The *Reader's Digest* conveniently overlooks many such cases in its puff about Chou.

"Then there are the untold millions consigned to slave labor camps in Red China. Even the United Nations admitted in 1955 that 20 to 25 million Chinese were in 'regular' forced labor camps, and that an additional 12.5 million were in 'corrective' labor camps. By 1968, some 25 million Chinese had perished in those camps. And it is Chou En-lai who oversees the operations of those death camps—murder facilities to which the *Reader's Digest* applies the euphemism 'continuing disciplinary migrations'!

"In 1966, nearly 11 million Chinese youths were organized into what was called the Red

Guard, gangs of Communist storm troopers that blanketed China with disruption, terror, and bloodshed for three years—all with the advice and consent of Chou En-lai. In *Peking's Red Guard*, a thoughtful book co-authored by Dr. S. C. Y. Fan and published by Twin Circle, we read that: "Lin Piao was acclaimed their commander, and Chou En-lai and Chu Teh became their advisors. With these men at their head, the Red Guards acquired prestige, and most important, the support and power which enabled them to do whatever they wanted in order to carry out the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution."

"Ma Sitson, China's leading violinist, gave to *Life* magazine in 1967 an eyewitness account of Red Guard activity. The great violinist observed: 'Elsewhere in the city (Peking) there were many terrible incidents during this period. Students at one high school actually beat to death every one of their teachers. The woman who lived next door to us in the west city was accused of having a radio transmitter and sending messages to Chiang Kai-shek. Red Guards pulled her from her house into the street and killed her. People spoke of heaps of unburied bodies rotting in the mortuaries.'"

"The *Digest's* slant in this article is also illustrated when it says: 'Now with President Nixon's spectacular policy reversal and the overwhelming U.N. vote, Mainland China's 750 million people are coming into their own.' This is madness! One might as well write that the people of Germany came into their own when Hitler was rounding up the Jews. Rather, the *Digest* should have reminded its readers of the following analysis by the Asian People's Anti-communist League: 'Let us always bear in mind that the Communist system is more cruel and inhumane than any in previous history. It is diametrically different from the traditional system which had been preserved through long ages.' The families of 64 million Chinese murdered by Chou En-lai and his Comrades will testify to that!

"There is a saying among refugees from Chou's China that the Yellow River is at flood tide, swollen with the tears of the Chinese people. Those are the tears *Reader's Digest* should be concerned about, instead of eulogizing the mass murderer with whom President Nixon is now breaking bread."—Copyright 1972, The American Way Features.

## SHOPPING FOR AUTO INSURANCE

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of debate on no-fault insurance, it appears the insurance commissioner of the State of Pennsylvania has found a somewhat different approach to the citizens' problems regarding automobile insurance. The following article merits further study:

[From The Commercial Appeal, Memphis]

#### SHOPPING FOR AUTO INSURANCE

How do you pick an automobile insurance company?

Some do it simply by giving their business to a friend who happens to be an insurance agent. Some do it because they have seen a company's name in an advertisement. Some others do it by finding a company which is willing to write insurance to cover

the applicant and his family, having found that other companies would not.

All that maybe changing, if what happened recently in Pennsylvania is extended throughout the nation.

That state's insurance commissioner, Herbert S. Denenberg, has issued what he says is the first "Shopper's Guide to Auto Insurance." Prepared by the Pennsylvania Insurance Department, this guide compares annual premiums in six different rating territories for the 12 largest automobile insurance writers who write approximately 50 per cent of the auto insurance business in Pennsylvania.

The guide reveals amazing variations in premiums for the same classification of policyholders. For example, a 19-year-old driver, for specific coverage, faces premiums in Philadelphia that vary from \$1083 to \$1716. And an adult driver in Bedford and Fulton counties of that state can find premiums that vary from \$132 to \$212 for the same coverage.

The publication has met strong resistance from the insurance companies, of course. The insurance commissioner admits his guide is "not to be used as the last word" in selecting an insurance company. He says the consumer should be aware other factors can enter into premium differences. These differences can include variations in policy coverage features, service of agents, financial strength of the companies.

To his critics, he offers the same advice he gave last year when there was strong criticism of a similar guide to Pennsylvania hospitals. It is: "If you don't like it, publish a better guide yourself."

It seems to be sound advice. Maybe insurance companies should be working on such guides of their own, with their own explanation of differences in premiums, now that the existence of such differences is coming out into the open.

## A TAXATION WITH REPRESENTATION

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago one of my constituents, Mrs. Harold Alderfer of Costa Mesa, Calif., wrote me a letter which expresses more vividly than any other I can recall receiving, just what the relentless "soaking" of the hard-working, productive middle and lower middle income taxpayer is doing to our country and our people. Mrs. Alderfer has no quarrel with me, as she now realizes, since I fully agree with what she says about taxation, welfare, and the courts, and have consistently voted against the increases in Government spending which require high taxes, and for limiting the power of the courts which has been so much abused. But it would appear that she does indeed have a quarrel with many other Members of the body, who I hope will consider how they might answer her if she were their constituent. Her indictment is directed toward the Congress of the United States as a whole.

The following letter is published with Mrs. Alderfer's written permission. In view of her sentiments expressed in it,

I am especially proud that in her second letter giving me permission to insert this one in the RECORD, she tells me that:

In my 42 years, I have never felt so well represented by a Congressman."

The letter follows:

COSTA MESA, CALIF.,  
February 4, 1972.

JOHN G. SCHMITZ,  
U.S. Congressman, 1208 Longworth House  
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHMITZ: This letter comes from an extremely worried mother of 3, who cannot seem to control the fate of our family any longer because of the high cost of living and taxes imposed on us by you lawmakers.

We have always tried to live within our \$10,000 annual income. There are no luxuries such as vacations, new cars, new clothes, entertainment etc. All the money earned in the family is spent on food, house payments and taxes, the bare necessities.

We are in a critical state financially as we can no longer keep up with the inflationary costs of food, taxes etc. We have had to borrow on our life insurance to merely pay the taxes and we have no reserve. When we purchased our 9-year old home, it was what we thought we could afford. Within a year the valuation went up and our taxes followed and they keep going up each year.

Across the country people in the professions such as doctors, big industry and the like have received raises. My husband did not get a raise. The cost of postage, food and clothing keep going up. It makes me angry when I see how welfare costs have gone up. I'm not against helping people but I am against being taxed to feed hippies, transients and helpless individuals who don't even try to help themselves and complain about not getting enough help.

People like us who have gone along paying higher taxes supporting these people are finding ourselves getting into the same predicament—the tremendous difference being that we have tried for so many years to stay with a job, have done menial work just to pay taxes and foregone all luxuries because we need all the money earned to buy food for the family. If you lawmakers don't do something for people like us, believe me, there will be an uprising and it won't stop until something is done for people like us who are genuinely trying to make a go of living.

Another thing has become a laughing matter. What has happened to our court system? The criminals come out looking like angels and we the people and our law enforcement people are made to look like tyrants. What is happening to our country? We have Sirhan, Angela Davis, Richard Spec and others, who are in jail or prison going almost free. The cost of holding their trials etc. keeps mounting and we are paying for that—but what is so maddening is that the people they murdered cannot speak for themselves and we seem to be helpless to do anything for the dead. Why has it become more glamorous to be a criminal type than one who supports the laws of the country?

So many things in this country need reform. America is becoming a sad country, it reminds me of what we fought for long ago—taxation without representation! Can't you representatives do something for us? We pay your salary. I love this country and don't like what is happening to it.

Is there anything you people can do to help this family? There must be many thousands like us who are at the breaking point as a family. Where can we go? What can we do? Is welfare the next step? You people who set the taxes are devouring this family. Does it make you feel good?

Sincerely,

MRS. HAROLD ALDERFER.

# ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR TOURISM, C. LANGHORNE WASHBURN, TESTIFIES BEFORE HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS SUBCOMMITTEE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Environmental Problems Affecting Small Business, of the Select Committee on Small Business, which recently concluded the first part of a series of hearings on small business opportunities in outdoor recreation and tourism, I believe the hearings have produced some valuable information which will be of great benefit to the Congress.

I would particularly like to call attention to the testimony of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Tourism, Hon. C. Langhorne Washburn, who spoke about the efforts of the U.S. Travel Service in promoting tourism to this country from abroad.

Secretary Washburn is to be commended on the high quality of his statement and for his enthusiasm and cooperation in testifying before the subcommittee.

Because of the great interest of my colleagues and the American people in this subject, I am inserting Secretary Washburn's statement at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF C. LANGHORNE WASHBURN,  
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR  
TOURISM

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today.

I will begin by outlining the importance of international tourism and what it means to our economy, cite some specific characteristics of foreign travel in the United States, discuss briefly some of the programs of USTS and EDA designed to increase foreign tourism to the United States and improve the host facilities for both foreign and American tourists, and conclude with my thoughts on the role of small businesses in foreign tourism and recreation.

## OVERVIEW

The international travel market is a multi-billion dollar foreign exchange earner representing the largest item of international world trade. Last year, world-wide international travelers took 181 million trips and spent an estimated \$19.9 billion. The United States received 7.6% of the arrival market, hosting 13.8 million arrivals, and 14.6% of the dollar market, earning \$2.9 billion. With respect to other host countries of the world, this Nation ranks first in terms of tourism receipts and fifth in terms of the volume of visitor arrivals.

To me, the importance of the entire market cannot be stressed enough. World-wide, this market grew 137% between 1960 and 1970 and is expected to continue to grow at an estimated 7% per year, reaching 280 million trips by 1980. Yet, in the last 10 years, the U.S. share of the total remained relatively constant. This country has merely been keeping pace with a growing market. The untapped VISIT USA potential is tremendous and expanding each year, as per capita incomes continue to rise throughout the world. It is currently estimated that some 82 million people of the world have the fi-

nancial ability to travel to the United States. Further importance of this market can be seen in the following:

Each tourist from overseas countries equals an export item worth \$400.

Each \$20,000 spent by foreign tourists in the U.S. creates one job. Hence, last year, foreign tourist spending (excluding transportation) provided for 122,580 new jobs.

For every 100 people directly employed in the travel industry, 60 to 100 back-up jobs are created in related industries.

Dollars earned from tourists stay in the local area directly benefiting the residents and small business of the area.

It is factors such as these, in addition to the fact that the United States is behind other national governments in tourism promotion—currently, we rank 19th—that led President Nixon in his State of the Union Message to request "that the budget for the United States Travel Service be nearly doubled in the coming year."

In addition there are certain factors currently at work which we must capitalize on fully through increased promotion abroad. In 1972, such factors favoring increased foreign travel to the United States are (1) the recent U.S. dollar adjustment which makes it less expensive for foreign travelers in this country, and (2) the reduction of air fares across the North Atlantic. In 1976, the Bicentennial and Winter Olympics are expected to provide a great impetus for increased travel to this country. In fact, we are anticipating between 22 million and 25 million visitors in 1976, with receipts expected to total about \$5 billion. I would like to make sure this forecast is reached, if not surpassed by (1) the proper and adequate promotion of this country abroad; and (2) developing the necessary tourist facilities to fully host these visitors.

## SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS AND DIMENSIONS OF FOREIGN VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES

*Origin*—Foreign visitors to the United States come from every corner of the globe but in the greatest numbers from Canada and Mexico, comprising 82% of all arrivals and 59% of all foreign exchange earnings. Visitors from overseas countries, while accounting for only 18% of the arrival market, represent 41% of our tourist dollar earnings. Looking more closely at the overseas market, Europe represents the most important area, accounting for 45% of all overseas arrivals.

Key European countries are the United Kingdom with 13% of the overseas market (\$25,555), followed by West Germany with 8.1% (203,010); France with 5.4% (133,604); Italy with 3.7% (93,421); and the Netherlands with 2.4% (58,748). The second most important geographic area is Asia/Oceania, accounting for 24.4% of all overseas arrivals, with Japan (311,066—12.5%) and Australia (70,860—2.8%) being the two dominant countries. The third key area is South and Central America, representing 17.1% of all overseas arrivals with the main tourist generating countries being Venezuela, Colombia, Brazil and Argentina.

*Earnings*—Our earnings from these visitors vary according to their country of origin. In terms of overall averages, excluding transportation, each overseas and Mexican visitor is equal to an export worth \$400. When Canadian visitors are included, the figure is lower—\$200. Thus, while Canadians comprise the majority of foreign visitor arrivals, their per capita expenditure in the United States is the lowest, equaling only \$90. Consequently, considerably more Canadian visitors are needed to equal the per capita spending of the West German (\$375), Mexican and Japanese (\$500) or Venezuelan (\$675) visitor.

*Seasonality*—Over 40% of our foreign visitors come to this country during the summer



months of June, July, and August, while less than 20% arrive during the winter months of November, December, January and February. This seasonality is representative of all international travel, primarily brought about by employers encouraging their employees to take summer vacations, with entire companies in Europe being closed during July or August and by the summer vacations of school children. This problem has been receiving increased attention by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Tourism Committee which is presently investigating possible solutions.

**Average Length of Stay**—Length of stay, as per capita expenditure, similarly varies with the visitor's country of origin. The overall average for all overseas visitors is estimated at 15 days, with Europeans staying an average of 17 days; South Americans, 15 days; Japanese 10 days; Mexican visitors who travel outside the border area stay on the average of 10 days; and Canadians, 5 days.

#### WHERE DO THEY GO/WHAT DO THEY SEE?

Perhaps the one generality which could hold true is that foreign visitors are interested in "seeing America"—just as our citizens are interested in doing when they travel within this country. Our outdoor scenic attractions as well as the sights and sounds of our big cities, day or night, are appealing to the foreign visitor. To cite some specific examples, the American Frontier West with its Indians, mountains and deserts, are particularly popular with Europeans, chiefly among the West Germans. The warm, sunny areas of the United States, and sandy beaches are popular, notably among the British, Scandinavians, and Canadians. The Japanese are interested in seeing all that is possible in the time allotted—from beaches to big cities to industrial plants.

Shopping in our major cities is a popular activity, particularly among Latin Americans, as is visiting Disneyland or Disney World. In fact, large festivals or exhibits are generally popular with Latin Americans as exemplified (1) in the increase (up 50%) in Mexican visitors to this country during the period of the HemisFair in Texas; and (2) the number of Mexicans visiting a USTS exhibit in Mexico City—over 1,000,000 in 3 months.

There appears, however, to be some discrepancy between what visitors would like to do and what they actually do. Generally, they stay within a small radius of the U.S. port at which they enter. For example, the majority of Mexicans visit only the states of California, Arizona, New Mexico and Texas. Europeans generally visit the Middle to Northeastern areas of the United States. Latin Americans see areas in the Southeastern United States, notably, Florida and Puerto Rico; while visitors from Asia primarily tour Guam, Hawaii and the West Coast of the United States.

Why is this so? Besides the usual degree of discrepancy between intentions and actions, it may be due to such facts as (1) an increase in travel costs to see places outside the major port of entry; (2) fear of not being able to communicate outside the major gateway cities; (3) less familiarity with the interior of the United States; and (4) the existence of few available organized tours, although more are offered now than 5 years ago.

It is in this area that I feel the small businessman has a definite role to play—in serving the foreign tourists' needs, particularly outside of the big cities. The trend currently, is toward more promotion of areas other than the already popular foreign tourist destinations such as New York City and Northeastern U.S. Chicago is becoming increasingly popular as a gateway city for foreign visitors. Las Vegas, last year, became an official international port of entry. Airline advertising is beginning to feature travel to areas West of the Mississippi as well as to the

East. All this actively represents an attempt to make America more accessible and attractive to the foreign visitor to better meet his needs and expectations.

#### USTS PROGRAMS

The programs of the United States Travel Service designed to promote and host foreign visitors can generally be classified under two broad headings: (1) stimulating demand; and (2) improving tourist plant facilities. Some of the specific programs are outlined below:

##### (1) Stimulating demand

Consumer advertising campaign costing over \$2 million in Canada and Europe, reaching over 30 million people.

Distribution of over 6 million informational brochures (in German, French, Spanish, Italian and Japanese) featuring U.S. regions, gateway cities, historic sites, and national parks, in all of the major tourist generating countries.

Special "high visibility" VISIT USA exhibits in Canada, Mexico and Japan. Total visitor attendance was estimated at 3.5 million.

VISIT USA familiarization tours for 3,000 foreign tour operators and foreign travel writers to acquaint them with the attractions and tour offerings of the United States.

VISIT USA seminars with the U.S. travel sellers and foreign tour packages. The purpose of these seminars is to save the foreign tour operator the time and money of a trip to the U.S., and to encourage him to develop and sell moderately priced VISIT USA package tours for both groups and individuals.

##### (2) Improving tourist plant facilities

Hotel/motel language certification program

To date, 182 hotels and motels have multilingual staffs at their front desks, switchboards and restaurants, speaking Spanish, French, German or Japanese. The hotels are publicized abroad and display a USTS plaque indicating "Welcome" in the various languages.

##### Multilingual Port Reception Program

Multilingual student port receptionist corps are in operation in New York's Kennedy International Airport, Seattle/Tacoma and San Juan International airports. USTS conducts this program in cooperation with the local authorities. The Receptionists assist incoming foreign visitors in clearing Customs and Immigration and on making transportation connections.

##### Travel Phone USA

Travel Phone USA is nation-wide, multilingual, toll-free telephone interpreter service sponsored by USTS in cooperation with Travelodge International. The visitor can dial the service from anywhere in the Continental United States (except Alaska) and obtain telephone interpreter assistance, or answers to his travel-related questions, in Spanish, French, German or Japanese. USTS explains the availability of this service in brochures distributed abroad. In addition, television clips produced by USIA on the Travel Phone USA have been seen by more than 360 million residents overseas.

**Americans-At-Home** is a USTS organized community-operated host plan for foreign visitors. 73 cities throughout the United States are participating from Syracuse, New York to Joplin, Missouri, to Tucson, Arizona. The program is designed to enable foreign visitors traveling without sponsorship to get to know Americans informally in their homes. USTS prints in nine languages and distributes abroad a folder giving details and telephone numbers of the community-sponsoring groups around the country.

In addition, in the area of tourist plant development, the National Tourism Resources Review Commission is currently studying the existing facilities and will make recommendations on the type of programs needed to

meet the needs of all tourists—both foreign and domestic, to 1980.

Two other major USTS programs, I believe I should also mention are: (1) The International Convention Office; and (2) Matching Grants Program.

(1) **International Conventions Office** located in Paris, played a substantial role in winning 8 major international congresses for the United States last year, bringing the total to 26 congresses since its opening in 1969. Foreign attendance at these 8 new congresses is expected to equal 21,000 with spending in excess of \$5.9 million. In addition, last year, a Washington-based USTS international conventions manager was appointed to provide domestic support to the Paris Office in the total effort to attract a larger share of the world's international congresses.

(2) **Matching Grants Program**—Last year, USTS launched its new matching grants program with regions, states, cities and public or private non-profit organizations, for the purpose of increasing promotion and improving domestic services for foreign visitors. USTS is allowed to fund up to 50% of the total cost of the project—available USTS funds equaled \$550,000 last year. As of March 1, 17 grants have been made totaling \$215,000; 3 have been for the production of films, 1 for a travel mission to Japan, 2 for convention bureaus for the installation of simultaneous language translation facilities and the remainder for joint advertising with USTS in Canada and Mexico.

In addition to USTS programs, many of those of the Economic Development Administration (EDA) involve tourism development. Since 1965 EDA has invested over \$98 million for tourism and recreation projects to benefit lagging economies especially in rural areas of this Nation.

Some specific examples of this agency's programs include public works grants for state park development and tourism and recreation projects on Indian reservations. Grants and loans for state park development totaled approximately \$20 million and included parks in the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia, while grants and loans were provided to 25 Indian reservations in 15 states totaling \$31.4 million.

In addition, EDA provides business loans and working capital guarantees and has funds available for feasibility studies and management and operational technical assistance to tourism and recreation related activities.

#### SMALL BUSINESS AND TOURISM

I believe that small business enterprises can play an important role in servicing the needs of foreign tourists in their particular areas by providing:

- (1) The needed people-to-people contact, and
- (2) The necessary tourist facilities, particularly in rural areas and smaller cities of the United States.

##### (1) People-to-people contact

Perhaps one of the best ways to see and learn about a foreign land is on a personal basis, a person-to-person contact. It has oftentimes been said that "It is the people that make the place." In fact, the Bahamian Ministry of Tourism was so concerned with the unfriendly image of its people that it launched a nation-wide "hospitality" campaign and began training all individuals servicing the tourist—from taxi driver to waiter to shopkeeper to hotel clerk, to be friendly, congenial hosts, representing the Bahamas as a Nation.

##### (2) Foreign tourist facilities

Small businesses have a most important part to play in servicing the foreign tourist—from the guest-house owner, the restaurateur specializing in home cooking, the talkative shopkeeper, to the local tour guide. For-

elign visitors want to see this part of America as well as the big cities, the hotels, restaurants and large department stores.

Small businessmen can work with those communities who belong to the USTS Americans-At-Home Program. Each community could plan for the supply facilities it feels are warranted by the current and expected volume of foreign visitors to their area, and to the extent the community is desirous of developing tourism in their area. USTS can provide additional assistance with matching grants to the community, group of communities, city, state or entire region, for increased promotion or development of tourist facilities for foreign visitors.

While the program limits grants to non-profit organizations, the small businessmen can work with the local recipient of the grant. Currently, USTS is helping to increase the flow of visitors to destinations outside of the major gateway cities by not only providing grants to Miami, Las Vegas, San Francisco, but also to New Orleans, Lincoln, Nebraska, and the Southern Highlands of North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia and Virginia.

#### TOURISM AND THE ENVIRONMENT

I have stressed repeatedly to both industry and state travel leaders the need for the proper development of tourist attractions, preserving existing destinations, and nurturing and protecting the essential characteristics which attract tourists to an area. Something seems to happen when tour destinations are developed too rapidly and without proper planning. They seem to lose their appeal. They become spoiled. And tourists leave them and move on to new "in" spots.

I believe tourism is wholly compatible with environmental values. Indeed, development of the kinds of attractions which tourists appreciate will most often involve "showing off" the environmental values which this nation has to offer, so that it is in the interest of the tourism industry to protect this environment. Thus, tourist development can exist symbolically with the culture and heritage of the community when it is planned properly. I believe that the travel industry has recognized the challenge of proper environmental development. In fact, The Travel Research Association, an industry-government association, consisting of universities, advertising agencies, airlines, hotels and motels, and government tourist associations, devoted its most recent conference to "Tourism and the Environment."

The foregoing was intended to provide you with the broad overview of international travel to the United States, the programs designed to increase the flow of tourism to and within this country, and a role small businesses can play in this important and growing market.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my formal statement. I shall be happy to respond to any questions you or the members of this Subcommittee may have.

Mr. Speaker, I was also pleased to have my good friend, Mr. Harold Koplar, chairman of the Missouri Tourism Commission and chairman of the St. Louis Tourist Association, testify before our subcommittee. He brought some valuable insights to our investigation of tourism, such as the growing trend of large companies to locate conventions in foreign countries because of cheaper cost for accommodations.

Mr. Koplar cited examples where large corporations arranged sales meetings in Portugal or other overseas locations. Sometimes they send as many as 4,000 of their employees to foreign tourist resorts as part of a tax-deductible sales meeting.

Mr. Koplar suggests that we reexamine our tax structure in regard to deductions for business conventions with a view toward encouraging greater domestic business travel. I feel this has merit and should be studied.

#### COOLEY'S ANEMIA RESEARCH DESPERATELY NEEDS FEDERAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT

#### HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the medical research community searching for the cause and cure of Cooley's anemia is large and growing, but desperately in need of Federal financial support.

Federal support would earmark Cooley's anemia as a particular priority for intra- and extra-mural programs of the National Institutes of Health, and continued support of the clinical research program of NIH will provide the subsidies to research facilities necessary to support study and service for patients with this and other mysterious but widespread diseases.

The high quality of existing medical research in this field—demonstrating the existence of a base of knowledge nearly ripe for practical application—has been shown in reviews of work on Cooley's nemi in the medical literature.

In 1966 and now in the March 16, 1972, issues of the New England Journal of Medicine, for example, review is made of research into the basic genetic and physiological causes of Cooley's anemia.

In 1964 and again in 1969 the New York Academy of Sciences and the Cooley's Anemia Blood and Research Foundation for Children jointly sponsored symposia on the problems of Cooley's anemia, resulting in the collection and publication of research papers totaling over 1,300 pages.

Much basic research has been done, therefore, with little or no Federal help. It is well known, however, that particular areas of medical research blossom when Federal direction and support are given. Researchers in basic areas are more able to direct their studies to practical ends, the clinical or applied part of medical research is enhanced within the institutions and organizations that conduct sophisticated medical research, results are more easily disseminated within the scientific community, avoiding duplicative work, and the work stimulated and supported by private foundations or general purpose research grants is brought to its fullest scientific and practical fruition.

Cooley's anemia is not unknown to medical research, Mr. Speaker, quite the opposite; but the practical help available to the physician or pediatrician who deals with Cooley's anemia is pitifully small. It is time to give national direction and support for this work, so that the patients and families affected by Cooley's anemia will benefit from the

best our Nation's scientific and medical community has to offer.

#### THE SOVIET THREAT

#### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the February 1972 issue of the Aiken, S.C., Chamber of Commerce "News and Views" contains therein a timely article entitled "A Lesson From History."

I found the article to be a particularly interesting analogy of our present international situation. The author warns against deluding ourselves into believing that simply because we desire peace, others in the world will not seek to destroy our way of life. Although we have long heard the idle boasts of the Soviets to defeat our system, we must take heed of their growing military strength and face the reality that peace may be better obtained through bargaining from a position of power.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### A LESSON FROM HISTORY

"The Soviets' present buildup of strategic forces, together with what we know about their development and test programs, raises serious questions about where they are headed and the potential threats we and our allies face. These questions must be faced soberly and realistically." President Richard M. Nixon, *U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's: A New Strategy for Peace*, Report to the Congress, February 18, 1970.

The President of the United States issued the above warning to the Congress almost two years ago. Since that time the circumstances which provoked the warning have become much more serious. Yet no action has been taken to counter the danger.

For nearly 25 years Marcus Porcius Cato ended all of his speeches in the Roman Senate with the solemn intonation: "Besides, I think that Carthage must be destroyed." By 151 B.C. he had won his point; Rome declared war on Carthage and a fleet set sail for Africa. But the Carthaginians, now peace-loving and unprepared for major war, sought desperately to avoid it. The Roman Senate promised their hastily dispatched envoys that Carthage would be spared if 300 children from the most prominent families would be given up as hostages. With great uneasiness and lamentation, this was done. Next, the Carthaginian ambassadors were summoned to hear the Roman demand that Carthage surrender her remaining ships and implements of war. This, too, was done. Finally, the Romans demanded the evacuation of the city so that it could be burned to the ground.

When the Carthaginians heard this final demand they realized they had been tricked, in one of history's greatest acts of perfidy. Wild with grief and anger, they tore limb from limb the leaders who had urged appeasement and frantically sought to rebuild their defenses. In two months, while the Romans massed their forces, they produced 8,000 shields, 18,000 swords, 30,000 spears, 60,000 catapult missiles and a new fleet of 120 ships. But it was too little and too



late. Following a bitter siege of three years, the Roman armies broke through the walls and nearly the whole population of Carthage perished by the sword. The city was then razed to the ground and the soil was sown with salt. The destruction was as complete as might be the most devastating nuclear attack of today's world.

#### MODERN PARALLELS

Historical analogies are never exact, of course, but the lessons they teach about the attitudes of men and government are instructive. The America of today would do especially well to pay some attention to the sad story of Carthage. Because if we do not soon come to our senses we will be well on the way toward a rerun, with ourselves this time cast in the unfamiliar role of the victims.

Cato called for the destruction of Carthage because he saw that it was regaining its prosperity after its earlier defeat under the great Hannibal, who had invaded Italy and had very nearly conquered Rome itself. Cato believed that the world of his day could not accommodate two strong antagonistic powers, and that Carthage would again become a military threat to Rome if left unchecked. Therefore, he persuaded his countrymen to launch a preventive war.

In reality, the people of Carthage had no further imperial ambitions. They wished only to be left in peace to develop trade and commerce and pursue their "domestic priorities." They must have been well aware of Cato's exhortations and of the developing Roman attitude, but they did little to prepare for war, hoping thereby not to provoke the Romans. When the prospect of war nevertheless became immediate, they sought to avert it by the most abject appeasement, including submission to total disarmament. When this policy was unsuccessful they chose to fight rather than surrender but by then their resources were hopelessly inadequate to the task. The result was that they, as well as their city, perished forever.

For more than 25 years, since the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. became the two predominant world powers, we have heard the Soviet equivalents of Cato proclaim the undying "conflict of social systems" in which they have sworn that their system will emerge as the victor. Desiring no conflict of any kind ourselves, and wishing only a live and let live arrangement with our adversaries, we have allowed ourselves to be comforted by Soviet assurances that war is not necessary to the triumph of their system. And we have been generally content to leave in slavery those who have fallen victim to their system in order not to appear "provocative."

At the same time, we have listened to our own philosophers assuring us that nuclear weapons have rendered war "unthinkable" because it is supposedly, "unwinnable." Thus bemused, we have watched, with apparent lack of official or popular concern, as the overwhelming military superiority which we once enjoyed over our enemies has ever more rapidly melted away. That superiority, with official blessing, has given way to what is now called "sufficiency."

Whether or not the Soviet Union is now operating upon some Hitlerian timetable leading up to an actual attack upon the United States, in order to remove us once and for all as a military rival, is debatable. Quite possibly no decision has yet been made that this is necessary—not yet.

What does seem certain beyond reasonable doubt is that a period of almost unimaginable danger, not a "generation of peace," lies ahead of this country. This stems from a combination of two factors. One is the political rot and erosion that is sweeping almost completely through what was once known as the "free world." The other is the rapidly

accelerating momentum of the Soviet strategic military buildup.

### A RUSSIAN AIRCRAFT CARRIER? THE IMPLICATIONS ARE OMINOUS

#### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 17, 1972]

#### A RUSSIAN AIRCRAFT CARRIER? THE IMPLICATIONS ARE OMINOUS

(By Robert S. Elegant)

MUNICH.—The Soviet Union is building a very large ship in its Black Sea shipyard at Nikolayev, which has during the past five years completed the helicopter assault-and-antisubmarine carriers Leningrad and Moskva.

The new ship poses both a riddle and a challenge. It might be simply a large tanker or passenger ship. It could be another helicopter carrier, though its estimated size of more than 30,000 tons would be unprecedented—and counter-productively—large for that function. But the chances are strong that the Russians are building their first conventional aircraft carrier, though intelligence cannot confirm that conclusion.

If the hull under construction is an aircraft carrier, its significance would exceed by far the metal, electronic gear, aircraft and highly trained air crews, whose cost will be at least \$500 million and, perhaps, twice that figure. The United States, Britain and other Western powers would still deploy many times that number of carriers. But a Soviet carrier would, in the long run, affect the world balance of power.

Since the weight of the evidence indicates that the mysterious hull is an aircraft carrier, non-Soviet strategists must proceed on that assumption. Her construction would indicate, first, that the Soviet Union has taken the fundamental decision to alter its previous policy of relying upon shore-based aircraft to support naval activities and upon submarines for long-range operations. Building an aircraft carrier, even as a pilot model for more and bigger carriers, would mean that the Russians are preparing to back their bid for world influence with hardware—and much hard cash.

Above all, building a carrier would demonstrate that the Soviet Union has, however tentatively, reversed its previous ingrained objection to aircraft carriers as "bourgeois, imperialist weapons."

Once again Moscow would be reaching far outward for power. Perhaps First Secretary Leonid Brezhnev of the Party would use a carrier as a bargaining counter in his long-term effort to win agreement on naval parity with the West. But even a single carrier is a fearsomely expensive chip in the international poker game—and admirals are notoriously reluctant to surrender advantages once gained.

Taken together with intensive Russian research into vertical and short take off and landing aircraft, a new carrier would pose a threat of Soviet expansion into areas where Moscow has previously been weak or even unable to deploy armed force. Moscow doesn't need carriers to maintain its influence in the Mediterranean, since it already possesses many air fields around the perimeter. Moscow does need carriers to operate effectively in the Atlantic and, above all, in Asia.

From the Indian Ocean to Australia to the Pacific, Russian carriers could temporarily or permanently, establish naval superiority over medium-sized or large areas. The consequent command of the sea could exert tremendous political influence.

The curious feature of command of the sea is that you either possess it or you don't. If you do, you needn't fight to dominate shipping and commerce in an area. If you don't, fighting won't do much good.

In Southeast Asia, the Kremlin wishes to contain Chinese influence which does not now assert itself through naval force and is unlikely to do so in the foreseeable future. Nonetheless, Russian naval power can exercise the strongest counter-influence throughout the area.

In the Far East, as also in Southeast Asia, the Russians could find themselves either working against or cooperating with Japan, which must, in the long run revert to naval power to assert new influence and to protect her lines of communication. The countries of the area, already deeply worried by Japanese commercial domination, are becoming vitally concerned about Japan's future military power. Russian naval expansion, sustained by new naval air power could either serve as a counterweight or be cast decisively onto the same side of the scales as Japanese power. In either case, Russian influence would increase enormously.

A carrier force could, thus, enable Moscow to retrieve certain present disadvantages in the world power struggle. The Kremlin could either "scale up" its carrier force in both size and numbers of "trade off" all or a portion for agreements with the non-Communist powers.

At the very least, the construction of a carrier force would enable the Kremlin to keep all its options wide open over a long period of time—albeit at a very high cost.

#### NATION TO CENTER ON PEVELY, MO.

#### HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the population center of this country has always been located east of the Mississippi River. However, various research organizations now tell us that based on projected population growth during the 1970's the center of population in this Nation will creep across the Mississippi and be located close to Pevely, Mo., by 1980.

Mr. Speaker, Pevely, Mo., which is in Jefferson County, is in the congressional district which I serve at the present time. I call attention to this fact because this shift clearly points to the fact that Missouri and, especially, such counties as Jefferson are growing and thriving.

At this point, I would like to insert in the RECORD for the consideration of all the Members the Associated Press story on the shift of the center of the Nation to Pevely:

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Leader-Press, Feb. 11, 1972]

#### NATION TO CENTER ON PEVELY

KANSAS CITY.—The nation's population center continues its movement west during the decade of the 1970s and will creep across the Mississippi River for the first time in

1980, a financial firm's research department said today.

Based on its estimates of the 1980 Census and patterns of growth, the research group predicted the nation's demographic center will be near Pevely, Mo., located about 25 miles south of St. Louis and six miles west of the Mississippi River.

Pevely is about 35 miles southwest of Mascoutah, Ill., the 1970 population center.

The projection was made by the research department of Waddell & Reed, Inc., a Kansas City-based national financial services complex.

"It is more than a mere titular honor for a place to be pinpointed as the population center of the country," said William A. Reasoner, the firm's president and chief executive officer.

"It is also an indication of the real growth potential for the surrounding area. Pevely, for example, is located in a region that is expected to grow significantly during the rest of this decade as St. Louis suburban development radiates outward," Reasoner said.

The nation's population center has moved westward steadily since the first census, conducted in 1790, placed the demographic center near Chestertown, Md., 23 miles east of Baltimore.

# MODEST HERO SAVES CHILDREN'S LIVES

## HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, last week in Stamford, Conn., 33 families were left homeless, victims of a disastrous fire which swept their neighborhood. Out of this tragedy, a modest man emerged a hero. Had he not acted as he did, seven children might not be alive today. That man is Ray Mitchell who rescued the seven children from one of the burning buildings. He came away with his hair singed and, as the Stamford Advocate has noted, his modesty intact. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Mr. Mitchell deserves the commendation of the Members of this House. At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert Advocate reporter Bob Masullo's account of Mr. Mitchell's heroics:

SEVEN SMALL CHILDREN OWE LIVES TO MODEST HERO

(By Bob Masullo)

Forty-nine-year-old Roy Mitchell came out of Monday night's West Side fire, which destroyed four black ghetto tenements, with his hair singed and his modesty intact.

Because of his actions, seven small children are alive today who otherwise might have died in the fire.

However, on Monday night at the Red Cross emergency room in the West Main St. Community Center, where he registered for aid along with other victims of the fire, he said nothing of his deeds, even when asked by a reporter for his account of the event.

An adult daughter, Miss Brenda Mitchell of 213 Selleck St., gave the following account Tuesday of what her father did at the fire:

"He was babysitting for seven children in the apartment of Mrs. Mozzel Person (apartment number six in 5 Roe Park Ave.). The children were in a bedroom and my father was sitting on the porch when the fire started.

"Two-year-old Brenda Williams came out on the porch all upset. She could not talk, but he knew something was wrong from the way she was acting.

"He went inside and the fire was all around. So he rounded up all the children and got them outside as fast as he could. (The apartment was on the ground floor).

"When he got outside one of the kids (Eugenia Person, 6) told him, 'The baby is still inside.'

"He ran back in, although the fire was already very bad, and got the baby (German Williams, 7 months) and brought her outside to safety. That's how he got his hair singed, when he ran back in."

Miss Mitchell identified the other children as James Hussel, 5; Reginald Person, 5; Kim-ley Robertson, 6, and Jacqueline Hussel, 2.

According to Miss Mitchell, the Williams children are grandchildren of Mr. Mitchell: the Robertson child is Mr. Mitchell's godchild; the Person children are the grandchildren of Mrs. Person, and the Hussel children are related to Mrs. Person.

# ENVIRONMENTAL ZEAL HAS OUTFRAN COMMONSENSE

## HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the people of California will be faced with an initiative measure on their June 6 primary ballot. The measure is proposition No. 9 and it is titled "The Clean Environment Act of 1972." This measure has been placed on the ballot by a group that have named their organization the People's Lobby.

Because of the attractive title "Clean Environment Act" people may confuse the contents of the bottle with its attractive label. I trust this will not occur and do not believe it will occur if the general public really understands the dangerous provisions in the act.

Proposition No. 9 is a perfect example of environmental zeal having outrun commonsense and reality. It cloaks the most harsh and unconstitutional provisions under a pious title.

Briefly, the proposition would close down all industrial and home sources of any air pollutant for at least half of each year. No one is permitted a hearing and no court may intervene—in other words, due process of law is denied.

The 20 million people of California are to be denied an adequate supply of electricity for a period of from 5 to 12 years through a moratorium on the construction of new pollution-free nuclear powered generating plants.

Most of the proven and effective insecticides, pesticides, and herbicides are to be outlawed in spite of the fact that known substitutes are more dangerous to man than those to be outlawed.

Most of what the proposition demands is impossible, the remainder is ridiculous.

I have said before and I restate again, "If this act passes, it would drive most of California's business out of the State or into bankruptcy." The people of California are literally being "propositioned" down a primrose path to economic ruin.

The people of California are being asked to vote upon a proposition which will have a lasting and drastic effect upon their own lives and the future of the State.

They are being asked to exchange their jobs, economic well-being, convenience, and some of their constitutional rights for the false hope that this measure will bring about a clean environment.

The people should not make this choice without fully understanding the contents of the initiative. It is doubtful that the 500,000 citizens who signed the petition to place this measure on the ballot had the slightest idea as to its real contents. And since the very long initiative will have to be explained on the ballot in very terse terms, the voters will not know of its contents on election day.

The Congress has enacted the Environmental Policy Act and created the Environmental Protection Agency to enforce that act. The Clean Air Acts of 1967 and 1970, along with clean water legislation which will soon be passed, are forward-looking laws which rightly take into account the technology and availability of economic support—taxes and profits—to support an antipollution effort. The California Legislature has, following many hours of hearings and debate, passed numerous antipollution laws. These laws are very strict but also take into consideration what is possible.

The initiative was apparently drafted without the benefit of legal or scientific expertise. Its terms do not reflect the sober deliberation found in laws enacted under the legislative process.

If there, in fact, was deliberation it appears to be aimed solely at the destruction of the industrial and agricultural base upon which 8,721,000 workers must depend for a livelihood. In 1971, more than 600,000 people were unemployed in California. More than 100,000 other persons had given up, and dropped out of the labor force. The employment picture will not be much better in 1972.

The imposition of this ill-conceived law will, without doubt, drive most of California's business and industry out of the State or into bankruptcy. Already financially depressed county and city governments will also be bankrupted. No tax revenues would be available to retain the services of many of the 1,137,000 State and local government employees.

Stated simply, the imposition of this law would result in the greatest depression California has ever experienced.

Further, the initiative would not halt pollution. It is aimed at the source of only 15 percent of total air pollution, and ignores the cause of 85 percent—the automobile.

Little is known about the leadership or membership of the organization which originated the initiative. Whoever they are, it must be said that they are insensitive to the basic needs of those in our State who must live on fixed and low or moderate incomes.

Perhaps the members of that organization can afford the extremely high prices of food grown on organic farms. Perhaps their resources will allow them to move and seek employment in an-



other State. And perhaps their standard of living needs no improvement. But this is not the happy lot of the many people who would bear the greatest burdens—the loss of jobs and higher prices.

No one will disagree that the problems of pollution abatement must be met head on and solved. However, we have a choice of methods. We can seek solutions within the realm of the "real world" where technology and the economy permit; or we can follow the approach of the so-called Clean Environment Act and strike out blindly.

Every thinking voter should reject the initiative and urge their elected and appointed officials to proceed with all possible speed on the course of reason.

I append to my remarks an excellent editorial printed in the Los Angeles Times on March 12, 1972, on this measure, proposition No. 9:

#### WRONG WAY TO CLEAN UP THE AIR

It's called the Clean Environment Act, a title of such respectability and promise that hundreds of thousands of Californians were glad to sign petitions to put it on the ballot. It will go to the voters next June 6, as Proposition 9.

It is being touted as a comprehensive assault on pollution. It is in fact a slapdash and deceptive measure which, if enacted, would probably increase air pollution, disrupt control procedures, and cost the people of California untold millions in unnecessary expenses and penalties.

Begin with air pollution. The thrust of Proposition 9 is to set highly technical and rigid standards for the sulfur content of diesel fuel and the lead content of gasoline. Now as it happens neither of these elements contributes in any significant way to photochemical smog, which is the main air pollution concern in Southern California. Both are pollutants, to be sure; what the proposed legislation disregards is the actual extent of pollution involved, the variations in the problem from area to area, and the costs to consumers of eliminating the contaminants.

Consider sulfur oxides, which definitely are not a good thing to have around. These come mainly from the burning of fossil fuels, like coal and oil, that contain sulfur. The primary sources are stationary sites—power plants and the like. Yet Proposition 9 would drastically reduce the sulfur content only of diesel fuel sold trucks, busses and cars.

The relevancy of the assault on sulfur in diesel fuel aside, there is the serious question of practicality. Refineries can be built to produce low-sulfur diesel fuel, but the oil industry says this would take at least two years and a huge capital investment. The oil industry, to be sure, is not the most objective source when it comes to questions of air pollution caused by fossil fuels. But the fact remains that enactment of this proposed law could threaten a major disruption of transportation in California and mean added costs for goods to all consumers. And for a purpose whose necessity is by no means evident.

Then there is leaded gasoline. Lead does have to be taken out of gasoline, chiefly so smog control devices can work properly. Proposition 9 says that after July 1, 1976 no more leaded gasoline could be sold in California. What it doesn't say is what will happen to the millions of pre-1971 cars that will still be on the road then which require leaded gasoline to run efficiently. It doesn't say what it would cost motorists to convert their older cars to run on lead-free gasoline, if converters were available. And it ignores the federal government's sensible timetable for phasing out leaded gasoline, an action that makes the proposed ban of doubtful legality.

Proposition 9 would make it unlawful to build nuclear power plants anywhere in the state for the next five years. Period. It takes no note of the state's constantly growing electricity energy needs, which include the need for power to help clean up the environment. What it does do is invite the further construction of fossil fuel power plants to help fill the energy gap that nuclear-generated power plants should be filling. That would mean putting into our air the contaminants that nuclear plants spare us, including those same sulfur oxides that the restriction on diesel fuel pretends to attack! It makes no sense at all.

The measure would also ban the letting of new leases or renewal of existing ones for oil or gas drilling along the coast, from three miles offshore to one mile inland. While we also oppose offshore oil exploration and drilling near the coastline, we can see no sound reason for extending the ban one mile inland.

The proposition provides for penalties for violations of any air pollution laws. The penalty is a fine of 4% of the gross income for the previous year for any person or company guilty of a violation. The penalty could be levied every day until the violation is corrected. As Norman Livermore, secretary of the State Resources Agency, has noted, this could apply even to a motorist "whose car smokes too much." We believe polluters should be penalized. But the sledgehammer, inflexible approach of Proposition 9 is not the way.

There is more in this initiative that is of doubtful utility, wisdom and legality. In the area of air pollution its provisions, if enacted, seriously threaten to add to our problems rather than to alleviate them. That one fact alone is sufficient to require the defeat of this proposal.

No doubt the motivation and chief appeal of this initiative has been frustration, the feeling that special interests have succeeded in inhibiting enactment or enforcement of necessary environmental protection laws, that local air pollution control boards have not been vigorous enough in cracking down on polluters, that there has not been a strong enough sense of urgency on the part of officials to environmental threats to public health. There is more than a little truth in this, as we have noted often before.

But bad law is not the solution, and that's what Proposition 9 would be. It would, if passed, trigger legal challenges and court fights that could go on for years, and worse, could lead in the meantime to a halt in further necessary steps to combat pollution. That wouldn't help the cause of environmental clean-up, and it wouldn't help the people of California. Proposition 9 should be defeated.

#### GOOD ADVICE FOR ALL AMERICANS

##### HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, once again the Warner and Swazey Co. in an advertisement appearing in the current issue of the U.S. News & World Report offers sound advice to all Americans. Essentially, the message is to try a little harder.

This is so true. If each of us would only put a little more effort into making the daily lives of someone else a little better, there is no telling what could happen. It just might become that better

America to which we all aspire. The ad follows:

#### TRY SAYING "GOOD MORNING" AS THOUGH YOU REALLY MEANT IT

Then (tomorrow, say) try treating some teen-ager like an adult.

Find someone to praise for doing a good job—waitress, bus driver, newsboy, store clerk, anyone.

Show respect for an older person's experience (or fortitude).

Be patient with someone who doesn't understand as quickly as you do.

Write or phone someone having a difficult time. Say you know it's rough, but you have faith in him.

Look pleasant.

If you're white, go out of your way to be polite to a black man or woman; if you're black, to a white.

Do your job a little better. Maybe you'll get some praise, but certainly you'll get more satisfaction.

Help someone—a cripple across a street, a young man or woman looking for a job (whether you can give it or not, give him hope) or an older one, discouraged in his.

Contribute to some church or charity—money if you can, time if you can't.

It just could be that this sort of understanding is what this country needs right now. Try it tomorrow—all day tomorrow. You might be surprised!

PAUL C. ALLEN

#### HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to insert in the RECORD the story of one of Michigan's outstanding labor leaders, Paul C. Allen. His efforts in the early days of union growth and his long-time service with Riggers and Machinery Erectors Local 575 stand as tribute to the men and women of America's labor movement. The story, which was printed in the program of a testimonial dinner recently given in his honor, follows for everyone to read:

PAUL C. ALLEN

Riggers and Machinery Erectors Local 575 is a small local union by most standards. It has less than 1,000 members and its jurisdiction covers only a very small part of the labor movement.

But, this local's members enjoy a high standard of living through the good wages and fringe benefits that have been negotiated for them by their union.

If you asked the members how this happens to be, you'd get the same answer from all of them. It's the same answer you'd get from the old-timer of the union scene, the so-called "pros" of the business of representing people. They all say:

"Paul C. Allen."

There is no doubt that Paul Allen has made all this possible.

Once a big burly man, rough and ready to fight for what he believed was right for the working man and coming up in an area when this was necessary, Paul was seen on many a picket line in the 30's when unions were making their greatest organizing efforts.

Born in Wabash, Ind., Oct. 8, 1915, the youngest of three children of Paul Allen and his wife Julie Bramble Allen, he watched his dad who was a railroad man and inherited

his union-mindedness. Upon graduation from high school, he came to Michigan in 1927.

He joined and was initiated in Riggers Local 575 Nov. 1, 1937, which was then under the supervision of the International Union and in 1938 he was elected the first president of the union.

He negotiated the first collective bargaining agreement and has negotiated every contract since, having set a precedent for the Building and Construction Trades with the Riggers being the first union to include Health and Welfare benefits in their contracts.

In 1941 he was elected a Business Agent and for a time was General Organizer for the International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers. He is now Business Manager of Local 575, having been re-elected to the post without opposition for 23 years. He has also served as President of the Iron Workers District Council of Michigan and Vicinity since 1960.

Local 575 is regarded as one of the most efficiently operated union organizations in America. The union has its own headquarters in Union Center, 14333 Livernois, modern complex which is a far cry from the one-room office on the third floor of a building on Erskine where the union started more than 35 years ago.

The building houses optical and dental care facilities, a doctor's office and a credit union—all provided without cost to the members. The union owns and makes beds available to members at the McNamara Hospital in Warren. It awards two scholarships annually. It has two recreation and retirement centers, a "Sunrise Village" at Marathon, Fla., and another at Leonard, Michigan and was even negotiating for a cemetery.

"We owe it to our members," said Paul, "to protect them on and off the job . . . from cradle to casket."

A supplemental pension plan, unequalled anywhere in the labor movement, has added a degree of financial security and dignity to the entire membership, young and old alike.

Those are the bare facts of the things that can be directly attributed to his leadership and foresight. Looking closer at Paul Allen, you see a very humane man who very rarely wears a tie and who more than likely will be puffing a cigar while he talks to you.

He is a dedicated family man with a wonderful wife, Ruth, and three sons and a daughter.

Believing strongly in the rights of the individual, Paul saw the grave injustice in the conviction of his friend, Jimmy Hoffa and he stood by, working diligently throughout the long fight for his release. And, Paul would do this for other friends.

He found out for himself that he had a multitude of friends when just a little over a year ago he lost his vision. When he regained his sight through what he termed "a miracle of God and medical science," he wrote in his column in *HARD HAT*, the local's widely-read newspaper, "I have learned a lot about my friends. I have discovered there are a lot of wonderful people. They probably have always been there, but I suppose I never really appreciated them. . . until now."

He paid particular tribute to his wife Ruth, who he married in 1952 and who he said, "above all others, was there at all times, reading to me the many, many pages of material that I have these many years as a union leader had to read and digest so that we could act in the best interests of the members."

And, much as he has done all along the way, he looked to the future, saying, "Now we can go on with our programs for the members. Believe me, the future looks brighter than ever . . . I can see it does!"

## DRUG ABUSE: THE PEOPLE MUST ACT

### HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, America does not have a drug problem. What we have is a people problem. Drugs have been around for centuries and have essentially changed very little. But what has changed is the climate, acceptability and hunger within large segments of our society for these kinds of products. Turning on with drugs has in the past decade become fashionable, in some circles even respectable, and for many an acceptable way of thumbing their noses at the government and society. We are, in fact, in the midst of a drug culture that is threatening the very future of our society if we do not act swiftly and forcefully to bring it under control.

We are constantly being told by some experts that drug abuse is a symptom of a sick society and that it is hardly surprising that people are seeking to escape through drugs from a world full of so many complicated problems. When I hear this kind of talk, I wonder how many young people will be persuaded by these words that they are predestined to become junkies and speed freaks. What the experts ought to be telling us is that the drug abuser is an individual with a basic character weakness. He cannot face up to stress and expects ready, instant answers; when the easy answers are not available he has to escape through artificial means. Drug abuse must be separated from the other problems of our society, not viewed as a symptom of those other problems. In the end it is really not that complicated—either you use drugs or you do not. What we need is to spend more time teaching our children how to deal with problems, not how to avoid or escape them.

There are also some people who would argue that every individual has the right to use his body as he chooses and that the drug abuser is not hurting anyone but himself. Frankly, I find this unacceptable. Everyone whose life is touched by the addict—his family, his friends—suffers because of his habit. And, of course the ultimate victim is society as a whole, which must shoulder the expense of his treatment, his lack of productivity, and the crime to which he eventually must turn to support his habit. The addict also contributes to the ongoing activities of organized crime, for it is this group which reaps the profits of his expensive habit. Furthermore, drug abuse is infectious; friends and associates are often the means through which drugs are introduced to still more people. The truth is that the drug abuser does not exist in isolation, and his actions are exacting a terrible toll on society.

But despite all the harm that drug abusers themselves cause, none of their offenses are as great as those of the pusher—the individual who makes a

profit by exploiting the weakness of others. These men are vultures in our society, feeding on the curse of drug abuse. All of our law enforcement agencies must be mobilized to bear down on them and their activities; they deserve no mercy. I can think of no penalty too severe for those who deal in the narcotics traffic, for they are killers on the installment plan. We must be relentless in our effort to halt the traffic in illicit drugs and to severely punish those who make their livelihood from it. And not only must we deal severely with individuals involved in this illegal traffic, but we also must deal strictly with any nation—be it France, Thailand, or any other—which does not cooperate with our effort to halt the production and traffic in illicit narcotics. Strict economic and diplomatic sanctions must be applied against such nations.

Still another group of people who are causing a great deal of uproar these days are those who call for the legalization of marihuana or for the lifting of penalties for its use. We have been subjected to endless arguments as to whether marihuana is harmful and whether it is better or worse than alcohol, but no one has come up with any certain answers. The Commission on Marihuana will be reporting imminently, and I can only hope that we will not be hearing more unsubstantiated claims that marihuana is really not very harmful and therefore we ought to be more lenient regarding its use. The plain truth is that marihuana is a drug, and the warning signals that it may be harmful are numerous. The recent "Marihuana and Health" report issued by the National Institute of Mental Health pointed out that marihuana can provoke psychotic episodes in unstable individuals, impair driving ability, and may cause other serious effects about which little is known. Dr. William E. Bunney, Director of NIMH's Division of Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse, stated that the effect of heavy use of marihuana over long periods of time is "one of the biggest question marks." And Dr. Bertram S. Brown, Director of NIMH, commented that "the current state of scientific and medical evidence" does not justify making the use of marihuana legal. We certainly do not need another socially approved intoxicant, and the use of marihuana ought to be vigorously discouraged, at least until we have more knowledge concerning its effects.

One of the most important things I have learned from my vantage point as a Representative is that people spend for too much time talking about drug abuse instead of taking action to eradicate it. They talk about the drugs that are being abused, the bizarre effects that they have, and why people take them. Everyone is alarmed and shocked, but they just shake their heads, substitute talk for action, and sit back and depend on Congress to enact legislation. This is ridiculous. With drugs as with so many of the other problems which face us, we must have more than concern, more than rhetoric, and more than legislation; if we are to survive we must have action, and that ac-



tion must come from an alert and concerned American public which is determined to eradicate this curse from our land.

#### ST. PATRICK'S DAY PROGRAM

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, when St. Patrick's Day comes around each year, every American becomes a "Friendly Son of Erin." We are all aware of the torments taking place today in northern Ireland. But beyond these troubles we should also take note of the genius of Irish culture and civilization to which America owes so much.

I feel especially privileged to bring to the attention of my colleagues the work of the Irish-American Cultural Institute, the premier international Irish organization and publishers of Eire-Ireland, the quarterly journal of Irish studies. The IACI is the first and only national and international organization in the United States devoted exclusively to promoting the culture of Ireland, past and present. It is not a social, fraternal, or a religious organization. It promotes no causes but the cause of Irish culture: the whole of national intellectual and cultural life. The IACI's board of directors and national council include members from across the United States and from Ireland. Honorary cochairmen of the institute are HSH Princess Grace of Monaco and Mr. I. A. O'Shaughnessy, St. Paul, Minn.

This week, Mr. Speaker, the IACI is presenting the Catholic University of America the Washington Irish Fortnight, a unique concentration in Irish culture. The program will run through March 27. Distinguished cultural leaders, scholars, musicians, and authors have been brought from Ireland for this cooperative international venture with prominent Americans.

The program consists of illustrated and regular lectures, performances, and demonstrations. An array of scholarly and creative talent focuses on various facets of Irish culture and civilization—art, music, archeology, literature, and history.

I would like to add that the undergraduate student government and the graduate student association of the Catholic University of America are co-sponsoring the Washington area Irish Fortnight on behalf of Catholic University, in recognition of the university's long association with the promotion of Irish culture.

In 1896, a few years after the university's founding, an endowed Chair of Celtic was established. This has provided for perpetual research and teaching in Celtic at the Catholic University. For the more than 70 years since the Ancient Order of Hibernians endowed the Celtic Chair, many of America's foremost Irish scholars have worked in

the university's division of Celtic studies. They have provided leadership for research in the intellectual and cultural world, and have brought home to the academic community and to the public the value and meaning of Irish civilization.

It should also be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the IACI is presenting the Irish Fortnight in St. Paul, Minn., and in Seton Hall University, Newark. In recognition of the extraordinary contributions which the institute is making to our culture the Senate of the State of New Jersey recently adopted a resolution commending its president, Dr. Eoin McKiernan.

Mr. Speaker, because I am so deeply appreciative of the institute's work and because I know that our colleagues will want to hear about the Irish Fortnight I include in my remarks the program of the Washington Irish Fortnight:

FRIDAY, MARCH 17

Maloney Hall—8:00 p.m.

Film Short: The Art of the Celtic High Cross.

Lecture: "Gods of the Gaels"; Liam Gogan, Formerly Deputy-Keeper of Irish Antiquities in the National Museum of Ireland (Dublin).

Chairman and Commentator: Louis J. Lutzbetak, SVD, Ph.D., Executive Director of CARA

SATURDAY, MARCH 18

Maloney Hall—8:00 p.m.

Lecture: "What Makes An Irishman Laugh?"; Tony Butler, Critic for the Evening Press (Dublin).

Chairman and Commentator: Art Buchwald, Syndicated Columnist (The Washington Post).

SUNDAY, MARCH 19

Caldwell Hall—2:30 p.m.

Lecture: "The First Irish in Eighteenth Century America"; Thomas Hanley, S.J., Ph.D., Editor of the Carroll papers for the Maryland Historical Society and the American Catholic Historical Association.

Chairman: Al. Philip Kane, Esq., Washington, D.C.

Caldwell Hall—4:00 p.m.

Lecture: "Feeling In Irish Poetry"; Eoin McKiernan, Ph.D., Litt.D., President, Irish American Cultural Institute.

Chairman: Rev. Gilbert Hartke, OP, Head, Department of Speech and Drama, Catholic University.

SUNDAY, MARCH 26

Caldwell Hall—2:30 p.m.

Lecture: "Anglo-Irish Sensibility—From the Eighteenth Century to Today"; Alec Reid, Irish author and interpreter of Beckett.

Chairwoman: Sr. Anne Francis Cavanaugh, RSM, Ph.D. Superior General, Sisters of Mercy of Eire.

Caldwell Hall—4:00 p.m.

Lecture: "An American-Irish Sensibility—The Art of Flannery O'Connor"; Riley Hughes, Founder and Director, Georgetown University Writers Conference.

Chairwoman and Commentator: Mrs. Eugene J. McCarthy, author; Vice-President, Church Women United.

MONDAY, MARCH 27

Caldwell Hall—8:00 p.m.

Film Short: Megalithic Monuments of Ireland.

Lecture: "Revelations from Irish Archaeology"; M. J. O'Kelly, Archaeologist, U. C. Cork.

Chairman: Courts Oulahan, Secretary-Treasurer, Society for the Preservation of Historic Ireland.

McMahon Hall—9:30 p.m.

Lecture and Demonstration: "Traditional Irish Pipe Tunes"; Paddy Maloney, Managing Director of Claddagh Records.

Chairwoman: Barbara Murphy, Coordinator Fortnight Music Committee.

FRIDAY, MARCH 24

Maloney Hall—8:00 p.m.

Lecture: "Irish Nationalism: The Impress of History"; Donal Macartney, Lecturer in Modern Irish History, University College, Dublin.

Chairman and Commentator: Carroll Quigley, Ph. D., Historian; author of Tragedy and Hope, A History of the World in Our Times.

Maloney Hall—9:30 p.m.

Lecture: "III. The Irish Character: The Welding of Cultures"; Sean O Tuama.

Chairman and Commentator: Riley Hughes, Ph.D., Founder and Director, Georgetown University Writers Conference.

SATURDAY, MARCH 25

Caldwell Hall—8:00 p.m.

Lecture: "Irish Nationalism: The Amalgam of Forces"; Donal Macartney.

Chairman and Commentator: James Kirwan (Counsellor), Press and Information, Embassy of Ireland.

MONDAY, MARCH 20

Caldwell Hall—8:00 p.m.

Performance: Irish Folk Music; Sung and played by Tomas O. Canaann Trio; (Matt Cranitch, Tom Barry), award-winning group in all-Ireland music festivals.

TUESDAY, MARCH 21

McMahon Hall—8:00 p.m.

Lecture: "Jack B. Yeats: Ireland's Foremost Emerging Painter?"; James White, Director, National Gallery of Art, Dublin.

Chairman: H. E. William Warnock, Ambassador of Ireland.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22

Caldwell Hall—8:00 p.m.

Lecture: "I. The Irish Character: The Historical Revelation"; Sean O Tuama, Ph.D., Premier author and poet in Gaelic and in English.

Chairman: The Honorable, Mario Biaggi, M.C.

Caldwell Hall—9:30 p.m.

Lecture: "The State of Celtic Studies in America"; Robert Meyer, Ph.D., Chairman, Celtic Department, Catholic University.

Chairman: Robert Lado, Ph.D., Director, Department of Languages and Linguistics, Georgetown University.

THURSDAY, MARCH 23

McMahon Hall—8:00 p.m.

Lecture: "II. The Irish Character: The Internal Contradictions"; Sean O Tuama.

Chairman: The Honorable, William Taft, former Ambassador to Ireland.

#### SPACE IS OUR NEW FRONTIER

### HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the outstanding gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAQUE, was recently quoted in the Wednesday, March 1, 1972, edition of the Eagle of Bryan-College

Station, Tex. This editorial discussing the 10 years since the epic flight of John Glenn, the first American to orbit the earth, quotes "TIGER" TEAGUE on our national space effort. I could say little to improve upon either the editorial or my friend's and colleague's words. The editorial follows:

#### SPACE IS OUR NEW FRONTIER

Ten years ago, John Glenn stirred the hearts of Americans as he made this nation's first orbits of the earth. For almost five hours, Glenn held much of the world's attention as he overcame problems to complete his mission.

Now, an incredibly swift decade later, the Moon Era is drawing to a close. The ultimate goal of Glenn's flight was to put a man on the moon. Next December Apollo 17 will make America's last scheduled manned landing. Apollo 16 will touch down this spring.

Public attention remained riveted on successive space spectacles which developed the men and hardware for the moon. When Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin landed the Eagle of Apollo 11 on the moon in 1969, the world watched. Since then, interest and funding have fallen drastically.

In 1971, \$3 billion was spent on space research and development. This represented a small fraction of our total federal expenditure. In the ten years since the space program was initiated, the program has contributed to opening new frontiers in technology and science.

But the broad questions that have been raised focus on the issue as to why we should be in space at all. With our massive domestic problems would we not have been better off waiting, until these problems had at least been gotten in hand.

In a recent interview, U.S. Rep. Olin Teague stated "...there was plenty to be done in Europe when Columbus first sailed. If Columbus had waited until Europe had no more internal problems, he would still be waiting."

And Teague could just as easily have added other names to the list—names which stand out in history as representing the finest efforts of man to open new frontiers. Those names would include Darwin, Marco Polo, Eric the Red, Dewey, Livingston, Rogers, Magellan, and ad infinitum. These names were grabbed at random. Some went in peace, some to conquer, some for trade, some with scientific problems to research.

These men in their time moved forward into new worlds—and those new worlds today are part of our everyday life.

It is fact that the only new worlds left today are out in space. And because man is both inquisitive and acquisitive, the urge to explore must be tempered by the need to maintain global balances. We can not forget that Russia is very much in space.

As Teague said..."only so long as the United States is a major space power will the FREE use of space be available to mankind. Space today is the high ground militarily. To abrogate the field to a potential enemy is to court disaster."

History teaches us that point very well.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT: THE TRUTH OF THE MATTER

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a recent article on the editorial page of the Wash-

ington Post is an extremely cogent articulation of the problem of unemployment among various groups in our economy—especially women. I am including the article in the RECORD for the edification of my colleagues:

#### UNEMPLOYMENT AS AN ISSUE IN THE ELECTION

(By Alice M. Rivlin)

One might have expected unemployment to be among the simplest and most comprehensible issues of the election campaign. A high unemployment rate means that the economic machinery is not functioning properly, right? That's bad for the incumbents, because they are in charge of keeping the machine running. What could be simpler than that?

But to no one's surprise the administration does not see it this way and has launched a multi-pronged verbal onslaught designed to diffuse the unemployment issue and make it a lot more complicated. The administration's argument reminds one of the old story about the man who returns a borrowed pot to the owner with the statement: I deny that it is broken; anyway, it is not my fault, because it was already broken when you gave it to me; and furthermore I've done everything I could to fix it. The administration's line on unemployment goes something like this: (1) unemployment is not as serious a problem as it might seem because many of the unemployed are women and young people; (2) anyway, unemployment is not our fault, because it was a necessary consequence of winding down the war; and (3) we are doing everything either we or the Democrats can think of to fix it up.

Administration spokesmen, of course, do not actually say that unemployment is not serious—on the contrary. "We recognize that unemployment is a serious problem," Council of Economic Advisers Chairman Herbert Stein told the Press Club last month. "At the same time," he continued, "it would be a travesty to call it a disaster or to compare the situation with the Great Depression. This is especially true when it is recognized that in 1971, 48 per cent of all unemployment was accounted for by people aged 16 to 24 and another 23 per cent by females 25 years of age and older." Without saying why, Dr. Stein left the clear implication that unemployment of women and young people is less serious than the unemployment of mature men. He also pointed out that a lot of young people are not in the labor force—as though that eased the plight of those that were—and that some of those counted as looking for work were also in school.

Dr. Stein is right, of course, that a higher proportion of the unemployed are women and young people than, say, a decade or two ago. This is partly because there are proportionately more women and young people in the labor force than there used to be, but it is mostly because unemployment rates for these groups have gone up relative to those of experienced men. Both phenomena—the increase in women and young people in the labor force and the relative rise in their unemployment rates—have been taking place gradually over the years. They are not features of the current recession.

The administration's apparent contention is that unemployment of women and young people does not cause as much pain and suffering as unemployment of mature males because other people do not depend on their incomes. But this is only partly true. Many women, especially black women, head families, and so do many men under 25. The 23-year-old married man with a new baby and no assets to fall back on may feel his unemployment more keenly than his father. There is also psychological damage. The young person who can't find work may end up pretty discouraged with himself and society. Even

loss of a part-time job may be serious, if it means dropping out of school.

Wives tend to earn less than their husbands, but that does not mean that no one depends on their incomes. The black family which is finally making it because both husband and wife work may feel just as desperate about the payments on the house or the car when the wife is out of work as when the husband is.

In any case, the unemployment rate is not so much a measure of economic pain and suffering—the poverty rate is a more sensitive indicator of that—as a measure of the health of the economy. It is also probably a pretty accurate proxy for the way people feel about the economy, which is why it matters in elections. If jobs are hard to get, people know about it. They worry about their own jobs; they postpone the vacation or the addition on the house or the store. It may not matter much to their state of mind whether the particular person they heard was out of work was Sam's father, or Harry's wife or Aunt Sue's oldest boy.

The second argument—that unemployment is attributable to de-escalation of the war—is a recurrent theme in the President's speeches. "We all know why we have an unemployment problem," he told the Nation on August 15. "Two million workers have been released from the armed forces and defense plants because of our success in winding down the war in Vietnam. Putting those people back to work is one of the challenges of peace..." "It is obvious," he repeated in his last economic message, "that the unemployment problem has been intensified by the reduction of over two million defense-related jobs..." And in the State of the Union address, he pointed out again "that if the more than two million men released from the armed forces and defense-related industries were still in their wartime jobs then unemployment would be far lower."

These presidential assertions that peace causes unemployment—vaguely reminiscent of Marxist theories that a capitalist system needs imperialism to maintain prosperity—are not stressed in the Report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers for the simple reason that they are not very accurate economics.

The attribution of the unemployment to military cutbacks implies that defense expenditures create employment and that other government expenditures do not. But there is no basis for this. If the administration had fully offset drops in military spending with increases in civilian programs, the de-escalation need not have created any aggregate unemployment at all, although there would have been local difficulties arising from the fact that the defense and civilian employment might have been concentrated in different places.

In fact, however, prior to August 1971, the administration deliberately pursued a policy of not offsetting the military cutbacks fully with increases in civilian spending. They were consciously holding down total government spending in order to create slack in the economy and reduce the inflation. It was not an implausible policy, although the human costs were bound to be high. Many economists thought at the time that it would be worth creating some unemployment in order to lower the rate at which prices were rising.

However, the policy did not work. Unemployment rose all right, but the inflation stubbornly refused to subside. Finally, in August 1971, the administration abruptly changed its strategy, began fighting inflation directly with wage and price controls, and started to use the budget to stimulate rather than cool off the economy. In view of this history it would be far more accurate to attribute current unemployment to a well-intentioned but unsuccessful attempt to fight



inflation without price controls, than to attribute it to de-escalation of the war.

The third argument—we are doing everything anyone could do about unemployment—was strongly stated by Dr. Stein in his remarkable speech to the Press Club, "This administration has, I believe, the most powerful, comprehensive, coherent program for dealing with unemployment that any administration ever had . . . We are running the biggest budget deficit ever, except for World War II . . . We have the most comprehensive price-wage control system ever except during the Korean War and World War II . . . We have suspended the convertibility of the dollar . . . We are spending this year about \$10 billion for manpower programs and unemployment compensation . . ." The message is: you Democrats have a lot of gall criticizing us; after all, we're playing your song and playing it louder than you ever played it yourselves.

This recital of Republican accomplishments boggles the mind—at least for a moment. If you had offered 100 to 1 odds a year ago that Stein would be standing before the Press Club crowing about deficit spending, devaluation, and comprehensive price controls you would have had no takers. If you had predicted that the Republicans would actually be exaggerating the size of their deficit you would have evoked the sympathetic half-smile that people reserve for harmless nuts.

But look carefully at that whopping \$39 billion deficit now predicted for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. In the first place, most of that deficit is a result of the sluggish economy, not a response to it. Tax collections are below what they would have been at full employment and some kinds of expenditures (such as unemployment compensation) are higher. The full employment deficit, a much better measure of the stimulative effect of the federal budget on the economy, is much smaller (\$8 billion, not \$39 billion) and very recent. In the first half of this fiscal year the government actually ran a small full employment surplus.

Moreover, the full employment deficit in the second half of the fiscal year (January-June 1972) is at least partly accomplished by pushing expenditures that would normally have occurred later into the current six month period. For example, the administration has indulged in a bit of calendar reform—the most original budget idea since Julius Caesar?—and has at least temporarily abandoned the twelve month year. Thirteen months worth of public assistance payments will be made to the states in the current fiscal year, leaving only eleven payments for next year. This maneuver has the effect of making this year's deficit look bigger (and next year's look smaller), but it has no real economic effect. States are not going to get their money out to poor people any faster than they would have anyway. Some of the other devices used to enlarge the current deficit seem equally unlikely to have any real economic effect. As George Perry put it in testimony before the Joint Economic Committee recently, the current "deficit looks to be about 10 parts slack-induced . . . 1 part full-employment deficit, representing a noticeable but not excessive fiscal push on the economy; and 1 part hope, representing estimates of expenditures that may never materialize."

That the administration is finally using the budget to stimulate the economy is good news; whether they are pushing hard enough remains to be seen. One could certainly make a case for creating deficits in a more stimulating way—giving consumers a tax break rather than investors and spending more on programs that create jobs directly, such as public service employment.

In the end, of course, it may turn out that the unemployment issue is really very simple

after all. The average voter is probably neither interested in nor influenced by the who-struck-John arguments of the economists. If he has the gut feeling—based on personal observation, unemployment rates, or whatever evidence comes to his notice—that the economy is moving forward he will vote for Mr. Nixon; and if he doesn't, he won't.

## EDITORIAL DRIVEL ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post editorializing that somehow capital punishment is outmoded cruelty unbecoming a free state is more editorial drivelt. Justifiable homicide has always included capital punishment, derived in part from the ancient "lex talionis"—an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.

Every person subject to the jurisdiction of American jurisprudence should know that if he or she willfully and deliberately with premeditated design, kills another human being, that they will forfeit their own life.

The sanctity of the lives of law-abiding citizens must be protected by the assurance of capital punishment in those relatively narrow range of situations in which innocent citizens are deliberately slain by willful criminals.

There can be no question but that the prospect of capital punishment is a deterrent to some people. How many murders it actually deters is impossible to determine—just as it is equally impossible to assert that the absence of the penalty of capital punishment results in a higher rate of first degree murder. In this era of rising crime, including such truly horrible, deliberate murder, as the Manson garroting of Sharon Tate, a helpless 8-months pregnant girl, or the methodical slaying of a dozen migrant farmworkers or the hiring of an assassin to slay for financial gain, society deserves and is entitled to the protection of the prospect of capital punishment. It also is entitled to firm, swift justice, not only in trial but in appellate review and in execution of sentence.

As for calling capital punishment cruelty—this is more editorial drivelt. It is no more cruel than imprisonment for life plus 99 years—and a heck of a lot less expensive to boot.

An editorial follows:

### KILLING IN MARYLAND

Del. Devin Doolan has introduced in the Maryland House of Representatives a modest, sensible and humane proposal for the substantial limitation of capital punishment as a factor in the state's criminal justice system. His bill would not totally abandon the death penalty as a punishment—a position dictated in our judgment by respect for the sanctity of human life and by a recognition that the state can best foster such respect by its own observance of it. Nevertheless, it would take a significant stride forward. It would do away with execution except for persons found guilty of the kill-

ing of a law-enforcement officer during the commission of another felony, murder committed by someone inside a penal institution or premeditated killing by someone previously twice convicted of that crime.

The adoption of this measure would put Maryland among those states and territories which have recognized that the death penalty is inconsonant with contemporary standards of civilization. Eleven have abolished it outright; five more have narrowly limited its application, as in Mr. Doolan's proposal, to a few extremely serious crimes. The country as a whole has manifested its repugnance for killing its convicts by almost completely avoiding that gruesome punishment in recent years. In 1935, capital punishment was a commonplace in the United States; 199 human beings were put to death officially in that year. In 1967, there were just two executions; and there have been none at all since then. Leadership in the deliberate abandonment of this outmoded cruelty would be becoming to the Free State.

## COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining Senator GAYLORD NELSON in sponsoring a comprehensive tax reform bill designed to make the Federal tax system more equitable and to generate more revenue.

Sometimes is very wrong with a system in which people earning \$50,000 a year pay no more in taxes than persons earning \$5,000. We must restore the integrity of our most progressive tax—the Federal income tax—by closing the loopholes which permit the rich to frequently pay less than the poor and some of the very rich to pay nothing at all.

The measure I am introducing today would not only make our tax system fairer, it would provide some of the revenue necessary to enable the Federal Government to develop a national health care system, reduce the burden on property taxes as a basis of educational funds, rebuild our cities, provide increased employment opportunities, and clean up our environment.

Some of the major provisions of the bill, which would produce \$15 billion or revenue in 1973, are as follows:

First, substitute a \$150 tax credit for the \$750 personal exemption. At present a personal exemption is worth \$525 to the top bracket taxpayer and only \$107 to the taxpayer in the lowest bracket. This change would reduce taxes for approximately 30 million taxpayers with income below \$10,000, while still returning an additional \$1.9 billion a year to the Federal Treasury.

Second, tax capital gains at death. Under our present system, if a taxpayer bought \$3 million worth of stock in 1958 and sold it today for \$10 million, he would have to pay a capital gains tax on the \$7 million increase in value. But if he holds the stock and passes it on to his heirs through his will, neither he nor his heirs will ever have to pay tax on the amount of the increased value of the stock while

he held it. By taxing the \$7 million as a capital gain at death, the bill would eliminate an unjustifiable loophole and raise \$3 billion a year.

Third, place a 15 percent ceiling on all mineral depletion allowances. In 1966, the top 20 American oil companies made \$4¼ billion in profits, yet they paid Federal income taxes at the rate of only 8½ percent. At the same time, the Treasury estimates that the cost of the average well was recovered 19 times. While the oil depletion allowance was reduced from 27½ percent to 22 percent by the Tax Reform Act of 1969, there is still no valid reason for not reducing it further. A reduction to 15 percent would save \$400 million a year.

Fourth, repeal the asset depreciation range (ADR) system of accelerated depreciation for business property. This scheme to allow rapid writeoffs was written into the Revenue Act of 1971 to encourage businesses to invest in new plant and equipment. But with business currently using only 74 percent of the plant and equipment it already has—and the 7 percent investment tax credit of the 1971 act also designed to encourage such investment—the ADR provision is likely to have little impact on investment. On the other hand, its repeal would bring in \$2.4 billion in 1972 and \$3 billion annually thereafter.

Fifth, broaden the application of the minimum tax. The minimum tax provision which was included in the 1969 Tax Reform Act has reduced the number of persons with reported incomes in excess of \$200,000 who pay no Federal income tax from over 300 to 112. By making more items subject to the minimum tax and by increasing the tax rates from a flat 10 percent to 50 percent of the regular income tax rates, we could eliminate the gross inequity of the very rich paying little or no taxes and at the same time raise an additional \$3 billion.

Overall, a comprehensive tax reform bill such as I have proposed would make our tax system far more progressive and equitable and would also yield the revenue necessary to provide the social services we want, without diminishing job creation or exploration for important minerals, the major ostensible justifications for these tax breaks.

#### LABOR MOVES AGAINST TAX LOOPHOLES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the efforts by the American labor movement to bring about a dramatic closing of present tax loopholes should be commended by every taxpaying American.

Legislation being considered by the Congress to achieve such tax reform should have highest priority during this session.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the will of the people is for enactment of these reforms

and I would like to state at this time my unequivocal support for these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the County Employee, official publication of the Los Angeles County Employees Association, recently published an excellent report on this matter entitled "Labor Moves Against Tax Loopholes."

I would urge all my colleagues to read this informative article.

The article follows:

#### LABOR MOVES AGAINST TAX LOOPHOLES

Demanding drastic and immediate tax reform, AFL-CIO leaders have blamed the Democratic-controlled Congress, as well as President Nixon, for shifting billions of dollars in taxes from big business to the working man and plunging the U.S. into its worst debt deficit in history.

Wealthy corporations and their stockholders have been relieved of their fair share of the Federal tax burden, according to the AFL-CIO Executive Council, and "the great majority of Americans whose living standards depend on a job and a paycheck will be called upon to make up the balance."

AFL-CIO Chief Economist Nathaniel Goldfinger said the national debt under Mr. Nixon has risen to historic heights, and the AFL-CIO is supporting Chairman Wilbur D. Mills of the House Ways & Means Committee in his efforts to force the Nixon Administration into tax reforms.

Mills, the powerful Democratic Congressman from Arkansas, called on President Nixon to submit proposals by March 15 for closing the glaring loopholes in the Federal income tax structure. However, Budget Director George Shultz said he was not optimistic, when asked to evaluate chances for plugging tax loopholes.

#### HUMPHREY BLASTS \$18 BILLION TAX GAP

On another front, Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey called for comprehensive changes in the Federal tax structure to close gaping loopholes that result in an annual tax loss of \$18 billion.

Humphrey called the Federal tax structure "rigged in favor of the wealthy few at the expense of the many—rigged in favor of unearned income, rigged against you—the working man." He said America has become "a nation that is privately rich, but publicly poor."

"The top two percent in income earn 22 percent of all income, but pay less than 10 percent of the total tax bill," the 1968 Presidential nominee said, adding that the Treasury Dept. admits more than 100 Americans making over \$200,000 a year paid no income tax at all.

Pointing out that one-fourth of the population earning \$8,000 to \$14,000 must shoulder 36 percent of the total tax bill, Humphrey declared:

"The time has come for tax justice for the American working family. The time has come for a tax system that says to the super rich, to the banker growing wealthy on sky-high interest rates, that you must carry your fair share of the load," Humphrey said, adding:

#### TAX BREAK OF \$9 BILLION FOR BIG BUSINESS

"Our tax system is full of inequities—breaks for the wealthy and special interests, and loopholes. The reason your tax bill is too high is that the bill for the favored few is too low. One large oil company earns more than \$2.8 billion a year but pays less than 11 percent of its income in taxes, while a worker with a wife and two children earning \$8,000 a year pays about the same rate."

"Is it fair that big business got a \$9 billion tax break in the Revenue Act of 1971? I say no—no more fast write-offs and no more phony loopholes."

"Is it fair that 10 percent of our people can take advantage of all kinds of tax dodges

and tax shelters to avoid paying taxes? I say no. The American public is through subsidizing generations of wealth."

"The Treasury Department has become the blocking back for big business, and the little man has no one running interference for him in Washington."

#### INSURANCE FIRMS PAY ZERO TAXES

Meanwhile back in Sacramento, spokesmen for "Project Loophole" charged that legislation aimed at reducing insurance company tax breaks has turned into a "quarter-million dollar investment bonanza."

"Voters were hoodwinked" said a spokesman for the group formed by State Sen. Mervyn M. Dymally (D-Los Angeles) to probe State tax inequities.

As a result, according to "Project Loophole," twelve insurance firms based in California paid no State taxes at all in 1970.

The Project Loophole figures have been confirmed by the State Board of Equalization.

In a related development, State Sen. David A. Roberti (D-Los Angeles) reintroduced legislation to eliminate the insurance company tax loophole. But similar efforts have failed—most recently during the 1971 legislative session—due allegedly to the influence of the powerful insurance lobby in Sacramento.

#### QUIET TRAGEDY OF RURAL AMERICA

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of *New Priorities*, I read an article which underscores the growing concern many of us have about the decline of family farms and resultant migration of rural Americans to our already overcrowded, blighted urban areas. Mr. Samuel Bougher, the author of this compelling study, accurately identifies the culprits of this unfortunate trend. I think my colleagues will find this article not only enlightening, but worthy of a reconsideration of our national priorities. Also, I think it relates directly to a provision in H.R. 7130—the minimum wage bill reported by the Committee on Education and Labor—with respect to the coverage of conglomerate enterprises.

I insert the following article in the RECORD at this point.

#### THE QUIET TRAGEDY OF RURAL AMERICA

(By Samuel Bougher)

#### THE PROBLEM

While the nation's attention was focused on the plight of its cities, and metropolitan Americans rested comfortably with their Jeffersonian notions of the family farmer satisfying his physical and spiritual needs from the soil, major forces have been at work transforming rural America into a network of corporate fiefdoms. We are now on the verge of closing American farming—and with it large parts of rural America—to all except the giant conglomerate.

America's number one industry is food—not defense hardware, not transportation, not electronics. In 1970, the American grocery bill came to \$91 billion. Add in the restaurant tab, and the total food bill for that year was \$114 billion. The federal government spends more than \$5 billion a year in direct agricultural outlays and loses millions more because of agricultural tax loopholes.



Yet little public attention has been directed to the drastic change in character of land-holding patterns in America, or to the government policies—a patchwork of contradiction, counterproductivity and confusion—that have encouraged that change.

What has been happening to American agriculture since World War II? The total number of farms has been declining rapidly, while the average size of farms has been increasing. In 1945, there were about six million farms averaging 167 acres each. In 1971, there are less than three million farms, averaging 389 acres. Half as many farms, averaging twice as large in 25 years. In short, farmland has not been retired, it simply has been concentrated in fewer hands. USDA officials estimate that within the next two decades, 500,000 large-scale corporate farms will do the work of today's three million enterprises.

The truest picture of what has been happening in rural America can be seen by examining who is selling how much. In March of 1970, 56.5 percent of America's farmers accounted for less than eight percent of all farm sales, while 13 percent, the largest of all farms, wound up with two-thirds of all U.S. farm sales.

Meanwhile, 70,000 family farmers each year have been forced to give up farming—as a profession and a way of life—and leave rural America, eventually taking with them the non-farming rural service people who have lost their markets. While the American city has become almost unbearably overcrowded, large areas of America have become rural ghost towns, snapshot negatives of the urban ghetto. Eighty percent of the people in the United States now live on ten percent of its land.

Who are the farmers left behind, the operations that buy out their departing brethren and grow larger and larger? What are the names on the mailboxes in rural America today? The American family farmer is being replaced by the vertically integrated "total food system." Today's American family is named H. J. Heinz Company, Coca Cola Corporation, Stokely Van Camp, Campbell Soup, Ocean Spray Cranberries, Prudential Insurance Company, Ralston-Purina, General Foods, Green Giant, Dow Chemical, Penn Central, Union Carbide, Goodyear Tire, Tenneco, etc. Those who originally sold to the farmer, or purchased from the farmer, have become the farmer.

The family farmer has not been the only victim of the new corporate land grab. Agribusiness has consistently exploited farm workers. To the industry, these field laborers are a necessary evil, wanted when it is time to hoe a field or harvest a crop, but definitely not wanted once the task is done. Farm workers are perceived as just another cost of production, not human beings. More attention is devoted to the tomatoes than to the people who pick them.

Farm workers are almost exclusively an agri-business problem. Small farmers—those grossing less than \$5,000—paid only 5.2 percent of the farm wage bill in 1964. Eighty-eight percent of all farm wages were paid by the largest 13 percent of all farms. But the wages they paid are among the lowest in the country. Even farm workers who are able to obtain year-round employment—less than 12 percent of the total—earn less than \$3,500 a year.

The condition of America's farm workers and their families is no secret. Farm worker families today still live in stifling shelters without heat, plumbing, privacy or hope for human happiness.

It is not the inevitable workings of history that made agri-business dominant and farm workers subservient in rural America; rather it has been the carefully managed impact of government policies. Farm workers are not the ones that have shaped these policies, nor have the great mass of small and medium size farmers been the ones to make the

choices; the policies are the product of agribusiness and their powerful spokesmen in Washington. Just as farming has become concentrated in fewer and more powerful hands, so has the rural political power.

#### THE CONFERENCE

There are a number of important issues that could be discussed at a conference on the plight of rural America, including:

1. The relationship between the urban problem and the rural problem. A million people have been leaving rural America each year. Attempting to solve the urban problem without a recognition that the disease of the city was contracted in rural America is like trying to bail out a boat with a hole in the bottom.

2. Are we in danger of forever losing the rural alternative as a way of life? Are we destined to become a thoroughly urban nation, with rural America simply a factory for our food and fiber? Is the process reversible? How?

3. What has been the role of government in promoting this transformation in rural America? Who runs the Department of Agriculture for whom? How do our tax laws encourage corporate farming to the detriment of the family farmer? Are government farm subsidies responsible for creating the agriculture of bigness?

4. Why have we made no progress in eliminating rural poverty since the President's Commission on Rural Poverty poignantly documented the extent of the problem in 1967? Why aren't farm workers thoroughly covered by social security unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, minimum wage laws, child labor standards, and legislation permitting collective bargaining?

5. Where do we want to go in rural America? Who decides? Should the powerful control? Are the present directions our manifest destiny?

6. *Solutions.* Should the federal government initiate a policy of *land reform in America*, buying land back from the largest farms and selling it to farm workers and other low income families at liberal credit terms? Should the federal government use its procurement power to help reverse the flow from rural America? Should agricultural subsidies be pegged to income rather than production? Should farm workers come fully within the social legislation of the past three decades?

#### CLEAN WATER PACKAGE

#### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under date of March 17, 1972, a group of 36 Members of the House sent their colleagues a letter urging support of the clean water package of amendments to the pending water pollution control legislation—H.R. 11896. I include the text of the letter and the names of the co-signers at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1972.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: In a few days the House will take up the bill (H.R. 11896) called the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972. The Clean Water Package of Amendments will be offered to strengthen the bill in line with the stronger Senate-passed bill (S. 2770).

The Clean Water Package of Amendments will:

Establish that, by 1981, without further action by Congress, polluters must use the best available technology, taking into account the costs, to clean up the wastes they pour into our waterways;

Provide more national control over State programs of discharge permits, in order to prevent economic hardship and interstate competition for industries, communities, and workers and to insure that the water quality objectives of the bill are achieved;

Strike from the bill provisions that give polluters who violate this bill or the Refuse Act a total immunity until 1976 from enforcement actions, merely because they file an application for a permit;

Provide that the rights of citizens to sue polluters and the Environmental Protection Agency, which this bill would gravely restrict, should be no less than the rights which Congress established in the Clean Air Act and which the House adopted on February 29, 1972, in the Noise Control bill (H.R. 11021);

Prevent the weakening of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act;

Provide criminal sanctions against polluters who willfully violate an EPA order to abate their pollution; and

Provide adequate worker job protection.

The Clean Water Package is supported by a broad-base group of environmental, civic, labor, farmer and other groups, such as: Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Bass Anglers Sportsman Society; Clean Air, Clean Water, Unlimited; Common Cause; Environmental Action; Environmental Policy Center; Friends of the Earth; Izaak Walton League of America; League of Women Voters of the U.S.; Minnesota Conservation Foundation; Minn. Environ. Control Citizens Assoc.; Minn. Public Interest Research Group; National Consumers League; National Farmers Union; National Wildlife Federation; Northern Environmental Council; Oil, Chem., and Atomic Workers Intern. Union; Save Lake Superior Association; Sierra Club; Sport Fishing Institute; Trout Unlimited; United Automobile Workers; United Steelworkers of America; The Wilderness Society.

We urge that you support adoption of the Clean Water Package which will be printed in the Congressional Record of March 20, 1972.

Sincerely,

Henry S. Reuss, Thomas M. Pelly, John E. Moss, Lucien N. Nedzi, Dante B. Fascell, Floyd V. Hicks, David R. Obey, William D. Ford, Bella S. Abzug, Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., Martha W. Griffiths.

Philip E. Ruppe, James G. O'Hara, Ken Hechler, H. John Heinz, III, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Robert O. Tiernan, Robert W. Kastenmeier, John D. Dingell, John P. Saylor, Thaddeus J. Dulski.

Gilbert Gude, John H. Dent, Silvio O. Conte, Donald M. Fraser, Jack F. Kemp, Charles C. Diggs, Jr., John Conyers, Jr., Michael Harrington, Thomas M. Rees, F. Bradford Morse, Charles B. Rangel, Charles A. Vanik, Abner J. Mikva, Donald W. Riegle, Jr., John G. Dow.

#### PRICE OF MEAT

#### HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, it is my strong conviction that the Secretary of Agriculture, Earl L. Butz, should im-

mediately resign from his post in the Cabinet.

Secretary Butz talks as if he is a friend of the American farmer; but in reality, he is less a friend of the farmer than he is a monumental insult to the American public. Since he became Agriculture Secretary last December, Mr. Butz has consistently demonstrated a callous indifference to the needs and the pleas of the American people. He has tried to force them to their knees by not only praising rising meat prices, but also blaming consumers and their spending habits for meat price hikes. And what is their crime? Consumers merely want to include meat in their family diet.

Last week, my colleague STEWART McKINNEY, of Fairfield, and I wrote to President Nixon urging him to impose an executive freeze on meat prices until such time as the Price Commission revises the guidelines applicable to food prices. In our letter, we stated that meat prices in the Northeast have risen by 8 percent, sometimes even as much as 11 percent, in the last 2 months. It is anticipated that consumers will spend a record \$125 billion for food in 1972—that is \$6.6 billion more than in 1971; and to a great extent that 4.5-percent increase will be taken up by meat price increases.

The wholesale price index for foods rose 1.8 percent in February—including raw agricultural products which are totally uncontrolled, and processed foods, which are controlled. At that rate, meat prices this year will rise a horrendous 21.6 percent.

Secretary Butz' reaction to uncontrolled food prices is unsuppressed glee. The present prices for beef—the highest since the Korean war—provide "the best way to insure a good supply of better cuts of beef that I prefer," he recently said in a speech in Houston, Tex. Clearly the Secretary is unconcerned that millions of Americans are troubled by exorbitant increases in prices for hamburger, frankfurters, and other so-called cheaper cuts of meat. He says salaries are increasing—it seems his philosophy is that people should get ahead in order to stand still.

And if any attempt is made to give the consumer a chance to catch his breath—by instituting a freeze on meat prices or food price controls, for example—this presumably intelligent, rational high Government official cries that he will "fight like a wounded steer" to prevent any slowing of meat price increases. In addition, he threatens the public with empty meat counters and meat rationing. Secretary Butz recognizes the rising tide of pressure from increasingly angry and dismayed consumers to halt further erosion of the shrinking family food dollar. That is the "attack" he resents and against which he invokes his "wounded steer" posture.

It is understandable that an Agriculture Secretary would defend the interests of farmers. After all, the American farmer is the most efficient food producer in the world, and yet he receives a smaller reward for his investment than other industries, has little control over what he gets for what he produces, and in gen-

eral is in economic trouble despite Government subsidies.

However, it is also true that rising food prices do not translate into a corresponding increase in income for the farmer. His share in the percentage of retail food price increases has grown steadily smaller over the years. What happens to food prices happens to them between the farm and the grocery store. The average annual food bill for consumers rose from \$2,223 to \$2,244 between 1970 and 1971, with all but \$1 of the \$21 increase going to processors and retailers. The point is that farmers are not to blame for climbing food costs.

It is also understandable that the administration would like to curry favor with farmers during this election year by keeping food prices high and boosting farm subsidies by nearly \$1 billion to a record high of more than \$4 billion. However, this plan does not require as its goal the breaking of the consumer's back. The administration seems to be concerned about rising meat prices—meat imports—mostly cheaper grades—have been allowed to increase by 7 percent, though this will have an admittedly negligible impact on prices; Cost of Living Council Director Donald Rumsfeld says he is concerned; and Price Commission Chairman C. Jackson Grayson suggests that if consumers ate less meat, or sought cheaper cuts of meat; the upward pressure on prices might be eased. More important was President Nixon's recent comment to his newly-sworn economic advisor, Marina von Neumann Whitman:

Now get those food prices down!

I look forward with interest to the President's response to Congressman McKINNEY's and my letter urging an immediate freeze on meat prices.

What is hard for me to understand is Secretary Butz' flippant and condescending attitude toward the American people during this period when all of us are trying in a rational manner to bring about economic recovery and provide a better life for all Americans. Mr. Butz' reaction to the 7-percent ceiling increase in meat imports for cheaper cuts is that, to his pleasure, housewives will not be helped much.

I guess she wants a nice choice roast or a good sirloin steak. She doesn't like hamburger too much.

The housewife may not prefer hamburger; but if Secretary Butz has his way, she will be lucky to be able to afford enough for her family on special occasions.

Such a shocking performance ill becomes a Cabinet officer whose job is to serve the public interest. To be sure, we will not be intimidated by him in our efforts to ease the burden of the family food shopper. To the man who cheers soaring meat prices while consumers struggle to put meat on the family table, my suggestion is that he would best serve the public interest by resigning immediately from a post which requires far more sensitivity, reason and tact than are reflected in his statements to the American public.

## THE POLICY OF "ASSURED DESTRUCTION"

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, free-swinging freshman Congressman FLOYD SPENCE is the product of a football scholarship at the University of South Carolina. Captain of the track team and basketball player, Spence also collected highest scholastic and student government honors. He brought this same fire and leadership to law school and to civic, military and political life. At 43, SPENCE is a veteran South Carolina lawmaker and now, on the Washington scene, an outspoken proponent of a national defense posture that will serve to keep America viable and a cornerstone of world peace.

It is a pleasure to include as a portion of my remarks the following article from *Survive* magazine:

SOVIET ARMS BUILD-UP AND THE POLICY OF "ASSURED DESTRUCTION"

(By Congressman FLOYD SPENCE)

The annual Soviet Armed Forces display on November 7, honoring the revolution of 1917, did not show any new missiles or strikingly new weapon systems. But that is certainly no cause for complacency or rejoicing. The build-up of the Soviet arms arsenal and their expansion of defense research and development in search of new and better weapon systems continues at a steady pace.

In his speech at the Moscow ceremony, Soviet Defense Minister Marshal A. A. Grechko stressed again that "the most important task is to raise the defense capacity of the USSR, the combat power of the Soviet armed forces and their constant preparedness..."

In line with this statement, it is significant that this year's military parade in Moscow was seconded by a display of Soviet naval strength in the port of Havana, Cuba. A naval detachment consisting of two submarines and two submarine chasers, under the command of Rear Admiral N. V. Soloviev, arrived in Havana several days before the November 7 commemoration to participate in the Cuban celebrations. The Soviet vessels displayed anti-aircraft rockets, and atomic missiles were clearly visible on the decks of the larger submarine chaser. Friendly Cuban visitors queued up on the piers in long, curious lines and were invited aboard for a close-up look.

The menacing language of this show of strength in American waters should not be overlooked or misunderstood. This is the first time the Soviet armed forces have ever celebrated their revolutionary holiday in any official way in the waters of the North American continent.

Ever since the time of Lenin, the Communists have said continually that they must gain not only a strategic superiority but a complete and effective supremacy over the capitalist world—in weapons technology, armed forces strength, economic capacity to produce decisive weapon systems, and psychological and moral readiness to use these weapons. That was what Khrushchev meant when he used his famous phrase "we will bury you." The Soviets have behaved according to their statements, but for some strange reason, which I confess has always baffled me, their pronouncements are considered by too many Americans to be only so much meaningless propaganda.

Many people, including leading govern-



ment officials, expected and hoped that after gaining parity, both the United States and the Soviets would level off and stop further expansion of their weapon systems.

In 1968 we agreed to join with the USSR in negotiations on strategic arms limitations, the so-called SALT talks. The United States at this time had 1,054 ICBM's, 656 SLM's and over 600 long-range bombers; the Soviet Union had a total of 600 ICBM's, including 100 heavy SS-9's. Since 1968 there have been five rounds of SALT, alternating between Helsinki and Vienna. During the three years of negotiation, the Soviet Union has increased its ICBM arsenal by about 900, to the present figure of about 1,500 or 1,550 units, including approximately 300 SS-9's.

The United States was serious about arms limitations and did not increase the actual number of its ICBM's. We began only a replacement program wherein the improved Minuteman III was substituted for out-dated Minuteman I and II missiles and some MIRV-ing of individuals warheads was undertaken.

Contrast this with the Soviet Union, which has maintained the ICBM construction rate of about 300 new missile systems annually, or about 150 to 180 new missiles from one SALT negotiation round to the other. In 1971, space reconnaissance revealed that the Soviets were preparing new and bigger silos for ICBM's, the number of which by October, 1971, was estimated at 100. These new underground silos are capable of accommodating missiles even larger than the formidable SS-9. As Hugh Sidey noted in the October 15th issue of Life magazine, our best experts are still uncertain as to precisely what this new construction means, weaponwise.

In the area of missile defense, the Soviet Union has about 67 ABM sites, with SA-7 missiles capable of missile intercept at high altitudes. According to more recent reports, a group of about 50 new launchers is being deployed for ABM interceptors with much higher velocity. Our modest Safeguard ABM program is dwarfed by comparison.

During October, Soviet technology succeeded in actually intercepting a satellite in flight, linking the interceptor with it and blowing up both. This is a feat we have yet to perform. If the Soviets can intercept and destroy their satellites in flight, they may soon be able, if they are not already, to intercept and destroy our surveillance satellites. This is the only practical means we have of keeping abreast of arms developments taking place within their closed society. Their ability to destroy these reconnaissance satellites means they would control the timing of any possible future direct confrontation. In the critical days or weeks preceding such possible strike they could eliminate our ability to anticipate or observe the preparations for the strike.

Further, the Soviet strategic missile force now has 750 medium-range units capable of reaching U.S. installations in Western Europe and the Far East for which the United States has no comparable equivalent, either through NATO or otherwise.

Then there is the Soviet Navy. It has grown much faster than anybody could anticipate or predict. In the short period of 14 years, under the command of Admiral S. Gorshkov, the Soviet submarine and surface fleet grew to a strong force capable of staging in the waters of the world a naval exercise, code named "Ocean," which surpassed any similar maneuver by any country or group of countries in the entire naval history of the world. In 1968 the USSR started its X-class submarine program. This is its principal submarine-launched missile carrier. It is estimated that about 17 such submarines were operational by the end of 1970, and at the rate of about one sub per month, they have close to 27 at the present time. The Soviet

surface fleet concentrated on adding new missile cruisers ("Kresta" class), destroyers ("Kynda" class), and the small speedy "Korvet" and "Osa" boats in numbers surpassing any estimates and predictions. As a result, the Soviets can now maintain a permanent fleet of about 40 to 60 ships in the Mediterranean Sea alone, putting an end to the U.S. Sixth Fleet's complete control of the area and exerting strong political impact in the Middle East, North Africa, and Southern Europe.

The Soviet Union is evidently dedicated to supporting its recent political initiatives with a strong, balanced armed force which will be superior to the United States in the areas of strategic missiles, air force, naval power, and conventional on-the-ground weaponry. They engage in negotiations designed to limit or reduce armaments only for the purpose of speeding up and implementing this final Soviet superiority. The theoretical reasoning of mutual advantage, implicit in "parity," "sufficiency," or "flexible deterrence," has not affected to any appreciable degree the basic Soviet thrust toward a stronger, superior military force and a position of real prevailing strength, both militarily and politically. In pursuit of this goal, the Soviets channel a considerable portion of their resources to expand their armaments research and production. As Mr. Sidey accurately noted in his article, their research and development budget has, for years, exceeded "anything necessary for mere parity with us."

The great weakness of our so-called "assured destruction" posture has been its underlying assumption that the leaders of the USSR respond, as our people do, to the threat of massive retaliation with its toll in death and destruction.\* Nothing in the moral or political system they espouse warrants such an assumption, and nothing in the record of their recent arms development indicates concern in that regard.

What is far more likely is that we will, indeed, awake one day soon to find the Soviets have achieved some massive new breakthrough in weapons technology which will render our defensive system obsolete.\*\* It is not in terms of striking particulars but in terms of overall growth and input into research and development and the number and complexity of new Soviet weaponry developments, that this prediction is justified. It simply stands to reason that a nation engaged in extensive weapons research and development will, sooner or later, come up with a breakthrough. Certainly one engaged in only minimal research and development, as we have been, is not likely to be able even to cope with such a breakthrough by others, let alone achieve one itself.

In short, "assured destruction" is not defense—it is merely psychological warfare. And I am convinced it was propounded by people who had a rather poor grasp of both defense and psychology.

The policy of "assured destruction," which is meaningless to the Soviets but grates on the moral principles of Americans, should be scuttled in favor of a forthright policy of dynamic research and development, an unmistakable posture of military strength with a balance between defensive and offensive systems, and a resolute civilian population bolstered by an adequate and visible civil defense. It is to the support of programs and funding essential to such a policy that I have pledged myself as a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

\* See English translation of Soviet book Civil Defense (1971) analyzed by Joanne Gailar in May-June 1971 issue of Survive.

\*\* See "The Myth of 'Assured Destruction'" by Eugene P. Wigner, Survive, July-August 1970.

## DEVELOPMENT OF A NATIONAL MANPOWER POLICY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the National Manpower Advisory Committee of the Department of Labor recently convened a conference commemorating the 10th anniversary of the enactment of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 here in Washington, D.C. on March 16-17, 1972. One of the principal speakers to the conference, which was addressed by the Secretary of Labor, James D. Hodgson and others, was Dr. Sar A. Levitan, distinguished labor economist and director of the Center of Manpower Policy Studies at the George Washington University.

Dr. Levitan, who is also vice chairman of the National Manpower Policy Task Force, delivered a speech on the need for the development of a comprehensive national manpower policy as we move into the second decade of major Federal initiative in this vital area. His remarks were indeed penetrating and I would like to share with my fellow Members of Congress the remarks of an esteemed friend.

### DEVELOPMENT OF A NATIONAL MANPOWER POLICY

(By Sar A. Levitan)

Each of us has a favorite tale of what changes MDTA has wrought. These stories deal with the millions who turned to the programs for help, the hundreds of thousands who have learned saleable skills and the dollars and cents that they are now earning instead of collecting unemployment insurance or welfare checks. The more sophisticated among us, who talk to computers, come up with impressive benefit-cost ratios that offer proof positive that MDTA has been worthwhile. In brief, we are better off today because we have had the MDTA for 10 years.

But I am running ahead of my story. The script for these festivities calls at this stage for a review of how it all came about.

So let us reminisce. My major qualification for the honor bestowed today apparently is longevity: I'm supposed to tell it as it all really was, based upon personal recollection. Regrettably, I was out of the country when the Smith-Hughes Act was debated and passed. So I'll have to telescope my observations on more recent history.

### THE SAME PROBLEMS PERSIST

It was only 11 years ago that Congress embarked upon the first of a long and growing series of programs to aid the structurally unemployed. The legislation dealt with federal aid to depressed areas and was proposed for workers stranded in areas of high chronic unemployment. The proposal called for annual federal expenditures of \$10 million to retrain workers whose skills have become obsolete. This was too much for some members in Congress; they thought that the federal government has no business spending good taxpayers' money to train unemployed workers. They loudly expressed the fear that from little acorns big trees would grow and that this little program would lead to vast new federal expenditures. And, thank heaven, they were right. Top manpower policy shap-

ers no longer talk in millions but in billions. As the acknowledged wit of MDTA once remarked, little did he know when he learned fractions in school that in planning manpower programs point one would mean not a dime but a hundred million dollars.

But the quantum jump from millions to billions may be misleading. The scene has not changed as radically as these numbers might suggest. A student of manpower problems today might be forgiven if he has the feeling that the current arguments about manpower policy sound familiar and are reminiscent of the debate that led to the passage of MDTA. It seems that the arguments are just as pertinent today as they were in 1962. A common denominator is still reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics with annoying repetition as it was 10 years ago: that the rate of unemployment is hovering around 6 percent and a drop to 5.7 percent is no cause for rejoicing and hardly a harbinger of full employment. Critics complain today as they did a decade ago that we should focus more on the 94 percent who are working than on the 6 percent who are unemployed. To clinch the argument they point out that more people are working today than ever before. And in each case, both today and a decade ago, they are correct for the population and economy have grown and the number of employed has continued to rise. But that does not fill the stomachs or satisfy the aspirations of those who are on the outside looking in, searching for useful work but not finding it.

Ten years ago we came up with a good and satisfactory reason—to some—explaining these 6 percent who are left out. We were told that there was really nothing wrong with the economy except that these unfortunate are "structurally" unemployed. And that was that. This explanation was supposed to lead to solutions. The answer we came up with is that if we train the unemployed they will find jobs and we'll all live happily ever after.

It takes more than just a token commitment to establish a society in which every person seeking work can find useful employment. So today again there are those among us who argue that we should settle for less than full employment. I don't believe it. And we have clearly seen that we can reduce forced idleness well below 4 percent, though we should achieve this goal with different methods than we used in the mid 1960s.

Ten years ago when we argued the same issues, the debate was couched more in visceral reactions than in good solid numbers. We have made a great deal of progress in the past decade. We have learned—at least some of us—that the overall average unemployment ratio is a very useful social barometer. But averages by themselves obviously do not tell the full story—a man and a horse have on the average three legs. When national unemployment hovers around 6 percent, unemployment in urban poverty areas is nearly twice as high and among minority youth it is 5 times as high. Disturbing as these statistics are, the recommendation of the technicians to discontinue these series because of alleged flaws in the data, and the eagerness with which policymakers acted on these recommendations, casts doubts on the sagacity of their judgments, leaving a gnawing feeling about their motivation.

Nonetheless, the old "solution" of blaming the messenger for the message persists. Ten years ago we were also dissatisfied with the monthly BLS reports about unemployment, and one national publication came out with an ingenious explanation: It's all the fault of bureaucrats who exaggerate unemployment problems because they have a vested interest in high levels of unemployment. You will have to judge for yourself the amount of progress we made in this area.

The MDTA and other manpower programs are hardly to be blamed for high unemployment. Instead, it would be more appropriate to credit these efforts for the hundreds of thousands who have been helped. Only the most enthusiastic backers and those who opposed stronger medicines to reduce unemployment have viewed manpower programs as a nostrum for our unemployment ills.

#### THE PROPER ROLE OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS

Unfortunately, it has become commonplace to expect too much from manpower programs. Manpower programs do not create jobs nor should they be expected to eliminate poverty or discrimination. Manpower policies are likely to affect only marginally inflationary pressures or the ills of a complex urban society such as family breakup, pollution, and congestion. Nonetheless, social scientists, politicians, and statesmen have placed unrealistic, possibly naive, trust in manpower programs that encourages rhetoric in place of hard-nosed analysis. Economists have claimed that an expansion of manpower programs would reduce unemployment by 2 percent and responsible statesmen have been no less sanguine about the presumed promises of manpower measures.

Newly emerging welfare policies perhaps best illustrate this faith in manpower programs. Conservative legislators who are normally most careful with the taxpayers' dollar and (when they do loosen the purse strings, it is not to help the poor), have shown a remarkable eagerness to spend vast sums of money on manpower programs in the hope of reducing welfare outlays. Both Democratic and Republican administrations have clung to this faith. President Kennedy urged training programs for welfare recipients to motivate them to seek economic independence. His slogan was "rehabilitation instead of relief." President Nixon recommended vast outlays for "workfare instead of welfare."

A decade of experimentation with manpower programs for welfare recipients does not justify optimism about using training programs as a means to reduce relief rolls. Welfare reflects both the multiple handicaps of recipients and the generosity of taxpayers who bear the costs. There are good reasons for expanding manpower programs to aid those who depend on meager relief, but saving public expenditures is not one of these.

Relief is given to the destitute not because it necessarily improves the efficiency of the economy, but out of compassion for those in need. So, too, training programs should be offered to those who have difficulty competing in the free labor market because they need help and not because of the impact of these expenditures upon the national economy. It's not at all improbable that the development of training programs for the poor will reduce their long run dependence upon welfare. If this happens, so much the better. Appropriate training may help some poor people to escape dependency but we should not expect training to cure poverty. More than a quarter of the poor are 55 or older and thus not likely to profit from training. Even more of the poor are in female-headed families. A sizeable group of these women have health problems, more have inadequate education, and even more have skills which command little remuneration even when they can find work. Most have young children in need of day care, which is in short supply nationwide and is more likely to be expensive than dependable. Transportation and health difficulties, the children's needs, and pregnancy often interrupt training or employment. And most crucial is the fact that jobs are not available to all who overcome these obstacles.

Other examples could be cited of the exaggerated faith that has been placed in train-

ing. Members of my own trade have tried to sell training as a new snakeoil, good for all ailments. Expansion of manpower programs, according to these enthusiastic proponents, will cure the economy from inflation, unemployment, ease the trade-off between the two, and improve the environment, to boot. Training increases some individuals' chances of being hired but does not expand the economy's complement of job slots. Thus, it affects the distribution rather than the degree of unemployment. Even if all those seeking work received training, the level of unemployment—forced idleness—might be reduced only marginally.

Even though there is usually slack in the training system and facilities do not operate at full capacity, training programs leave much to be desired as countercyclical tools because they cannot be expanded or contracted at will. It takes considerable time to develop facilities, gather instructional staff, select applicants, and enroll students. By the time the unemployed complete their course of training, the economic conditions that called for the expansion may have changed. Because human lives are involved, training programs cannot be expanded or contracted like an accordion and cannot be easily adjusted to changes in business conditions. We do not base enrollment in Harvard or Stanford or Duke on the level of unemployment. Enrollment in skill centers or the Job Corps should also be based on individual needs.

Manpower programs were initially designed to aid workers whose skills are obsolete. By expanding beyond remediation into prevention, these emerging institutions manifested the evolving democratic tenet that society should not segregate sections of the population to remain—without hope for improvement—the hewers of wood and drawers of water. Training can provide paths for upward mobility, not only for those who have difficulty competing for even entry jobs, but also to those who aspire to more skilled and challenging jobs. But the resources available for manpower programs are quite limited in comparison to the vast universe of need. Therefore, successive administrations and Congresses have placed increasing emphasis upon serving those in greatest need. Until the outbreak of the recession, from which we are hopefully recovering, manpower programs attempted increasingly to serve those who are discriminated against in the labor market and those who have difficulty in competing for sustained gainful employment. But the cost of this choice was to play down the upgrading function of MDTA.

The last decade was a period of experimentation and development of infrastructure for manpower programs. It was also a period of introspection. Possibly no other social program has undergone as close scrutiny by the Congress, the academic community, and the administrators of the program. We know everything that is wrong with these programs and also quite a lot that is right with them. The latest happening in manpower—the Emergency Employment Act—also indicates that we have already developed an efficient structure capable of acting when an emergency arises. It is not easy to give away a billion dollars and to hire 130,000 people within 6 months. But this is exactly what the Manpower Administration has done—most efficiently.

Conventional wisdom about the snail's pace of government action notwithstanding, the manpower administrators have demonstrated the capability to act massively and speedily.

#### LESSONS OF THE DECADE

From experimentation and introspection, manpower administrators have learned important lessons. Time will permit here to



single out seven conclusions on which most observers would agree.

1. First and foremost, investing in human resources makes sense. Cost-benefit ratios are always open to question, and vary markedly from program to program, but those who vote funds for manpower programs can find comfort in the finding that society gets back more in terms of productive work and reduced support than it expends to provide manpower services. The investment, so say the numerologists, is justified in dollar and cents without even considering the less tangible benefits.

2. There is no single clientele for manpower service, but rather a whole range of groups in the labor force which can benefit. MDTA was designed to assist the technologically displaced. The poor, regardless of cause, were included under the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964, and services were extended on a large scale to welfare recipients after 1967. Recently, there has been an increase in services for veterans and for unemployed engineers and scientists. Gradually, what is emerging is a comprehensive human resources approach and, hopefully, a comprehensive human resources policy, which seeks to develop and utilize fully the abilities of all citizens.

3. Just as many types of persons may benefit, there are no simple solutions for varying problems. It is now recognized that basic education, counseling, medical care, and other services may be required along with training, and these multiple services are now offered by manpower programs or by related governmental efforts. Each target group may need a variety of services. The ideal of one-stop comprehensive delivery to the needs of each individual and each area remains elusive and may actually be impractical in many cases.

4. To provide various services for many groups requires careful coordination. The establishment of numerous separate institutions is not efficient. As manpower efforts have expanded, the federal government has funded programs for all sorts of occasions and for all types of people. This proliferation of manpower efforts has led to a great deal of waste. The Manpower Development and Training Act has continued, to borrow Garth Mangum's phrase, to be the "foundation of manpower programs." But the superstructure frequently extended beyond its foundations and has therefore become wobbly. Ten years of experience has demonstrated the need to develop a more consolidated and comprehensive program.

5. A promising development has been the establishment of institutional training facilities. A decade ago such facilities were not available for adult men and women. It is a mistake, however, to separate those seeking remedial education from persons who seek other educational pursuits. As more and more adults return to school to recharge their intellectual batteries and to renew their skills, remedial education and training can become an integral part of a general adult education program. A comprehensive manpower program would coordinate the learning of adults needing training and those pursuing avocational interests.

6. On a broader scale, it has been learned that even with a complete range of manpower services, clients may still have employment problems because of their location, racial or other discrimination, or other flaws in the labor market rather than in the individual. Manpower programs have helped to spotlight these barriers to full participation in the labor market and have contributed to their decline, though, alas, not yet to their breakdown. Indeed, one of the most important contributions of the man-

power programs is their dissemination of information. The employment problems of various labor market groups are more widely understood than ever before. There is much broader insight into the causes of these problems and the ingredients to their solution. The gradually emerging discipline of manpower is also a vested interest group to work for increased human development efforts.

7. A final contribution of the last ten years has been to provide a more rigorous foundation for public policymaking. In the manpower field, more than ever before, an attempt has been made to measure and evaluate the impact of the programs, to improve their design on the basis of these measurements and evaluations, and to experiment with new approaches. Though in many cases, these results fell far short of what have been accomplished, manpower policymaking was far ahead of other areas. Its methods are now being applied elsewhere, and hopefully, research, evaluation, and experimentation will be an integral part of all efforts in the future.

#### A FAVORABLE BALANCE

Federal manpower programs are rapidly reaching maturity. The Office of Management and Budget has estimated that the federal outlays alone for manpower programs during the current year will carry a price tag of \$4.3 billion and the cost will rise above the \$5 billion mark by next year. Even with the dwindling value of the dollar, the manpower programs are now an important industry supporting an army of newly certified and aspiring manpower experts.

It may come as news to the newly emerging academic manpower complex that training programs have also benefited hundreds of thousands of clients, though by no means all the 7 million who have gone through the Labor Department's work and training programs. Many enrollees have learned new skills and the families of many more have been fed—after a fashion—while the enrollees have undergone training.

A realistic appraisal of the developing federal manpower policy must acknowledge the limitations of manpower efforts and recognize that training in itself does not produce jobs even for those who have mastered their lessons. The argument that manpower programs are no substitute for fiscal and monetary policies by no means denigrates the proper role of these measures. We must continue to rely upon fiscal and monetary policies to achieve high employment while manpower programs focus on helping individuals develop their potentials to earn a living and to function with dignity.

#### AN EPITAPH BY THE HONORABLE LESTER G. MADDOX

#### HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Lieutenant Governor of Georgia, the Honorable Lester G. Maddox, recently wrote an epitaph, which he says he hopes will be used as a memorial should America ever fall to her enemies.

I believe that the thoughts expressed in this epitaph are worthy of consideration by the Members of Congress and by all Americans. For that reason, I include it in the Record.

Here lies the remains of the United States of America, born a free republic on July 4, 1776, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; delivered by the hands of patriots who so loved freedom that they dared to demand it, standing ready to sacrifice their fortunes, even their very lives, to insure that freedom was established and preserved.

The infant republic was threatened from every quarter. Its own mother country sought to end its life with the sword. Hostile forces, coming by ship and by horseback, tortured the infant with cannon, arrow, and pen. But the infant continued to survive and grow and prosper, nurtured by the love of men and women, now long forgotten, who would not accept tyranny at any price.

And the young nation grew to adolescence. In this period of its growth, it was torn in half by the divergent philosophies, and weak from loss of blood, its wounds healed slowly. But nourished by a strong faith in God and its principles of private enterprise, private property rights, states' rights, and respect for human dignity, the scars of civil war all but completely faded, and the century-old nation matured to become a giant among nations.

Many were envious of the wealth and prosperity of the vibrant, burgeoning republic. While Americans sang of "spacious skies," "amber waves of grain," and "fruited plains," nations without America's abundance of freedom and plenty cried out for food to feed their starving masses, and multitudes flocked to the shores of the one nation which promised every individual an opportunity to reach his full potential.

The greedy came not with outstretched hands, but with clenched fists. But America, with unprecedented industrial muscles developed through the system of private enterprise, and with an unyielding spirit born of a long life of freedom, turned back every aggressor and remained the greatest nation of all time.

But then, with a full belly, weary of war and confident that the land and the hard-won freedom were secure, the giant slept. The American people grew apathetic. They stored away their feelings of patriotism along with the flags they once waved proudly. Politicians became followers rather than leaders, and as crime swept the nation, government failed in its first responsibility, that of protecting the lives and property of its citizens. The people ceased to be secure in their homes and safe on the streets.

The people surrendered public education, and a million times more important, they surrendered their children, the nation's most precious resource, to a federal "police state," which acted without constitutional authority in stealing away the rights and freedoms of America's children and their parents.

America turned from God, grew self-righteous, and began playing God rather than praying to Him, and communism, drug addiction, pornography and immorality ate steadily away at the moral and spiritual strength of the nation.

When tyrants came and nudged him with riots, anarchy, crime, war, and threat of war, the giant only mumbled, "okay," rather than rising to fight.

And so, gradually, communism and socialism replaced capitalism and freedom. Private property rights were abolished a little at a time, and the Constitution of the United States was re-written by judicial tyrants and bureaucratic dictators until ultimately, it became totally meaningless and was discarded.

Human dignity and personal initiative were gradually eroded and replaced with government handout programs until, finally, every citizen received a government paycheck, and none remained to produce the needed wealth.

Faith in God was replaced by faith in man, faith in government, faith in political parties, and faith in immortality of the United States of America.

In his last moments, the giant opened his eyes. In one final, valiant effort, he tried to get back to his feet, but he was kicked back down by the iron boot of tyranny.

His last words were, "Don't give up hope. All we need is more dollars . . . just a few more dollars, . . . just a few more dollars . . ."

May the greatest nation the world has ever known rest in peace.

## UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

### HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the city of New Britain, Conn., in my Sixth District, is experiencing a critical unemployment problem with over 6,200 unemployed persons representing 12 percent of the labor market. Seventy percent of the unemployed are heads of households. The statistics are truly startling.

In an attempt to alleviate the problem, Mayor Stanley J. Pac has conducted

under the Emergency Employment Act an in-depth analysis of the unemployment situation in New Britain. The mayor is to be commended for his imaginative and worthwhile use of EEA funds. For the analysis of the problem has provided the background material necessary to develop projects and programs that will be of benefit in reducing unemployment in New Britain.

On February 25, it was my pleasure to cosponsor with Mayor Pac a conference in New Britain at which Federal, State, and local government agency representatives, business and labor leaders came together to discuss the report and make appropriate recommendations. It is our strong conviction that stepped-up intergovernmental cooperation is the most effective way to translate Mayor Pac's detailed unemployment report finding into constructive programs. Indeed, all of us are working for the objective of creating more jobs and improving the quality of life in New Britain.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting in the Record a statistical profile of unemployment in New Britain, along with Mayor Pac's preface to the study. The analysis includes the identification of those unemployed, the number of heads of household, number of

veterans, occupational skills, and other pertinent information.

The analysis follows:

#### STATISTICAL PROFILE OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN NEW BRITAIN, CONN., FEBRUARY 25, 1972

Today's conference has been called to discuss the almost unprecedented economic and unemployment crisis to face the city of New Britain in over twenty years. Historically, it must be said that this city has, for too long a time, been overly dependent upon the defense and aerospace industries for its survival. As a consequence, far ranging national cutbacks have all but crippled our local economy and involuntarily "benched" a staggering segment of the professional, technical, structural and machine trade groups which constitute our city's greatest asset . . . its highest skilled labor force.

The enclosed material well illustrates this staggering joblessness which pervades our labor ranks. They are a result of an in-depth study of unemployment in our city by the staff of the public employment program.

The purpose of this research effort was to accurately number and define unemployment in New Britain, and to analyze the resulting data in order to develop sound action proposals aimed at combating the unemployment problem.

Raw data for this study was gathered from employment application card files at the Connecticut State Employment Office in New Britain.

As evidenced by the results, this city is faced with a problem that is just too big for us to cope with at the local level.

	Percent of category	Percent of total New Britain unemployed	Percent of labor market unemployed		Percent of category	Percent of total New Britain unemployed	Percent of labor market unemployed
I. Unemployed (Jan. 21, 1972):				V. Unemployed in excess of 52 weeks	867	14	11
(1) Females	2,715	43	36	VI. Combined veterans unemployed:			
(2) Males	3,562	57	47	(1) Veterans (V)	710	59	9
Total	16,277	100	83	(2) Special veterans (SV) and Vietnam era	499	41	7
II. Head of household unemployed:				Total	1,209	19	16
(1) Females	824	19	11	VII. Labor market area unemployed:			
(2) Males	3,555	81	47	(1) New Britain	6,277		17
Total	4,379	70	58	(2) Plainville	488	6.4	83
III. Minority group unemployed:				(3) Berlin	404	5.3	
(1) Spanish	453	52	6	(4) Other	400	5.3	17
(2) Nonwhite	420	48	6	Total	7,569		
(3) Oriental	4						
(4) American Indian	1						
Total	878	14	12				
IV. Disadvantaged unemployed:							
(1) Spanish	175	23	2.5				
(2) Nonwhite	162	21	2.5				
(3) White	426	56	5				
Total	763	12	10				

<sup>1</sup> New Britain unemployed, city of New Britain only: Represents 14.2-percent unemployment rate in labor market area, New Britain labor market area employment equals 43,960.

#### OCCUPATIONAL GROUP OF UNEMPLOYED (JAN. 21, 1972)

Group	Amount	Percent of unemployed
1. Professional, technical and managerial	428	7
2. Clerical and sales	1,251	20
3. Service	594	10
4. Farming, fishing and forestry	48	1
5. Processing	183	3
6. Machine trades	1,452	23
7. Bench work	777	13
8. Structural work	878	14
9. Miscellaneous	576	9
Total unemployed in New Britain	6,277	100

#### CITY OF NEW BRITAIN OCCUPATIONAL GROUP OF UNEMPLOYED VETERANS (Jan. 21, 1972)

Group	Amount	Percent of unemployed veterans
1. Professional, technical, and managerial	135	11
2. Clerical and sales	164	13
3. Service	80	7
4. Farming, fishing, and forestry	8	1
5. Processing	32	3
6. Machine trades	214	18
7. Bench trades	37	3
8. Structural work	403	33
9. Miscellaneous	136	11
Total, unemployed veterans	1,209	100

#### CITY OF NEW BRITAIN OCCUPATIONAL GROUP OF UNEMPLOYED MINORITIES (JAN. 21, 1972)

Group	Amount	Percent of minority unemployed
1. Professional, technical, and managerial	21	2
2. Clerical and sales	106	12
3. Service	125	14
4. Farming, fishing, and forestry	7	1
5. Processing	68	8
6. Machine trades	201	23
7. Benchwork	129	15
8. Structural work	95	11
9. Miscellaneous	126	14
Total, minority group unemployed	878	100



**City of New Britain—College educated unemployed\***

Still attending:	
Business administration	17
Education	8
Accounting	4
English	4
Sociology	4
Liberal arts	4
History	3
Math	3
Art	2
Economics	2
Psychology	2
Data sciences	1
Science	1
Physical education	1
Police administration	1
Communications	1
Merchandizing	1
Marketing	1
Interior design	1
Total (1 percent of total)	61

**College graduates:**

BS-BA degrees:	
Psychology	7
Economics	5
Sociology	4
History	3
Math	3
Physical education	3
Biology	2
Drama	2
Education	2
Political science	1
Medical	1
Physics	1
Chemistry	1
Geography	1
Liberal arts	1
Music	1
Languages	1
Management	1
Marketing	1
Total unemployed holding BS or BA degrees	41

**MS and MA degrees:**

Economics	1
Math	1
Education	1
History	1
Physics	1
Counseling	1
Total unemployed holding MS or MA degrees	6

PHD degrees: Chemistry	2
Total of unemployed holding degrees (.008 percent)	49

\*These statistics reflect only those unemployed individuals whose college major differed from their stated occupation.

**City of New Britain—Technical, professional, managerial unemployed**

Technical:	
Mechanical draftsman	7
Draftsman	11
Product designer	18
Design checker	2
Manufacturing engineer	3
Assistant engineer	6
Time study engineer	8
Electronic engineer	3
Electronic technician	5
Engineering scheduler	1
Engineer	6
Chemical engineer	1
Radio engineer	2
Marine engineer	1
Design engineer	2
Laboratory tester	6

Process planner	4
Systems analyst	3
Computer sciences	8
Metallurgist	1
Surveyor, construction	4
Radio operator	2
Medical technician	4
Aerial photographer	1

Total, technical (1.75 percent) --- 109

**Professional:**

Architect	2
Financial analyst	4
Credit analyst	1
Controller	1
Economist	4
Assessor	1
Accountant	21
Purchasing agent	9
Marketing specialist	3
Sales/service	5
Mathematician	4
Chemist	4
Physicist	1
Biologist	3
Social scientist	2
Political scientist	2
Lawyer	1
Security officer	1
Revenue agent	1
Commercial designer	7
Fashion artist	2
Musician	1
Communications	9
Shipmate	1
Athlete	2
Physical education/sports instructor	4
Teacher	50
Teacher's aide	2
Director/special education	1
Teacher/mentally retarded	1
Psychology/counseling	7
Employment interviewer	2
Interpreter	1
Librarian	2
Medical/dental assistant	12
Nurse	6
Pharmacist	2
Health inspector	1
Airplane pilot	2
Administrative assistant	8
Administrative contractor	2
Social worker	19
Total, professional (3.5 percent) --	217

**Managerial:**

Manager	65
Manager trainee	17
Company president	4
Production manager	3
Superintendent/construction	7
Supervisor	5
General foreman	1

Total, managerial (1.75 percent) --- 102

Total, technical, professional, and managerial unemployed (7 percent) --- 428

**CITY OF NEW BRITAIN, DEFINITION OF AGE GROUP OF UNEMPLOYED**

	Number	Percentage
Age group:		
16 to 20	632	10
21 to 29	2,069	33
30 to 39	917	15
40 to 49	1,071	17
50 to 59	1,320	21
60 and over	268	4
Over 45:		
Male	1,007	
Female	973	

**TECHNICAL/PROFESSIONAL UNEMPLOYED<sup>1</sup>**

Category:	Amount
Medical <sup>2</sup>	39
Computer science	14
Management	8
Psychiatry	6
Electronic technology	5
Mechanical	4
Education	4
Language interpreter	3
Photographer	3
Dental	2
Communications	2
Accounting	2
Personnel	2
Banking	1
Expeditor	1
Tax examiner	1
Market research analyst	1
Journalism	1
Total	59

<sup>1</sup> This is a list of unemployed individuals who possess skills and training in addition to their primary occupations.

<sup>2</sup> 85 percent of this figure is composed of nurses aides.

**ARMY HELICOPTER GUNSHIP**

**HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO**

OF CONNECTICUT

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most urgently needed items for the Army's inventory of defense systems is the helicopter gunship.

A diversified Army helicopter gunship is needed to counter some very serious threats. For instance, in the European theater the Warsaw Pact and Soviet forces maintain a superior margin of mobility because of a greater number of armored vehicles than NATO has. However, NATO and the United States could offset or balance that edge by having mobility in the form of helicopter attack units supported, of course, by low-flying helicopter gunships.

In guerrilla warfare or counterinsurgency, the Air Force close air support systems cannot flush out the enemy as capably as a helicopter gunship can. The helicopter gunship can fly along contours at low altitudes, change to slow speeds, and, of course, move vertically and turn about in a way that provides a more accurate and timely response to the needs of ground troops. The infantry soldier's survival can be further assured.

Whereas the Air Force close air support systems can interdict from high altitudes and destroy generally defined targets, which is necessary, they cannot identify and segregate individual targets during periods of harried close combat without the support of specialized forward air controllers and a sophisticated communications system, while the helicopter gunship can provide support almost instantaneously. Helicopter gunships can support small but highly important patrols or other small engagements when it would appear too costly to provide the Air Force systems.

A helicopter gunship rides "shotgun" during an air assault. After the troops are on the ground, the gunship continues to support by fire. It stays close to the unit it is supporting and can perform as a protective lead element, or a rear guard, or it can defend the flanks. The

Air Force close air support systems must fly too fast. The main concerns of the Air Force close air support systems should be the larger obstacles which are the main impediments to an infantry unit's progress, which is why they would maintain much napalm and large rockets.

The gunship can land in an emergency. It can change its role and evacuate wounded if necessary. It can aid the commander of ground troops to reconnoiter. It can serve as a command ship.

The V-STOL quality gives the system a broad range of advantages that fit the needs of the infantry. I sincerely hope that the request for funds for the Army's helicopter gunship will be supported by this Congress.

## THE GAPS IN OUR AIR DEFENSE

### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion Claude Witze, senior editor of Air Force magazine, is one of the most knowledgeable and reliable reporters on the Washington scene, and I have had the privilege of inserting several of his past articles in the RECORD.

Today I want to insert an in-depth report entitled, "The Gaps in Our Air Defense," a subject in which we all should be interested.

As you know, I immediately launched an investigation into the surprise landing of a Cuban plane in New Orleans on October 26 of last year to determine how it was able to enter our airspace undetected.

My Armed Services Investigating Subcommittee learned that there was a 1,500-mile gap in our air defense system along the southern border of the United States. Fortunately, I was able to get a commitment from Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird a short time after my subcommittee report was made public that a radar would be installed at Whitehouse, Va., to plug that gap.

Mr. Witze's article deals with our entire air defense situation, and I insert it at this point:

#### THE GAPS IN OUR AIR DEFENSE

(By Claude Witze)

About two and a half years ago, Gen. Seth J. McKee, Commander in Chief of the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD), was asked by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to evaluate the impact of a proposed shutdown of half a dozen long-range radars, then part of the network guarding the USA from attacks by hostile bombers.

The General's reply was that if six radars had to be closed down, for budget reasons, they should be selected from the area along the Gulf of Mexico, because that was the least critical area.

However, he added, "we will be vulnerable to embarrassment by undetected and unchallenged flights entering the U.S. . . ."

"When was that written?" General McKee was asked last November by Rep. F. Edward Hébert, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

The witness gave the date as September 4, 1969.

"You certainly have been embarrassed," the Congressman continued.

"Yes, Sir," was the General's answer.

The General was not alone. Mr. Hébert has been embarrassed, too, most of all last October 26, when a Russian-built AN-24 transport, out of Havana, Cuba, landed at Molsant International Airport in New Orleans. Mr. Hébert represents New Orleans in Congress, and national defense is his personal legislative bailiwick.

The Armed Services chairman had been upset previously, on October 5, 1969, about a month after General McKee wrote to the JCS. That was the day an armed Cuban MIG-17 flew undetected from Havana to Homestead Air Force Base in Florida and landed while the Presidential aircraft, Air Force One, was parked nearby.

Both incidents resulted in examinations by Mr. Hébert's committee. It was only two weeks after the New Orleans surprise that his Armed Services Investigating Subcommittee, chaired by the chairman himself, called a hearing.

The report on that session came up with these conclusions:

1. Existing US air defense is virtually useless. It is more concept than actuality.

2. In a series of economy moves, beginning in 1963, our detection and intercept capabilities have rapidly deteriorated despite a steadily increasing threat posed by submarine-launched missiles and newly developed Soviet long-range bombers.

3. Because of the failure to maintain a viable US air defense system, sovereign US airspace cannot be effectively protected from intrusions by foreign aircraft, civil or military.

4. A 1,500-mile opening in our air defense exists on the southern US perimeter between Florida and California. The area is virtually devoid of military surveillance and air defense command and control.

5. The Cuban plane incidents of 1969 and 1971 demonstrate that any foreign power can, at will, violate the southern US airspace without detection or interception. More importantly, they suggest that any enemy having the capability to attack from the south would be immune from detection and interception.

#### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee made two recommendations to the Secretary of Defense:

1. Accelerate the upgrading of existing outmoded and ineffective continental air defenses by inclusion of the Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS), the Over-the-horizon Backscatter Radar (OTH-B), and the Improved Manned Interceptor (IMI).

2. Utilize, as an interim measure for southern air defenses, the OTH-B system presently available for detection and surveillance.

If Mr. Hébert seems unduly alarmed, there are more reasons for it than two airplane sorties from Cuba. The truth is that Soviet bomber flights along the fringes of North America are routine. Alaska, Canada, and Iceland are common territories of interest and the Russian flights are monitored by American and Canadian interceptors. Our Defense Department has a policy of keeping silent about this, although the Canadian government shows little reticence in this regard. At NORAD Headquarters in Colorado Springs, Colo., there is a file of motion-picture films, taken from accompanying interceptors, of innumerable examples of Russian bombers on probing flights.

General McKee makes it clear to visitors at his command post at Ent AFB, Colo., that the two Cuban flights are different only in that they terminated in the continental US. Soviet bombers fly over our fleets in the Atlantic and Pacific and skirt the continent

with regularity. They are checking NORAD's response time. They are recording the frequencies of our command-and-control systems and radars. They are giving Russian bomber crews realistic training. They are observing our naval activity.

And NORAD is not alone in facing these feints. Reports from Europe say Soviet aircraft are probing NATO defenses in the same manner. Almost daily they are testing NATO's ability to react. The British Royal Air Force sees a great deal of Russian Bear and Badger bombers, many of them headed for Cuba. In Castro's country they not only can receive fuel and maintenance, but they profit from the experience of navigating and operating at the edge of the United States.

Like General McKee, Mr. Hébert is interested in broader aspects of the problem than those dramatized by the Cuban act in his own front yard.

In his report on the most recent hearing, the chairman points out there has been little change in our concept of air defense since the late 1950s, when Russian bombers were the only threat. Since then, the missile has assumed stature as a strategic weapon, "although the bomber threat has not significantly diminished."

At the same time, the report says, to save money, air defense forces on the continent have been cut sixty percent. It fixes 1963 as the start of this degeneration. As money became scarcer, the decision was made to deplete the southern defense ring in favor of the northern borders.

#### SURPRISED REACTION

Out in Colorado Springs, a component neighbor of NORAD is USAF's Aerospace Defense Command, headed by Lt. Gen. Thomas K. McGehee. General McGehee sounds a little surprised when he talks about the reaction in Congress to a couple of episodes in which the southern defense ring has been penetrated by airplanes from Cuba. He points out that there was little objection in Congress back in 1963 when the first steps were taken. According to the General's recollection, the first surveillance radar to be dismantled was in Texas. And the only Congressman to complain with vehemence was Edgar F. Foreman, a Texas Republican and Armed Services Committeeman. When the radar was taken out, the hole was called "Foreman's Gap."

Now the gap is about 1,500 miles long, and the Cubans know it can be penetrated with ease. The aircraft that landed in New Orleans last October—Mr. Hébert says it was flown in by Fidel Castro's personal pilot—was designated Cubana 887. Early on the morning of the flight, the Havana Air Traffic Control Center filed an instrument flight rule (IFR) flight plan for a proposed trip from Havana to New Orleans. The message designated the flight as Cubana Special One, not Cubana 887.

This flight plan was filed directly with the Federal Aviation Administration's switching center at Kansas City, Mo., and relayed at once to centers at Houston and Miami as well as the New Orleans International tower. Word also was passed on to NORAD, FAA headquarters, and the State Department. The plan called for Cubana Special One to depart Havana at 9:00 a.m. with estimated arrival in New Orleans at 11:59 a.m. Intended airspeed was 240 miles an hour at an altitude of 14,000 feet.

The Cubans violated a couple of regulations right at the outset. There is a rule, instigated by the State Department and presumably enforced by FAA, that says any flight from Cuba is required to file its flight plan five days in advance. This wasn't the case and when FAA asked Havana if Cubana Special One had taken off, FAA was told it had not departed. In fact, Cubana 887 had already been in the air about forty minutes. On top of this, at no time was FAA told how



many passengers were aboard or their identification. Mr. Hébert says one of those aboard was the chief of Castro's central intelligence organization.

"There is no evidence," the Armed Services report says, "that any of the US authorities advised the Cuban authorities that the flight plan filed by Havana failed to conform to US requirements in at least two important respects and, therefore, would not be approved."

#### STICKY MATTER

On the morning of October 26 there was another sticky matter in the news about Cuba that obviously had a bearing on how FAA handled what turned out to be Cubana 877. Washington was concerned about an American Airlines 747 and 235 passengers that had been hijacked to Havana and kept there more than two days. James Murphy, Director of the Office of Air Transportation Security, was the man in charge of the problem on the morning of October 26. Under questioning, he was asked whether he challenged the Cubans when they failed to give five days' notice for the flight.

"We were having a hard time with the Cubans that particular day," Mr. Murphy replied. "The night before—because of the American 747 and 235 people on the ground—the Havana Center told the Miami Center to stop bugging them. They didn't want any more transmissions. We tried to be very selective in communicating with Havana Center until it really counted."

Mr. Murphy said he waited until fifty-three minutes after the flight plan called for Cubana Special One to have taken off, then ordered Miami to ask whether the aircraft had taken off or not. He suspected, by this time, that Cubana Special One had something to do with the hijacked airplane and the release of the Americans aboard. He said, "We were urging the State Department and other elements to treat the Cubans with courtesy and consideration on their arrival" because he did not want to jeopardize the release of the 747 and the Americans aboard.

As for Cubana Special One, the inquiry found Havana replied to Mr. Murphy's query at 9:54 a.m., saying the aircraft had not departed. Later evidence showed Cubana 877 had taken off at 7:15 a.m. and was in the air for thirty-five minutes before the flight plan was filed. It arrived in New Orleans at 11:17 a.m., nearly an hour earlier than the arrival time estimated in the flight plan for Special One.

The first knowledge US officials had of an impending arrival was a request for landing instructions received at New Orleans International at 10:57 a.m. The aircraft identified itself as Cubana 877 and said it was twenty-five miles away at 4,000 feet. Cubana 877 was cleared for landing at 11:12 a.m. There is no further reference to Cubana Special One.

Who was on board? Twenty-one Cubans who said they came to town to attend an International Sugar Cane Technological Conference. In addition to arriving without an approved flight plan, they had no US visas for admission to this country.

The uninvited and unannounced Cuban guests were put up, for a couple of days, at a Hilton Hotel adjacent to the New Orleans airport. Then they were moved, to quarters that were less expensive to the US government. They spent the next half-dozen days at the Belle Chasse Naval Air Station, where they were bedded down in—of all places—the F. Howard Hébert Bachelor Officers Quarters. From here, they were sent home, without a taste or smell of sugar.

#### STATE NOT SPARED

The committee report does not spare the State Department. Kenneth M. Smith, FAA Deputy Administrator, testified that "we got nowhere" in first efforts to find out whether any visas had been issued.

An hour and twenty minutes after the proposed departure of Cubana Special One, the word came back from State that visa applications for the sugar-cane conference had been denied about a month earlier.

As a matter of fact, the State Department had known for over a year that Cubans were making a determined effort to attend the conference. The Armed Services Committee argues that State "should have brought this information promptly to the attention of all agencies concerned with national security, in order to insure a ready response to a possible illegal entry. However, although the problem was discussed over a period of months, there is no evidence that either NORAD or CONAD was advised of the pending problem or that any contingency plan had been agreed upon."

Further, in discussing NORAD's participation, the report concludes that it was exactly eight minutes after the Cubans had deplaned at New Orleans that the command had a call from the State Department representative at the National Military Command Center. The message: Due to Soviet Prime Minister Kosygin's arrival in Cuba that day, the Havana airport was closed and the proposed flight—of Cubana Special One, later Cubana 877—could not take off.

"Under these circumstances," the report says, "it would not be too difficult to understand why NORAD might have been less than certain as to what, if anything, it should do."

General McKee's attitude was stated, loud and clear, on the stand. He was asked whether he was of the opinion that the Cubans really were headed for the conference on sugar, or "did they have something else in mind?"

The answer was that from the way the flight was conducted and the fact that it was not detected "indicates to me that they underflew our radar, which did give coverage in the Cuban area. Also, since they didn't report in at the mandatory reporting points as they should have done, it is my opinion they didn't want us to know they were there until they arrived."

The General was reminded that even though he doesn't have the equipment, he has the responsibility.

"If they had come in, let's say, and dropped bombs or something or other, you would be the fellow that would be on the pan, would you not?"

The General replied this was most likely.

General McKee raised a point of his own about the State Department's requirement for five days' notification of unscheduled flights from Cuba to airports in the U.S. There had been a long discussion about it, and the USAF captain who got the first word on October 26 testified that he did not know of the requirement.

"That response might have led you to believe that others of us were aware of that requirement," General McKee told the hearing. "The facts are that I was not aware of it, and I have been unable to determine that anyone in NORAD was aware of it."

#### JCS CHAIRMAN

There were two star witnesses heard on the subject of air defense capabilities. In addition to General McKee, the committee had a long session with Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, Chairman of the JCS.

The General reviewed the role of CINCNORAD and his responsibilities to the President, the Prime Minister of Canada, the JCS, the Secretary of Defense, and their military counterparts in Canada. NORAD is binational; it uses the strength of USAF's Aerospace Defense Command (ADC), the Canadian Forces Air Defense Command, and the U.S. Army Air Defense Command.

Back in 1958, when NORAD was established, it had substantial forces. What has happened since then is shown in this tabulation:

#### NORAD WEAPONS

	1960	1971
Nike/Hawk batteries.....	270	63
Fighter squadrons (Reg.).....	65	14
Fighter squadrons (ANG).....	38	15
Bomarc squadrons.....	9	7
Total.....	382	99

By June 30, 1972, the fourteen regular interceptor squadrons will be cut to nine and, by June 30, 1973, reduced again to seven, half of the 1971 strength. The Fiscal 1973 proposed budget, sent to Congress in January, also indicates the Army's surface-to-air batteries will be depleted to only twenty-one. The number of Bomarc squadrons already stands at five instead of seven.

#### NORAD RADARS

	1960	1971
Long-range radars.....	187	99
Gap fillers.....	105	0
Total.....	292	99

In the same time period, personnel assigned for air defense of the continent were reduced by about sixty percent, from 246,720 to 94,575.

In his testimony, General McKee emphasized that he does not have forces to cover our southern approaches. There are from four to six interceptors on alert at Homestead AFB in Florida. He said that in the past year the 20th NORAD region, which is responsible for air defense of the southeastern U.S., has detected a total of 176 unknown aircraft.

"I can say," he told the committee, "that our anti-bomber defense systems are obsolescent and generally nonexistent along our southern border. We still have precisely the same types of weapons that we had in the early 1960s, but they are now ten years older, and we have them in far fewer numbers. In spite of this phase down in weapons and personnel, CINCNORAD's responsibilities have not diminished."

#### PRIORITY DEPLOYMENT

Later, the General said he must use what he has on a priority basis. Russia has the capability to threaten our survival and that is why his limited arsenal is deployed the way it is. He said the master plan drawn up in 1967 was based on the premise that the savings achieved by phasing down the system would amortize the procurement of a more modern defense force.

It was repeatedly pointed out that the decisions to phase down air defense are made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and "at a higher level." NORAD gets its orders from the JCS. The Hébert hearing called Admiral Moorer, JCS Chairman, to testify.

The Admiral, always a blunt witness on Capitol Hill, made no bones of the fact that "fiscal realities" dictate some JCS decisions. He said the big threat from Russia lies in their nuclear missile capability; their bombers could strike targets in the southern states, but better options are in hand at this time.

So far as Cuba is concerned, Admiral Moorer testified that it has Russian MIG-17 and MIG-21 aircraft, the latter with an operating radius that would permit attacks no further away than Florida. American deterrent power, the Admiral believes, is enough to eliminate the risk of such an assault. He indicated the JCS still stands in support of the air defense modernization program drafted in 1967. Under questioning he gave the anticipated operational dates for the OTH-B, IMI, and AWACS projects. The dates were deleted by the censors.

For the improved interceptor, Admiral Moorer suggested, probably for the first time in public, that either the Navy's Grumman F-14 or the USAF McDonnell Douglas F-15 could fill the bill. In Colorado Springs, General McGehee indicated to this reporter that ADC has been working on a proposed modification of the new USAF aircraft, the F-15 that can fill the requirement later in the 1970s.

In his testimony, Admiral Moorer somehow did not seem to share the distress of General McKee and Congressman Hébert over their embarrassment at the violation of our airspace and regulations by Cubana 877. He was asked what he would do if he had more money. "Would you fill this gap as a top priority, or put it somewhere else?"

The Admiral replied that he would favor more modernization.

"You might procure the AWACS aircraft, for example, when it becomes available, so that it could be redeployed quickly to establish a barrier along the southern area in order to prevent these single-plan run-ins.

"I think you are always going to have the possibility that a single plane flying on the deck can penetrate almost any system that you could develop. It would be very expensive indeed to build up a system in this area that [would be] 100 percent leakproof. It would be very expensive for the purpose of intercepting one or two aircraft a year, if you consider these priorities that I have discussed.

"On the other hand, I realize fully the psychological impact and the need for the United States to protect this airspace. It is a highly desirable capability, as I have said. But at the rate we have been reducing the defense budget, and viewing at the same time the condition of the current air defense forces, I would have to look at the problem in totality to see just where we should put the money."

It was suggested by Rep. Samuel S. Stratton of New York that the Cubans might attempt an attack against a US target and Russia would intervene by threatening nuclear war if the US retaliated.

The Admiral said he does not think the Kremlin would be willing to trade Moscow for New York in order to support Castro "on such a junket as these MIGs might indulge in." He puts his faith in continued deterrent power.

#### STORED RADAR

It was while Admiral Moorer was testifying that the inquiry learned there is a backscatter radar (OTH-B) in storage. In early December, at the final session of the Armed Services hearing, witnesses were called from the Office of Naval Research and the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. (ITT) to discuss the status of this project. A vast amount of the testimony was deleted by Pentagon censors, upon publication of the transcript. What was learned is best summarized in the committee report:

"The brightest spot in this depressing picture was supplied by certain military and civilian witnesses, who testified that Over-the-Horizon Backscatter (OTH-B) radars are in operation overseas today, and have been for some time, and such a unit is now available to provide immediate detection capabilities along our southern perimeter," the report says.

"Experiments with OTH-B detection systems have been conducted since the late 1940s; but at that time results were inconclusive as to their value for military purposes. In the late 1950s, greater attention was directed toward the development of OTH capabilities when the Navy proved it could detect nuclear testing. In the early 1960s, the Navy constructed an OTH-B and began reporting missile launches, as well as nuclear testing.

"Later, techniques were developed to detect aircraft and cruise missiles that can be launched from submarines. The operational capability of OTH was proven in the deployment of such radars overseas. Confirmation of the OTH capabilities has led to plans to develop a sophisticated OTH-B system for US air defenses to be operational in the mid-1970s. However, a used system, which is now available, can provide interim detection capabilities along our southern perimeter."

The report continued:

"Estimates provided by industry witnesses indicated that coverage of the Florida Straits, and practically the entire Gulf of Mexico by the existing OTH-B radar, can be achieved in six months. They also testified that the first-year costs, including refurbishment, installation, and site preparation, as well as one year of operational manning, are estimated at \$5.7 million.

"The subcommittee urges the Department of Defense to take immediate action to install the presently available OTH-B at a location that would close the gap in our southern defense perimeter. The subcommittee also urges the rapid development, procurement, and deployment of the improved OTH-B to insure the integrity of our entire CONUS defense detection capability. This, of course, is but the first step in the critically needed upgrading of our CONUS defense which, in addition, must also include the new Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) and Improved Manned Interceptor (IMI).

"These two systems can also be operational by the mid-seventies and, when used in connection with the OTH-B, can give this country real defensive security. This must be accomplished with all speed, for each passing day makes more dangerous 'the calculated risk' which has been permitted in the name of economy."

What the report failed to point out in this otherwise revealing summary of OTH-B capabilities is that the new advance in radar contributes to more than our defense against intrusions by airplanes, be they bombers or irritating little flights like that of Cubana 877. The OTH-B, once fully operational, will be part of the continent's strategic warning system.

#### A NEW SOVIET BOMBER

In recent months, the Russian surge to achieve nuclear superiority has been well publicized. *Jane's Weapons Systems*, published last November, reported that the Soviet Union has "overtaken, and in some cases surpassed, the West in developing missiles and other weaponry." More recently, there was the appearance of a new bomber, named "Backfire" by NATO. *Jane's* says it is supersonic with a low-altitude capability at no loss of speed. Also, that "the approximately equivalent US B-1 bomber project is only at the mockup stage, while Russia has two Backfire prototypes flying."

In Colorado Springs, air defense experts argue that the Russian aircraft now in use for offshore missions near North America are a credible threat to the United States. Heaviest is the TU-95 Bear, with an unrefueled range of about 8,000 miles. It can carry a 25,000-pound bomb load.

The commercial version of this airplane, the TU-114, regularly flies nonstop from Havana to Moscow. Bear bombers fly nonstop Moscow to Havana in seventeen hours—that trip has become routine. They are turbo-prop.

There is a smaller, medium-range Soviet bomber called the Badger, frequently seen off Alaska, and a supersonic medium-range bomber named Blinder. The Defense Department estimates there are 750 aircraft in these two classes, plus 110 Bears and ninety Bisons, an older all-jet bomber.

The credibility of this threat is accepted

at NORAD and obviously is of major concern to the Armed Services Committees of both the House and Senate. No report is complete, however, without reference to the skepticism that prevails in other key areas.

It suffices to call attention to last year's hearings of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations of the Senate Appropriations Committee. The Chairman is Allen J. Ellender, who hails from Louisiana and is a political neighbor of F. Edward Hébert.

Mr. Ellender, who has visited Russia and considers himself something of an expert on that country, its intentions and capabilities, says "they are not building bombers to any extent." He says the force they have is old and he fears that "the moment we start building the B-1 . . . they are going to go back and try to imitate us.

"I have contended all along that we have put Russia on the defensive for the last fifteen or twenty years. That is what we have done. That is why you see so many Russian ships in the Mediterranean. We have been in the Mediterranean for twenty-two years, and they just recently have come there."

The hearings were held last April, but the censored transcript was released only about the first of this year. In it, Chairman Ellender engaged in exchanges on Russian military stature with Grant L. Hansen, Assistant USAF Secretary for Research and Development, and Lt. Gen. Otto J. Glasser, Deputy Chief of Staff for R&D.

Mr. Hansen pointed out that the F-106 air defense interceptor is fourteen years old. That situation must be remedied and other R&D money for the next few years must go to finish development of the B-1, the F-15, the A-X, and AWACS. There are other items essential to our defense, including better surface-to-air missiles, optically aimed weapons, improved reconnaissance devices, unmanned observation platforms, and relays for guidance and control. So far, there is no development program for the IMI.

Mr. Ellender's response was to recall the history of the North American B-70 bomber. He said the project was stopped because the Russians improved their high-altitude defense system, which also forced the US to alter B-52 tactics and put the aircraft on the deck. "How do we know," the chairman asked, "they won't develop a low-altitude defense system that will counter the B-1's low-level capabilities?"

The response was that the B-1 will be versatile; it can go high and fast, and go low, using sophisticated penetration aids.

Facing General Glasser, who outlined the case for OTH-B and AWACS, the Appropriations Chairman challenged the spending of "tremendous sums" for a warning system aimed at Russian bombers, arguing that it escalates the arms race. Again, he depreciated the threat from Russian bombers.

General Glasser testified that the OTH-B proposed funding for Fiscal 1972 was \$3.6 million, added to prior funding of \$8.6 million. Then there was this revealing exchange:

Chairman ELLENDER: In view of the limited threat against the continental United States, just why do you feel it necessary to spend all of these funds to develop new aircraft warning systems?

General GLASSER: As you know, we have hard evidence of a bomber prototype, which is well advanced in the Soviet Union and which could be in production long before we would be able to put in these reactive defenses.

Chairman ELLENDER: That has been going on for several years?

General GLASSER: Yes, Sir.

Chairman ELLENDER: When we develop a new weapons system, the Russians emulate us or develop a countermeasure to our action. The development of the B-1 may well ac-



celerate the development of more sophisticated Russian bombers. Don't you agree?

General GLASSER: I am not in a position to agree with you, but I would have to point out that it would be reckless of us to engage in unilateral disarmament.

This discussion, essentially about the chicken and the egg, is going to be continued in 1972. Considering the opinions of Mr. Hébert, Generals McKee, McGehee, and Glasser, Admiral Moore, and Mr. Ellender, the debate is not likely to wane.

The right answer could be dictated in Moscow.

Until it is, the NORAD command and Congressman Hébert appear to be the only principals truly embarrassed by such events as the flight of Cubana 877.

# THE NEW YORK TIMES AND NEW YORK POST SCORE PRESIDENT NIXON'S BUSING STAND

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's message to Congress concerning the busing of children to achieve racial balance in schools failed to provide the Nation with the leadership it needs to deal with this highly charged emotional issue. Instead of reminding the American people that a clearly established line of Supreme Court decisions, starting with *Brown* against Board of Education in 1954, requires the integration of schools and the dismantling of the dual school system, the President chose to align himself with those who make political capital out of racial distrust and discord.

The proposed moratorium on all new or additional busing orders would be a legislative usurpation of judicial power, which at the least would provoke a constitutional crisis. It is a direct assault upon the Supreme Court's desegregation decision and should be rejected.

Two of New York City's major newspapers, the *New York Times* and the *New York Post*, have in editorials on March 18 forthrightly scored the President's decision to extract maximum political capital from the busing issue.

Both of these editorials which point out how the President is confusing the issue, lucidly and cogently discuss the busing question; I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the *New York Times*, Mar. 18, 1972]

## FALSE BUSING CRISIS

President Nixon has snatched the anti-busing ball off the muddy field of Florida primary politics and is trying to carry it to a November touchdown, whatever the price in national division. In his televised address Mr. Nixon rejected demands for a Constitutional amendment to ban school busing, not because it would trivialize the Constitution, but only because "it takes too long."

With a strident appeal for "action now" that lent a President imprimatur to the hysteria already distorting this issue, Mr. Nixon has asked Congress to pass legislation that would "call an immediate halt to all new busing orders by Federal courts."

Far from adding perspective to the argument, the President further confuses it by inveighing against the busing of children over long distances to inferior schools "just

to meet some social planner's concept of what is considered to be the correct racial balance. . . . He wants to save a generation of children from the policies of those who are putting "primary emphasis on more busing rather than on better education."

All this paints an alarming picture of a reality that does not exist. No new legislation is required to prevent the courts from mandating racially balanced schools. In a unanimous ruling based on an opinion written by Chief Justice Burger last April, the Court upheld busing as a means of dismantling dual school systems. At the same time, however, the Court stated explicitly that it had neither mandated nor considered desirable the establishment of a racial balance or of any "fixed mathematical norms."

The Burger ruling stressed that, where there was no history of discrimination, "it might well be desirable to assign pupils to schools nearest their homes." It specifically questioned the wisdom and propriety of transporting children over long distances.

Thus, it is clear that the Supreme Court does not require the kind of indiscriminate busing Mr. Nixon wants to outlaw. No legislation is required to prohibit a Federal court from ordering what the Supreme Court has already declared undesirable. Mr. Nixon must surely know that the principal aim of desegregation is to allow children who have been confined to inferior schools to be given access to superior ones, and not vice versa. Many children moreover have long been bused over long distances, in order to maintain segregation.

The President's second proposal—the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1972—aims at improving schools now attended by poor children, in other words primarily the segregated schools. This is what desegregation was all about in the first place. It is in those districts which have failed in the nearly two decades since the historic *Brown* decision of 1954 either to desegregate or to improve the schools attended by black children that Federal courts have been driven to order busing.

There is little in the President's call for spending \$2.5 billion to upgrade poverty schools that is not already contained in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Regrettably, neither the Federal Government nor many state and local school authorities have shown the will and skill to put the act and the funds to effective use.

President Eisenhower made little secret of his personal coolness toward the 1954 desegregation ruling, but he enforced the law as defined by the Court to the limit of his Presidential power. When the Chief Executive now appeals for legislation to limit the authority of the judiciary, he tampers with the foundations of government under law; for he diminishes the capacity of the courts to gain voluntary and peaceful compliance for their rulings. Such compliance is never more vital than in times of deep social conflict. It is an asset not to be squandered for temporary political gain.

[From the *New York Post*, Mar. 18, 1972]

## THE POLITICS OF DISCORD

President Nixon's special message to Congress contains some elaboration and even modification of his televised address on school busing. But it does not alter its basic thrust. Mr. Nixon has clearly chosen to extort maximum political dividends from the tensions surrounding the living controversy and forfeited another chance to assert courageous moral leadership. In a situation that cried out for reason and reconciliation, he has let down many men, women—and children—who have been conscientiously striving to find an honorable common ground, including his own Senate leader, Hugh Scott (R-Pa.).

But before commenting on either his prose or his proposals, let us begin by saying it

would be a misfortune if Mr. Nixon's opponents were to fall into the trap of allowing him to convert this issue into the central argument of 1972.

The tragedy is that the busing controversy has been—and apparently will continue to be—a cruelly diversionary, divisive conflict. No matter how it is resolved in the legislative arena at this juncture, the Supreme Court will still be heard from. Mr. Nixon is deluding the country by suggesting that the program he outlined can be imposed overnight.

Moreover, and perhaps more important, regardless of the immediate legislative result, the deep unrest and frustration afflicting so much of America will remain essentially unchanged. The drug plague responsible for much of the nation's crime—inside and outside the schools—would not be remotely affected by the stoppage of the buses. No jobless Vietnam veteran would gain employment. Explosive economic inequities would be unaltered. And the distortion of national priorities embodied in the military budget would remain a flagrant example of conspicuous human waste.

Mr. Nixon could have performed a momentous mission by placing the problem in such perspective rather than injecting new emotionalism into the debate. He could have recognized and saluted the areas—especially in the South—in which busing has proved to be an entirely positive weapon in achieving both desegregation and quality education. He could have recalled the long, sad history of the busing of black children to maintain segregated schools.

But he did none of these things. While professing to discern the complexity of the problem, he offered simplistic—and largely spurious—answers little different from those George Wallace had proposed. He delivered a harsh blow to the thoughtful leaders of the black community who have been striving to resist the new tide of separatism in their own ranks. He derisively assailed the "social planners" whom he seemed to accuse of insensitivity to the unease of parents and of a mindless attachment for the busing process. But it was a Republican Chief Justice named Earl Warren who presided over the court in the celebrated case that is now the real center of the storm.

Mr. Nixon depicted himself once again as a man walking the "middle ground" between rival extremists. If that were truly his position, he would have backed the Scott-Mansfield amendment approved by the Senate.

That amendment essentially borrowed the language used by Chief Justice Burger last April when he declared objections to busing became valid "when the time or distance of travel is so great as to risk either the health of the children or significantly impinge on the educational process."

These words are responsive to the concern voiced by parents in situations where busing plans would expose children to manifestly hazardous areas and inferior schools. While such provisions might be subject to abuse, they appeared to reflect a consensus of moderate, responsible Senate opinion.

Mr. Nixon's moratorium is far closer to the essence of the rejected Griffin amendment and plainly raises grave issues of constitutionality. For while Griffin urged a permanent busing ban—rather than a moratorium—the principle of legislative usurpation is the same.

If the President had aligned himself with the Scott-Mansfield position and advanced a program for genuinely expanded school aid, he could have justly portrayed himself as a voice of restraint and affirmation. Instead he has chosen a course that invites repudiation by the Chief Justice he appointed. He has appeared to resurrect the doctrine of "separate but equal."

Perhaps worst of all, he has helped to promote the delusion that the country can find the way to peace and tranquillity by stopping

new buses for 15 months. He has set the stage for a long, bitter, distracting legislative struggle. That is the most melancholy aspect of this dismal interlude.

# JUDGMENT OF TV EXECUTIVES AND NEWSCASTERS QUESTIONED

## HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the judgment of television executives and newscasters was brought into question most ably recently in a speech delivered by Mr. J. L. Robertson, Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

His remarks deserve wide distribution, and for that reason I am inserting them at this point in the RECORD:

### THE CREDIBILITY CRISIS

(By J. L. Robertson)

In searching for a subject for my remarks here, it occurred to me that since, in the formulation of monetary policy, I have been in the front lines longer than anyone else—more than two decades—I should say something about the economy, perhaps pinpointing the mistakes of the past, explaining how we got to where we are, and indicating where we go from here. But the more I thought about it, the more certain I was that that objective was not a good one. At least with respect to where we go from here, the papers are full of prognostications—some by persons whose only qualification would seem to be an academic degree. I think all I need to say to you on that subject is that, at long last, the fallacious and enervating doctrines of "gradualism" and "benign neglect" have been discarded—unfortunately, at the cost of price and wage controls—and that we are now headed in the right direction. Given time, the psychological attitudes of businessmen and consumers will change for the better. The wisdom and steadfastness with which we formulate and adhere to sound monetary and fiscal policies, while awaiting those changes in attitude, will determine not only the extent to which we succeed in reducing both inflation and unemployment, but also the time when we can safely dispense with controls.

Having given up that objective, I turned to another. I thought perhaps the Hunt Commission Report would meet my needs. But the more I read that report, the more inappropriate it seemed, because the good and bad ideas are so intertwined and knotted together that it is almost impossible to unravel them. In this political year, I am sure Congress will not be able to do so. Why should I impose on your time to discuss them now? Besides, few of you have any doubts about my views on any portion of the report. And so, again, I changed objectives.

The other day a play opened in Philadelphia called "The Selling of the President", in which the candidate is portrayed as having been born and raised in Broken Bow, Nebraska, my home town—a town about which bankers have been hearing for as long as I have been making speeches. The play is based on the book, "The Selling of the President 1968", by Joe McGinniss. I read that book and Broken Bow was never mentioned. Why was it injected into the play? My guess is that the playwright is a banker on the side who is utilizing what he learned at your conventions to get to Broadway—or, perhaps, to enhance the credibility of his play.

Credibility is what I want to talk about today. We have heard a lot about credibility gaps in recent years. But I would put it more strongly. Our society is suffering from a credibility crisis. It affects the political world and the business world. It is a grave problem for our communications media. Our educational institutions and even our family life are touched by the growing lack of trust and confidence.

Some efforts have been made to augment credibility in the business world by enacting legislation. You in the banking business have been touched by this through the Truth in Lending Act, which has been under my wing from its inception. We are now seeing a major governmental effort to get a higher degree of truth in advertising. It must come as a great shock to many of the denizens of Madison Avenue to be confronted with demands that they both explain what they mean and provide proof when they claim that brand X is 20 per cent faster or brand Y lasts 10 per cent longer. Those percentages always remind me of Chinese economic statistics—they sound fine but you seldom know what the base is.

I do not know whether this drive for truth in advertising will ever get to the point where a certain newspaper is asked to prove that it really gives its readers "all the news that's fit to print," or whether a certain magazine will be asked to provide the statistics that will show that it really is "the world's most quoted news weekly". Probably not. One of the strange facets of the tell-the-truth campaign is that it has the enthusiastic support of most of the mass media, as long as it does not apply to them. The media agree that you bankers should be scrupulously honest in informing your customers about your interest charges. At the same time, some of them contend that "freedom of the press" gives anyone who has access to a printing press or a microphone the right to lie and deceive, even if those lies are part of an effort to incite people to perform illegal acts, such as blowing up banks.

Examples of this curious double standard are not hard to find. One government agency, the Food and Drug Administration, is willing to use the full force of the law to stop an advertiser from exaggerating the effectiveness of its mouthwash in combatting cold germs. But another agency, the Federal Communications Commission, was apparently unwilling to even so much as slap the wrist of a powerful television network for showing its vast audience a baby that (according to the network) was dying of starvation, when the actual cause of death was premature birth and had nothing to do with malnutrition.

The protective mantle of the First Amendment to the Constitution has been draped around such varied activities as peddling pornography, pushing pot, and advocating arson, but it has not been extended to provide protection to those who would stretch the truth in their efforts to sell mouthwash or gasoline. Perhaps it is felt that the mendacity of Madison Avenue is a greater threat to our well being than the intellectual drift of the pushers of drugs, debauchery, and destruction. But a consequence of our unprecedented tolerance of dissemination of destructive falsehood is the growth of the great credibility crisis that now confronts us.

We find the communications media being used to undermine the credibility of everyone who represents authority, whether it be the government official, the business leader, the police, the school teacher, or the mere parent. In turn, the credibility of the media is called into question, and the public regards with increasing skepticism what they are told by the press and the broadcasters. An ace political correspondent of the *Washington Post* put it this way:

"The measure of the failure of the newspapers is the open skepticism and even deri-

sion with which they are viewed by their customers.

The press has as big a credibility gap as any institution in this society."

A well known liberal academic, with extensive experience in high government positions, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, has voiced deep concern about the degree to which irresponsible behavior on the part of the news media is making it difficult for our government to perform its assigned tasks effectively. In an article published last year, Mr. Moynihan said:

"Hence the conditions are present for a protracted conflict in which the national government keeps losing. This might once have been a matter of little consequence or interest. It is, I believe, no longer such, for it now takes place within the context of what Nathan Glazer has described as an 'assault on the reputation of America . . . which has already succeeded in reducing this country, in the eyes of many American intellectuals, to outlaw status . . .'. In other words, it is no longer a matter of this or that administration; it is becoming a matter of national morale, of a loss of confidence and nerve, some of whose possible consequences . . . are not pleasant to contemplate."

We can see those consequences emerging already. On the one hand, there is a growth in the number of cynics who believe nothing; on the other, we see an increase in the number of "true believers" who are guided by nothing but their own unshakable convictions. The cynics are bogged down in apathy and indecision. The true believers are fired with fanaticism, not tempered with knowledge. The ability of our people to cooperate to promote the general welfare is vastly diminished, as we find it increasingly difficult to reach agreement on what the general welfare is.

For example, virtually every country in the history of the world, including ours, has always placed high priority on maintaining its ability to defend itself against potential enemies. This priority was well stated by Adam Smith two hundred years ago when he wrote in *The Wealth of Nations*: "Defense is much more important than opulence."

When Smith wrote those words, no one enjoyed much opulence in terms of present day standards. It is shocking that in a society that has more motor cars, television sets, air conditioners, etc., etc. per capita than any country in the world, the cry is going up that we cannot afford to spend the money required to provide ourselves with an adequate defense against our potential enemies. We are told that we must reorder our priorities and that national defense must be shoved far down the list. This is not just the cry of some "lunatic fringe". It is a scheme that is put forward by serious contenders for high political office. It is supported by influential newspapers and by some of the most influential voices heard on that powerful medium, network television.

I do not question their motives, but I do question their judgment, and I am shocked by some of the methods that they employ to influence public opinion. Let me cite a couple examples of the methodology.

A few months ago one of the best known TV commentators in the country told his vast audience that two-thirds of the regular tax income of this country was spent on the military. He compared this unfavorably with the old state of Prussia, which he said was criticized around the world for spending half of its income on the military. The implication was that the United States is more militaristic than Prussia was in its hey-day.

The statistics used by this commentator were incorrect. In the last fiscal year, our expenditures on national defense amounted to a little over 40 per cent of the revenues of the federal government. This year it is estimated that defense expenditures will



amount to less than 36 per cent of federal revenue—a far cry from the figure of two-thirds used by the television commentator. After his figures were challenged, the commentator attempted a lame justification which made little sense. He and his network refused to correct the misleading impression that was given to the estimated fifteen million people who heard the original broadcast. They refused to even acknowledge the fact that a far more valid measure of the relative defense burden carried by different countries is the ratio of defense expenditures to GNP. They have not informed their audience that in the last fiscal year the total defense expenditures of the United States amounted to just a little over 7 per cent of our GNP, the lowest this ratio has been for many years.

The commentator in question makes no bones about the fact that in his judgment the United States spends far too much on defense. He is one of those who wants to see our priorities drastically reordered. He appears to overlook the fact that it will not be Americans who reorder our priorities if we so weaken our defenses that we are unable to protect ourselves from an attack. However, he is entitled to his judgment. What he is not entitled to do, in my opinion, is to use his privileged position as a national television commentator to persuade others of the correctness of his judgment by feeding them false information.

The president of CBS News would appear to agree, because a few years ago he made this statement:

"Anybody in news who is unfair, biased or inaccurate—deliberately or negligently—despoils his journalistic heritage and demeans his profession."

That is a fine statement. Unfortunately, however, it would appear that it is not invariably heeded even in his own organization. You may recall that a year ago CBS broadcast a documentary called "The Selling of the Pentagon", which aroused great controversy. This CBS production has probably been charged with more inaccuracy and bias than any comparable television production to date. I will cite only one example, not the most important, but one which is indisputable because it involves the use of false statistics.

In introducing the theme of huge Defense Department expenditures on public affairs, CBS noted that about \$30 million a year was budgeted for such expenditures. However, it pointed out that an "unpublished" study by the prestigious Twentieth Century Fund had estimated that such expenditures might be as high as \$190 million. CBS displayed a graph showing that this was more than all three television networks combined spent on their news programs. However, investigation by the critics revealed that at the time the CBS program was aired, the study by the Twentieth Century Fund had been published and that it contained no such figure.

On the contrary, it said that no accurate estimate of total Defense Department spending on public affairs could be made. Although one of the papers prepared for the study had included the \$190 million estimate, the Twentieth Century Fund had not wished to lend its prestige to a figure that it did not consider to be reliable. The Twentieth Century Fund dropped it, but CBS did not. Whether this inaccuracy was deliberate or negligent I cannot say, but to borrow the words of the CBS official I just quoted, those responsible for it demean their profession. What is sadder still is that CBS has admitted the facts but has not to this day apologized for the inaccuracy or corrected the misinformation which it disseminated.

However, the most important criticism of this particular TV production centers on the basic veracity of the documentary.

There are those of us who think that if the taxpayer is to be asked to support a defense program that costs around \$80 billion a year, the government has a responsibility to tell him why it is necessary and what is being done with his money. CBS rejected that viewpoint so completely that it made no mention of it whatsoever in its documentary. The basic issue at the heart of this program was never debated. CBS assumed that expenditures to inform the public about the need for national defense were unnecessary and then went on to show that they were being made, implying that it was showing the public examples of illegitimate and wasteful activities. It seems safe to infer that what the producers wanted to accomplish was not the trimming of a few million dollars from the Defense Department budget to save the taxpayers money. They were clearly after bigger game. If the government could be denied the right to finance an information program to maintain public support for national defense, then those such as the commentator I discussed earlier would find it much easier to win public support for really huge cuts in our national defense. The documentary clearly implied that we no longer needed to be as concerned with national defense as we once were, since we had been living in an era of peaceful co-existence for over a decade. That decade, I might note, included such events as the building of the Berlin Wall, the Cuban missile crisis, the Vietnam War, and the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

I call these matters to your attention today, rather than discussing with you banking matters or the state of our economy, because I, too, have become impressed with the importance of assigning proper priorities to our national goals. I had the privilege recently of reading the manuscript of a forthcoming book by General Lewis W. Walt, who retired last year from his post as Deputy Commandant of the Marine Corps. General Walt is not only a great soldier, but he is a most articulate and perceptive observer of the current scene.

His book bears an ominous title: "America Faces Defeat." It begins with words that everyone concerned with reordering priorities ought to think about. He says:

"Most living Americans have grown up in the most powerful nation on earth. Under the cover of that strength we have enjoyed an affluence hardly equalled in the history of any nation. This era ended in 1971. Today, we are a second-class power and we will have to accept that role for at least four years. Perhaps longer, possibly, forever."

He goes on to say:

"The individual citizen has not yet felt the impact of this basic change from strength to weakness, from leadership to compromise. Each of us will feel it as the world market for our goods and services shrinks; as we find ourselves increasingly alone within the community of nations; as we are forced to abandon the noble projects we have devised for the health, education and welfare of every living American."

"Instead, we shall have to learn once again the harsh lessons of weakness, of being trampled upon, and how it is to tighten our belts in privation and gird ourselves for nearly hopeless conflicts. We face, today, either defeat or years of national tragedy."

Those are strong words—too strong, I am sure, for those TV commentators who juggle figures to persuade the public that America is already spending far more than necessary on national defense. I will be surprised if General Walt is invited to discuss his book and its dire warning on the popular TV talk shows. I will be surprised if our leading newspapers and magazines give it any serious attention, but not because it would be disquieting to the American people to hear such warnings. The media spokesmen are constantly telling us that they should not be

blamed for conveying so much bad news to the public. They explain that if the news is bad, they have a sacred obligation to report it, and we should not conclude that they like it any more than we do. On that basis, of course, the media would not shrink from alerting the American public to the bad news that General Walt is bringing out in his forthcoming book.

My guess is that General Walt's warning will be largely ignored for the same reason that similar warnings voiced by other distinguished Americans have been ignored in recent years. The explanation lies in these words penned by David Broder of the *Washington Post*:

"Selectivity is the essence of all contemporary journalism. And selectivity implies criteria. Criteria depend on value judgments, which is a fancy word for opinions, preconceptions and prejudices."

It would be naive to suppose that the criteria for news selection employed by a TV commentator or a newspaper editor who believes that we are already spending far too much on defense would lead him to give prominent attention to the warning of General Walt.

That is why those of us who by chance are aware of such things must avail ourselves of opportunities to discuss them and to inform others. We must not permit our country to be immobilized and rendered defenseless by media manipulation.

Because of the credibility crisis, the average citizen is hard-pressed to know who and what is to be believed. I am prepared to admit that I am no expert on military matters. Perhaps experts such as General Walt who voice these disturbing warnings are wrong. But if we follow their advice and keep our defenses stronger than might really be necessary, what have we lost? Nothing more than a slight retardation in the expansion of what is the highest level of living the world has ever known. If, on the other hand, we follow the advice of those who say that a strong defense is not necessary and it develops that they are wrong, what will we lose? Our lives, our freedom, our country. I have no difficulty in choosing the side on which I would rather err.

I make no apology for appearing before you today to talk about matters that are not related to banking. We are Americans first and bankers second. When our country is in danger, we ask our sons to interrupt their studies and careers, to shoulder arms and give their lives if necessary to defend us. It behooves all of us who have passed that age and who have risen to positions of leadership in our communities and our profession to take whatever steps we can to insure that our country remains strong, that we not slip into war or—worse—into surrender from weakness.

The likelihood that the national news media will continue to ignore the warnings of experts in this field may create the impression that what I have said to you today is a minority view of doubtful validity. In my view, that would be a false impression, flowing from what Theodore H. White has described as the increasing concentration in fewer hands of the cultural pattern of the United States. Mr. White has said: "You can take a compass with a one-mile radius and put it down at the corner of 5th Avenue and 51st Street in Manhattan and you have control of 95 per cent of the entire opinion-and-influence making in the United States."

That explains, perhaps, why we get the monotonous sameness of opinion from our national news media, much of it very much at odds with the deeply held views of what I believe to be the great majority of American people. There is no acceptance of the idea that those encompassed by Mr. White's circle ought to reflect the views of the people. One of the most prominent TV commentators reacted to such a notion by saying:

"More responsive to the public! What are they talking about? . . . I'm not about to adjust the work I do according to the waves of popular feeling that may come over the country. No responsible person can do that."

That surely means that the voices of the people must more frequently be heard in contradiction of the waves of feeling that emanate from that tiny group of men in Manhattan that make up, according to Mr. White, 95 per cent of the opinion-and-influence making in the United States.

Let no man be deterred. It has been said that it is easier to find a score of men wise enough to discover the truth than to find one man intrepid enough, in the face of opposition, to stand up for it. Perhaps that one takes his counsel from Daniel De Foe, who said: "He that has truth on his side is a fool, as well as a coward, if he is afraid to own it because of other men's opinions."

#### YOUNG REPUBLICANS ENDORSE STRONG SPACE PROGRAM

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Young Republican National Committee on March 10, 1972, endorsed the space shuttle program. Because of the importance of this commitment of these young people to a major national effort I am inserting in the RECORD the press release from the Young Republican National Federation and a copy of their resolution endorsing the most important space activity of this decade—the development of a low cost transportation system to space—the space shuttle:

#### YOUNG REPUBLICANS ENDORSE STRONG SPACE PROGRAM

WASHINGTON.—The Young Republican National Committee, at its meeting March 10, 1972, endorsed the space shuttle program.

The resolution urges "Congress to supply adequate funding for the Space Shuttle Program to guarantee the growth of the United States in future space ventures and to insure continual lead in space exploration and scientific development."

"Because the United States is number one in space," the resolution says "the space program has been responsible for economic growth and employment of many communities throughout the United States, and has greatly aided in the progress of medical and scientific technology, thereby advancing world progress."

#### RESOLUTION

Whereas, the United States is number one in the space program; and,

Whereas, the space program has been responsible for the economic growth and employment of many communities throughout the United States; and,

Whereas, the space program has greatly aided in the progress of medical and scientific technology, thereby advancing world progress,

Therefore be it resolved that the YRNF does hereby endorse and support the space program and urge the Congress of the United States to supply adequate funding for the Space Shuttle Program, to guarantee the growth of the United States in future space ventures, and to insure our continual lead in space exploration and scientific development.

#### FOXES AND CHICKEN COOPS— PHASE 2½

### HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, in earlier installments of this series on the Nixon administration's penchant for asking the foxes to protect the chickens, I have concentrated on the Labor Department's ingenious interpretation of its clear legislative mandate to promote and protect the interests of wage earners. But this inventiveness is not, in the Nixon era, limited to the Labor Department.

It is worthwhile, for example, to take a look at the personnel of the Price Commission and the Pay Board to understand why it seems that working people are making most of the sacrifices in the President's endless "war on inflation," while big business cheers from the sidelines and continues to enjoy whatever it is big business expects to enjoy during Republican administrations.

Mr. Duane Emme has written a recent article on where the wage freezers and price fixers in this administration come from. Like my earlier insertion on the backgrounds of Labor Department officials, this brief biographical summary is most illuminating.

The summary follows:

#### PEOPLE WITH CORPORATION TIES HOLD KEY POSITIONS IN PHASE II

(By Duane Emme)

WASHINGTON (PAI).—Labor has charged that President Nixon's Phase II program is shaped to favor corporations over workers and consumers—and revelations about the people running it continue to show a tilt in that direction.

Leo Perlis, director of AFL-CIO Community Services, told a luncheon meeting of the AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department that all of the present Price Commission members have strong ties to corporate managements.

Meanwhile, an examination of the Pay Board shows that four of its ten top staff people are from business. Three are from government, one from education, one is a lawyer and one is a former Air Force officer. There are no key people on the staff with union backgrounds.

Here is a rundown on some of the corporate connections of Price Commission members:

Chairman C. Jackson Grayson, currently on leave as Dean of the School of Business Administration at Southern Methodist, has had an academic career that has been liberally mixed with work for corporate managements. He has helped train executives for Motorola, IBM and Sun Oil Co. He has been a consultant to Sun, Humble and Marathon Oil Companies and Standard Oil of Ohio.

William Scranton, former governor of Pennsylvania, was board chairman of Scranton-Lackawanna Co. and has served on the board of International Textbook Co., Scott Paper Co. and Fidelity Bank & Trust.

John W. Queenan was the managing partner of Haskins & Sells, an accounting firm with a number of business firm clients.

J. Wilson Newman is former board chairman and chief executive officer of Dun & Bradstreet, the noted financial directory

firm He has served on the boards of Chemical Bank Corp., General Foods and Consolidated Edison.

Robert F. Lanzillotti, has had a career as a professor of economics at several universities but he also has been a consultant to the Michigan Bankers' Association, U.S. Steel Corp., and the Swift Co.

William T. Coleman is a partner in a noted Philadelphia law firm with a long list of corporation clients.

The Price Commission has seven members but the seventh post is vacant. It was held by Mrs. Marina V. N. Whitman who resigned to join the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Ironically, she was the only one of Nixon's seven original appointments without apparent ties to business.

Biographical data furnished by the Commission on its members shows none of the business background of members except to touch upon it slightly in the sketches on Grayson, Queenan and Newman.

A look at the biographies of the top staff people in the Commission indicates that nearly all of them come from government careers. There are some with legal backgrounds but any corporate experience they may have had is not identified.

However, conspicuously missing from any key or even influential staff posts are people from union positions or consumer organizations. The sole representative of labor in any notable position is John Tomayko, Steelworkers' director of pensions and insurance, a member of the health services advisory committee to the Commission.

Labor's complaint on the tripartite members of the Pay Board, 15 in all, has been that at least three of the five so-called "public" members are not truly representative of the public; William Caples is a former Inland Steel vice-president and Arnold Weber and Neil Jacoby come from government posts in which they helped formulate Nixon economic policies.

In turning to the biographies of the Board's top staffers, four acknowledge a background with links to corporations:

Executive Director Robert P. Tiernan is a former tax attorney and labor counsel for Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corp.; John W. Ross, special assistant to Chairman George Boldt, comes from a labor relations post on the management side of the Wall Street Journal; R. T. McNamar, director of economic policy and case analysis, is a former tax attorney for Standard Oil of California; and Jack E. McGregor, general counsel, was president of a professional hockey team and Pittsburgh's "Business Man of the Year" in 1966.

A search through the Board's staff turned up only two people from labor careers, neither in key posts: Frank Burhardt of the Painters serves in the economic policy division, and Charles McDonald of the Communications Workers, is an attorney advisor in the legal section.

#### CLEAN WATERS

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, next Monday and Tuesday the House will take up the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972. The following editorial in the March 20 edition of the New York Times states succinctly the need to strengthen this bill:



## AND CLEAN WATERS

The water-pollution control bill, which Senator Muskie sponsored and his colleagues long ago approved by a vote of 86 to 0, is even more far-reaching and hence in worse trouble. Between heavy fire from industry and moderate fire from the Administration the Senate bill may be shot down, or existing controls may be seriously weakened in the name of improvement.

Of the changes made by the House Public Works Committee, one of the sharpest setbacks is the drastic modification of the Senate's objective to decrease effluents into the nation's waters for the next thirteen years, by which time (at least this is the goal) they would be eliminated altogether. The House committee, while theoretically retaining the goal, would subject the plan to a study by the National Academy of Sciences, to be followed by a second vote in Congress—by which time a lot of foul water will have flowed under the bridge. Not content to weaken the Senate bill, the committee would also reduce the effectiveness of the EPA by shifting primary responsibility for the issuing of effluent permits to the states, a grave backward step.

Representatives Reuss of Wisconsin and Dingell of Michigan are striving to reverse these stultifying changes with a "clean-water package" of amendments. Unless the efforts of these two outstanding conservationists succeed, there may be no clean water legislation in this Congress at all—a disastrous setback to a cause that cannot afford any delay.

## ALL-AMERICAN CITY

## HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the town of North Branford, Conn., has recently been named an "All-America City," one of nine municipalities in the Nation so honored. I am extremely proud to have this town in my congressional district.

This town of nearly 11,000 people has been awarded the designation "All-America City" primarily because of the high level of citizen participation evidenced in a recent change in the town's governmental structure.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, how often apathy is found in municipal government, and how often personalities and heated arguments overshadow rational debate in the city and town elections of America.

North Branford, however, has proven that widespread civic action can take place in an atmosphere of debate, exchange, and positive action. The importance of North Branford's designation as an All-America City in recognition of this civic action is not that one side was "right" and another "wrong" during the referendum that changed the town's government, but that both were "right" in going about that change with widespread citizen involvement.

Mr. Speaker, the involvement of the people of North Branford in changing their form of government was such that more than a fifth of the population signed the petition forcing a referendum, and more than two thirds of the town's voters turned out to vote on the question.

Entry in the All-America Cities competition was made in behalf of North Branford by the North Branford League of Women Voters, and Mrs. Maurice Raymond, chairman of the Charter Revision Commission, presented the town's case at the National Municipal League Conference on Government in Atlanta.

More information and evidence of North Branford's achievement is contained in the following article and editorials which I would like to submit for RECORD:

[From the Hartford Courant, Mar. 1, 1972]

## A STATE TOWN HONORED

For so small a state, Connecticut has won over the years a large share of national awards for community progress. And now another has been added. As announced the other day, North Branford has been named one of the nine All-America Cities for 1971 by the National Municipal League. Thus are hearty congratulations in order for the New Haven suburb of little more than 10,000 persons.

As many will recall, two other Connecticut communities won the same All-America Cities distinction last year. And the awards to Enfield and Bloomfield were equally deserved. If one still tends to think of these three communities as small towns, that makes their achievements all the more remarkable in competing with far larger municipalities across the country. And there is considerable variety in the reasons for the awards to Connecticut in the past two years.

North Branford, for instance, has been cited for "the efforts of its citizens to reform an obsolete local governmental structure." Local government is always a highly subjective matter, of course. And whether the council-manager system, now in effect in North Branford, is better than the traditional selectmen-town meeting form of government which it replaced is still debatable. What is especially noteworthy, however, is the fact that many responsible residents of the town believed so earnestly in the necessity for a change that they worked hard for it.

Thus, at the behest of an organization called Citizens for Council-manager Government, a special election was held last March on a new charter. And 67 per cent of the town's eligible voters turned out, favoring the council-manager system by a tally of 1,713 to 1,547. But perhaps the real winner was the democratic process. The large turnout for the election was attributed by the National Municipal League to a door-to-door campaign conducted by the citizen's group. The average turnout for special elections in Connecticut, the League has noted, is 24 per cent.

Last year, in Enfield's case, that town was cited for citizen participation in a variety of municipal functions. More specifically, the community was applauded for the imaginative \$5 million Thompsonville redevelopment program, school-building projects and commercial and industrial expansion, notably a proposed 500-acre industrial park. As for Bloomfield, it was commended for its forward-looking, educational planning. The town had launched a desegregation program which includes a \$5.5 million middle school for housing all fourth, fifth and sixth grade pupils, while a redistricting plan is providing an equal race mixture in the lower grades.

There are those of late, including the Wall Street Journal, who regard the All-America Cities awards as mere boosterism, signifying little. We don't agree. When citizens work tirelessly to improve their own communities, there is nothing so rewarding as a sincere pat on the back. And it's nice that North Branford has joined Enfield

and Bloomfield (and Hartford as well) in earning that nod.

## NATIONAL HONOR FOR NORTH BRANFORD

We congratulate the Town of North Branford upon its selection as an All American City—one of only nine municipalities in the nation to be chosen for the high honor. The citizens of neighbor cities and towns can profit by the example and inspiration of the healthy civic interest that won the coveted award for the relatively small community of 10,654.

This marks the first time since the mid-1950s that an All-America Cities flag has flown in this region. The only other community in the area to win it was New Haven itself, honored as it underwent the pangs of pioneering in redevelopment. The accomplishments that brought the honor to New Haven are visible today—despite difficulties experienced by the city in common with other urban centers. It is most likely that in the years to come, North Branford will profit by its extraordinary achievement.

Politics being what it is, there may be some residents of North Branford who resent the honor, which grew out of controversy. It was bestowed for the display of civic interest that was channeled to action, with resultant change in the town's form of government. Whether one feels the change is for the better or worse, it seems plain enough that apathy was not countenanced by the citizens of North Branford. There should be satisfaction on the part of all over the fact that so many citizens of the town took part in the decision to establish a council-manager form of government.

No less than 250 to 400 residents instigated the campaign that eventually involved so many townspeople. An unprecedented turnout of 67 per cent of the voters approved the change by a close vote of 1,713 to 1,547. Such a turnout is highly commendable when the undramatic issue, important though it is, involves government structure and no personalities.

But all along the line, high interest was stimulated by a non-partisan drive in the face of Town Hall obstruction and lassitude. The selectmen had refused to implement the recommendation of a charter commission that the voters express themselves at the poll. But the campaign leaders wouldn't take delay for an answer.

A petition to force the referendum was circulated through citizen action. That petition was signed by 2,008 voters when only 690 signatures were required—an indication of the intensity of the effort. The determination held all the way, right down to the business of convincing a town meeting to overrule the selectment on the referendum date so that more citizens would be likely to vote.

The voice of the people has been heard and heeded in North Branford through citizen initiative that has put the town in the national spotlight.

## PRESIDENT NIXON MEETS RESPONSIBILITY ON BUSING

## HON. HENRY BELLMON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, the message which President Nixon sent to Congress on busing deserves the full attention and fair consideration by every Member because it represents a sincere effort by this administration to come to grips with a controversy which has be-

come the most heated and highly emotional issue of the year.

The specific legislative proposals offered by the President requires serious study, which I am confident they will receive from the appropriate committees. There should be an adequate opportunity for debate, in order that all Members may be able to have all the necessary information before making a final decision on the President's proposals.

While the merits of the administration's plan are yet to be fully examined, however, the message alone has already accomplished one worthwhile purpose. It has served to inject a leveling influence into a situation where panic threatened to rule.

President Nixon's approach will not be pleasing to those who seek a simple, sudden, single-shot solution to the complex and longstanding problem of educational inequality. Neither will it please those who wish to return to the totally separate educational system of pre-1954. This is a problem which does not lend itself to immediate settlement and it is far too important to be swept back under the rug.

Sometimes the role of the Chief Executive is to serve as a balance wheel to keep the country from tearing itself apart. President Nixon has met that responsibility to a high degree in the recommendations he has made to the Congress.

Although busing is not a product of Congress, but of the courts, integration of the public schools is not a problem we can ignore.

Totally aside from the constitutional ramifications of the matter—about which competent and fair legal minds disagree—there is another issue that must be decided. The question is: Are black people here to stay and are white people ready to admit that they are?

If the answer is "Yes," then two courses of action are open. One is to pursue a course of action which has the end result of confining blacks to separate areas where they are maintained largely with huge sums of welfare payments. Around and through these communities will be needed an army of police to control crime and contain fear. Also needed will be another army of medical and social workers to contend with the problems of alcoholism, drug abuse, unemployment and illegitimacy. The net con-

tribution of such a community is negative.

Another choice is to follow Thomas Jefferson's admonition as expressed in the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights . . ." This theme was further extended in the Constitution which says, in the 14th Amendment: "... nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Even one who has never considered himself to be a great social reformer cannot ignore the plain requirements of this language nor deny the direction our Nation's founders had in mind when this language was adopted.

The main point to keep in mind is simply this: Where, in what direction, is the country headed?

Until the 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Brown against Board of Education*, public school systems for more than 50 years had been allowed to operate under laws which permitted racially separate school systems, if those systems also were theoretically equal. In many States, the result of this doctrine was the enactment of laws which either required or officially sanctioned racially separate or dual school systems.

In such situations, regardless of how close a school was located to a home, children in the family were assigned to school on the basis of their race. In order to assure racial segregation, it was frequently necessary to bus both black and white children many miles each day.

In the *Brown* case, the court declared that "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal" and ordered that school desegregation be accomplished "with all deliberate speed."

My own State of Oklahoma, which had pioneered in breaking down color barriers at institutions of higher learning, moved rapidly and successfully to implement the court order and to end the dual school system. During the decade that followed, Oklahoma compiled an excellent record of progress in civil rights, moving away from separation in many areas—eating places, hotels and motels, public facilities, transportation and employment. The same thing has happened generally over the country.

These changes have come slowly and

sometimes painfully. The real question before Congress and the country now is, Shall we continue in this direction or do we begin to move back to where we were 18 years ago?

This country was established by those who believed that every citizen deserves an opportunity to fully develop whatever abilities and talents he has. It was believed that the Creator did not limit brains and talent to members of any race or class.

A nation that denies full participation in society and an opportunity for making a full contribution to any citizen because he is in the minority becomes a little weaker and a little less desirable place to live for everyone.

This, then, is the fundamental question that must be answered. I feel that the country must continue moving in the direction of bringing the races closer together by offering equal opportunity for all. This standard certainly should apply to education, because a person who is denied an education in his youth will find doors to opportunity closed to him all the rest of his life. A government which fails to provide an educational opportunity to its youth cannot through welfare or any other means make atone-ment later.

Over the years Congress has tried numerous times to enact a law dealing with the busing of students, but these attempts have been overturned as soon as they get into court. A prime example is the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which stated that:

No local educational agency shall be forced or required to bus or otherwise transport students in order to overcome racial imbalance.

During the most recent Senate action on this subject, a number of antibusing amendments were introduced to education appropriations legislation previously passed by the House. Most attention was focused on two of these—the Griffin amendment and the Scott-Mansfield amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a comparison of these two amendments and a summary of the key provisions of each be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### COMPARISON OF GRIFFIN AND SCOTT-MANSFIELD AMENDMENTS

##### GRIFFIN

Section 901—No court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to make any decision, enter any judgment or issue any order the effect of which would be to require that pupils be transported to or from school on the basis of their race, color, religion, or national origin.

No comparable section.

##### SCOTT-MANSFIELD

No comparable section.

Section (a)—No funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out any program subject to the provisions of the General Education Provisions Act, including this Act, may be used for the transportation of students or teachers (or for the purchase of equipment for such transportation) in order to overcome racial imbalance in any school or school system, or for the transportation of students or teachers (or for the purchase of equipment for such transportation) in order to carry out a plan of racial desegregation of any school or school system, except on the express written request of appropriate local school officials: Provided, however, that no court, and no officer, agent, or employee of the United States shall order the making of such a request: And provided further, that no funds shall be made available for transportation when the time or distance of travel is so great as to risk the health of the children or significantly impinge on the educational process.



## COMPARISON OF GRIFFIN AND SCOTT-MANSFIELD AMENDMENTS—Continued

## GRIFFIN—continued

Section 902—No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States, empowered to extend Federal financial assistance to any program or activity at any school by way of grant, loan, or otherwise, shall withhold or threaten to withhold any such Federal financial assistance in order to coerce or induce the implementation or continuation of any plan or program the effect of which would be to require that pupils be transported to or from school on the basis of their race, color, religion, or national origin.

Section 903—Notwithstanding any other law or provision of law, in the case of any order on the part of any United States district court which requires the transfer or transportation of any student or students from any school attendance area prescribed by competent State or local authority for the purposes of achieving a balance among students with respect to race, color, religion, or national origin, the effectiveness of such order shall be postponed until all appeals in connection with such order have been exhausted or, in the event no appeals are taken, until the time for such appeals has expired.

Section 904—If any provision of this title, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remaining provisions of this title, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

## SCOTT-MANSFIELD—continued

Section (b)—No officer, agent, or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (including the Office of Education), the Department of Justice, or any other Federal agency shall, by rule, regulation, order, guideline, or otherwise, (1) urge, persuade, induce, or require any local education agency, or any private non-profit agency, institution, or organization to use any funds derived from any State or local sources for any purpose, unless constitutionally required, for which Federal funds appropriated to carry out any applicable program may not be used, as provided in this section, or (2) condition the receipt of Federal funds under any Federal program upon any action by any Federal program upon any action by any State or local public officer or employee which would be prohibited by clause (1) on the part of a Federal officer or employee. No officer, agent, or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (including the Office of Education) or any other Federal agency shall urge, persuade, induce, or require any local education agency to undertake transportation of any student where the time or distance of travel is so great as to risk the health of the child or significantly impinge on his or her educational process; or where the educational opportunities available at the school to which it is proposed that such student be transported will be substantially less than those offered at the school to which such student would otherwise be assigned under a non-discriminatory system of school assignments based on geographic zones established without discrimination on account of race, religion, color, or national origin.

Section (c)—Notwithstanding any other law or provision of law, in the case of any order on the part of any United States district court which requires the transfer or transportation of any student or students from one local educational agency to another, or which requires the consolidation of two or more local educational agencies for the purpose of achieving a balance among students with respect to race, sex, religion, or socioeconomic status, the effectiveness of such order shall be postponed until all appeals in connection with such order have been exhausted or, in the event no appeals are taken, until the time for such appeals has expired. This section shall take effect upon the date of its enactment and shall expire at midnight on June 30, 1973.

No comparable section.

## SUMMARY OF KEY PROVISIONS OF GRIFFIN AND SCOTT-MANSFIELD AMENDMENTS

## GRIFFIN

Federal courts would be forbidden by Congress to issue school desegregation orders that would have the effect of requiring busing.

Federal officials would be forbidden to withhold or threaten to withhold federal funds in order to coerce or induce school districts to begin or continue any desegregation program that would have the effect of requiring busing.

Federal district court orders that require busing or consolidation of school districts to achieve racial balance would be stayed until all appeals have been exhausted.

## SCOTT-MANSFIELD

Federal funds could not be used for busing to overcome racial imbalance, unless requested in writing by local school officials.

No court or federal official could order a school district to request federal funds for that purpose.

No federal funds could be used for busing when the time or distance or travel is so great as to risk the health of the children or significantly impinge on the educational process.

Federal officials would be barred from urging, persuading, inducing or requiring local school districts to spend state or local funds for busing unless constitutionally required.

Federal officials would be barred from pressuring a local school district to bus students to a school where educational opportunities are substantially less than those at a neighborhood school.

Federal district court orders that require busing from one school district to another or consolidation of school districts to achieve racial balance would be stayed until all appeals have been exhausted, or until June 30, 1973.

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, as the summary shows, the amendments contain many similar provisions.

The Scott-Mansfield amendment, which was approved by the Senate, answered most of the criticisms that have been raised by opponents of busing. By prohibiting the use of Federal funds for busing unless requested in writing by local school officials, the responsibility and authority was placed on local boards of education which are in the best position to make decisions. It prevents courts from ordering school districts to request Federal funds and guards against Federal agencies pressuring schools into using State or local funds for busing.

Under this amendment, no Federal funds may be used to transport students when the time or distance of travel may be harmful to their health or education. Also, Federal officials are barred from making a school district bus students to a school where educational opportunities are substantially less than those at their neighborhood school.

The basic difference between these two amendments, as I saw it, was that the Griffin amendment would completely remove busing as a tool to achieve school integration, while SCOTT-MANSFIELD would place heavy restraints on busing but not do away with it entirely.

Until a better solution is found, it is my feeling that Congress should not forbid the use of busing everywhere and under every circumstance. Therefore, I could not support the Griffin amendment. The Scott-Mansfield amendment offers a reasonable, workable approach to the

problem and for that reason I found this particular legislation more preferable.

Also to be considered is the fact that both these amendments would be subject to challenge in the courts and it was generally felt that SCOTT-MANSFIELD had a better chance of being upheld though admittedly even this is questionable.

The battle is far from over on the busing issue. There will be other votes, in both the House and the Senate. There will be much speechmaking, letterwriting, and arguments pro and con.

Nobody I know of likes or wants busing to achieve school integration, although busing has been practiced for years without being regarded as evil. As members of a farm family, my wife and I and our three girls all have had to ride the bus to public school.

However, I fully recognize the intense public concern that has been generated in Oklahoma as well as other parts of the country as a result of Federal court rulings on the question. I can well understand the frustration and anger that citizens may feel under the pressure of Federal authority.

In this statement, I have attempted to set forth my feelings on the subject to this point. On a final note, and perhaps as a guide to future consideration of this difficult problem, I ask unanimous consent to insert a portion of the 1971 report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

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

## BUSING AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL

Two emotionally charged issues have intruded into the public debate over school

desegregation and have tended to cloud understanding rather than clarify discussion. These are "busing" and the "neighborhood school." Those who have used them as arguments against desegregation ignore certain plain facts. One is that every day of every school year 18 million pupils—40 per cent of the Nation's public school children—are bused to and from school, and the buses log in the aggregate more than two billion miles each year. Another is that the trend of modern-day educational thought is away from the neighborhood school—a self-contained unit serving a relatively small student population—in favor of larger school units where economies of scale frequently make possible a broader curriculum, provision of new educational equipment, and special services not financially possible in schools which serve small numbers of students.

This happened in Oklahoma in the late 1940's and early 1950's when over 3,000 rural neighborhood schools were closed and the students were "bused" to schools in town.

To discuss desegregation in terms of "busing" and "neighborhood schools" is to remove the issue from the legal and educational context to which it belongs and transfer it to the arena of emotion and politics. Neither busing nor the organizational structure of school systems is an end unto itself. Rather, each is a means to the end of desegregated, quality education. As this Commission pointed out last April:

... the emphasis that some put on the issue of busing is misplaced. As most Americans would agree, it is the kind of education that awaits our children at the end of the bus ride that is really important.

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, it is my firm conviction that this is something everyone can agree on—the President, Congress, the courts, educators, parents and children, black or white. I am hopeful that the people of this country, with the vast public and private resources we have at our disposal, can unite in a common goal to achieve the objective of the best possible education for every child in this Nation.

## THE HIGH COST OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROLS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, it has become commonplace for those concerned with problems in American society to refer to such problems as crises and to propose crash programs designed to stem the onrushing tide of disaster.

In most instances the solutions proposed by critics are neither as new nor as innovative as they suppose them to be. Critics of medical care, for example, call for national health insurance and Government-controlled medicine. Critics of the welfare system call for a guaranteed annual income system conducted from Washington. Those concerned with unemployment simply advocate that Government hire all of those without jobs.

The alleged solutions and responses are simply the same old answer of "let

the Government do it," which we have heard in response to so many other problems in the past. Government, we may recall, was meant to solve the farm problem, the problem of slum housing, the problem of inflation. Government, through the Office of Economic Opportunity, was going to assist those who were underprivileged in gaining the education and training they needed. In all of these cases, Government involvement has compounded rather than solved the problem.

Now the Congress is discussing the problem of water pollution. This problem exists, as does the farm problem, the problem of slums and all of the other problems which crusading reformers hope to solve by turning them over to Government bureaucrats.

The Senate has passed a bill and the House is considering a bill which will, its sponsors tell us, produce clean lakes and rivers all across America. The bill provides a clear-cut timetable: By June 30, 1974, municipal sewage pollution facilities will provide the equivalent of secondary treatment. By July 1, 1974, construction grants for treatment facilities will be made on a regional, or areawide basis, rather than on a city or town basis as in the past. By January 1, 1976, industrial sources of pollution will be required to have the best practicable control technology. By January 1, 1981, industry will cease water pollution discharges. By 1985, the discharge of all pollutants from all sources into navigable water will be eliminated.

In an important article in Barron's of January 31, 1972, Washington attorney Douglas Caddy notes that:

The Administration and industry representatives argue that the setting of these goals and deadlines is unrealistic and could lead to a new undermining of the confidence of the citizens in their government when expectations are not fulfilled.

Environmental Protection Agency Administrator William Ruckelshaus told a National Press Club luncheon that the provision for the elimination of all discharges into waterways by 1985 is not technically feasible.

The demands made upon American industry may not be only unreasonable, but also not possible. In his article, Mr. Caddy points out that:

Industry is . . . disturbed over the logistical problem of meeting the Phase I January 1, 1976, deadline, since EPA regulations defining the treatment facilities will not be available until 1973. The design and installation of sophisticated treating facilities for large or complex manufacturing plants involve a lead time of several years.

Beyond this, Mr. Caddy writes, is the fact that:

Phase II will see a separate and more stringent standard for treating facilities. Thus, after massive investment in Phase I facilities, industry may quickly find that they do not satisfy the act's requirements.

Another aspect of this legislation which is of growing concern is the fact that under this bill any citizen would have the right to initiate a civil suit against any party who is alleged to violate an effluent limitation or a Federal

or State abatement order, or against the EPA Administrator for failure to perform a nondiscretionary act. Businessmen, on the other hand, are unfairly denied the right to challenge the Administrator's actions in civil or criminal enforcement proceedings.

It is unusual that a Congress which is concerned with unemployment and the fact that American industry is becoming less and less competitive in the world market would place such new restrictions and limitations, as well as expenses, upon business. Economist Paul McCracken warned that the impact of this water legislation could "turn out to be proportionately heavy on industries and products that are important to our foreign trade" and could lead to enlarged structural unemployment, the most difficult to control because it is caused by disappearing markets.

Congress should carefully consider the implications of this legislation. All of us seek cleaner air, cleaner lakes and cleaner rivers. The question involved is not our goal, but whether particular legislative remedies bring us closer to such goals, or make their achievement less possible and less realistic, as well as more costly. I wish to share Mr. Caddy's article, "Effluent Society? Pending Water Pollution Controls Would Cost Industry Dear," with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time.

[From Barrons, Jan. 31, 1972]

EFFLUENT SOCIETY? PENDING WATER POLLUTION CONTROLS WOULD COST INDUSTRY DEAR  
(By Douglas Caddy)

Now that Congress has reconvened for its second session, it will pick up where it left off in processing major legislation. At the top of the list is the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, an impressive title for an array of concepts and proposals which may drastically affect the balance sheets of American corporations for at least the next decade.

In the opinion of most Congressional leaders, the new water bill could be the most important legislation enacted by the 92nd Congress. One thing is certain: If the proposed 1972 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965 are adopted without substantive modification on the floor of the House, their potential impact upon the economy and upon industry, agriculture, labor and government will be profound. The bi-partisan leaders of the House Public Works Committee, in announcing that the Committee had ordered its bill HR 11896 reported on the day before the first session of Congress ended, described it as "the most significant water improvement legislation ever reported to Congress," meaning the 1972 offspring amendments certainly outshine their parent act passed seven years ago.

### SENATE VOTE

The Senate passed its own bill S. 2770 on November 3. The vote of 86-0 clearly reflected the absence of controversy and debate, although Senators James Buckley (R.-C., N.Y.) and Lloyd Bentsen (D., Texas), who serve on the Senate Public Works Committee, voiced concrete reservations about some of the bill's provisions. The Senate Public Works Committee in the past two years devoted 33 days to public hearings on the water legislation, heard 171 witnesses, received 470 statements for the record, compiled 6,400 pages of testimony and held 45 executive sessions. In the end, even the two slightly critical Senators, joining in praise for Senator Edmund



Muskie (D., Maine) for skillfully guiding the bill toward successful passage, voted "yea" and sent the measure to the House.

Rep. John Blatnik (D., Minn.), Chairman of the House Public Works Committee, almost immediately indicated he strongly opposed reopening the public hearings on the legislation which his committee, like its counterpart in the Senate, had been conducting for months. The Administration, supported by industry and state governments which felt the Senate bill weakened their pollution control powers, pressed for new hearings. Within a week after having voiced opposition to the hearings, Rep. Blatnik succumbed and scheduled final hearings for December 7-10.

The four days of hearings saw a parade of prominent witnesses—from the Republican governor of New York, Nelson Rockefeller, to the then Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Paul McCracken—criticize the Senate and House bills as embracing the wrong goals and establishing dangerous regulatory powers. Nevertheless, on December 16 the House Committee voted to order its own bill, stronger in some aspects than the Senate version, sent to the House floor where it will be voted upon, perhaps as early as February. Rep. Robert Jones (D., Ala.), who is Acting Chairman while Rep. Blatnik recovers from a slight heart seizure, and Rep. William Harsha (R., Ohio), ranking minority member, declared the House bill goes "with the overwhelming bi-partisan support of the Committee's members."

#### COMPLEX PROVISIONS

One reason why little or no opposition is voiced against the legislation in Congress is that few members of Congress admit they understand the amendments' complex provisions and concepts. Indeed, it is worth noting that the Senate Public Works Committee on October 28 voted to report its bill but the actual text and committee report were not available until November 1, the day before the Senate was scheduled to vote. S. 2770 is 190 pages long and its length and complexity undoubtedly deterred many Senators from reading the bill in the 24 hours between the time the bill became available and the debate and vote. Thus, the Senate almost blindly relied upon the collective judgment of its Public Works Committee, which strongly recommended passage.

It was not until after Senate passage that the Administration and other critics awoke and began to clamor for a re-examination by the House Committee. S. 2770 and H.R. 11896 (as introduced on November 19—the text of the final bill will not be ready until February) must be read sentence by sentence to pierce their complex concepts and provisions. After doing so, one veteran Washington lawyer described the bills as "virtually a world's fair of legislative ingenuity and legal intricacy."

The controversy that has developed since Senate passage swirls around five concepts embraced by both bills:

First, the legislation sets a series of goals to be achieved and deadlines to be met in order for the country to obtain pollution-free water.

By June 30, 1974, municipal sewage pollution facilities will provide the equivalent of secondary treatment.

By July 1, 1974, construction grants for treatment facilities will be made on a regional, or area-wide basis, rather than on a city or town basis as in the past.

By January 1, 1976, industrial sources of pollution will be required to have the best practicable control technology.

By January 1, 1981, industry will cease water pollution discharges.

By 1985, the discharge of all pollutants from all sources into navigable water will be eliminated.

#### INTERIM GOAL

There is one general interim goal: to make lakes and streams clean enough by 1981 for swimming and for the propagation of fish, shellfish and wildlife.

The Administration and industry representatives argue that the setting of these goals and deadlines is unrealistic and could lead to a new undermining of the confidence of the citizens in their government when expectations are not fulfilled. Environmental Protection Agency Administrator William Ruckelshaus told a National Press Club luncheon on the same day that the House Committee ordered its bill reported that the provision for the elimination of all discharges into waterways by 1985 is not technically feasible.

Earlier, in committee testimony, the chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, Russell Train, also criticized the goal. After noting that "since wastes will not simply disappear and must be disposed or recycled in some way," Train observed, "a no-discharge requirement presupposes that it is uniformly preferable to dispose of all waterborne waste on the soil or in the air rather than in the water, except where some type of re-use is possible. It is true that the land should be considered and quite possibly used to a much greater extent as an alternative to water for waste disposal, particularly for wastes that are composed of usable nutrients. However, I am aware of no evidence that land can be regarded as the best or even a viable solution for all or most waste disposal requirements. There are practical limits on land availability; there is potential for contamination of soil and ground waters by heavy metals and other materials."

"These and other questions need, and are receiving, further research and investigation. Moreover, surface water has a capacity to absorb a certain amount of wastes without harm. Although we certainly should not abuse or strain this capacity, neither should we ignore it, especially not without weighing the environmental hazards of alternative disposal choices." Train further noted that incremental costs of abatement increase greatly as higher levels of reductions are required. This is shown in the accompanying table.

#### EFFLUENT LIMITATION STANDARDS

The second major concept is abandonment of water quality standards developed under the 1965 Act and substitution of effluent limitation standards. Premised on a determination of the beneficial uses to be made of a given body of water, water quality standards include a description of the quality necessary for such uses, stated in physical, chemical and biological measures. A schedule of remedial actions to achieve and preserve such quality is included.

The proposed effluent limitation standards would require the progressive restriction on discharges into the water until the point is reached when no pollution effluent is discharged, i.e. 1981 for industry, and 1985 for all other sources.

EPA Administrator Ruckelshaus, in criticizing the substitution of effluent limitation standards for water quality ones, points out that this concept would forbid tertiary chemical treatment of sewage. Such a system is currently being installed at the Blue Plains sewage plant for the District of Columbia and, according to Ruckelshaus, the discharges from this treatment will be just short of drinkable quality. However, under the concept of effluent limitation the treated discharges could not be put into the Potomac River. According to Ruckelshaus, the alternative will necessitate the building of huge lagoons for sewage sludge settlement and the use of irrigation or some other system for the return of disinfected sewage effluent to

the land, EPA favors the new legislation building upon the existing foundation of water quality standards and employing effluent limitation only as a tool to achieve such standards.

#### BEST PRACTICABLE

The legislation's third major concept is to achieve the "no discharge" goal and effluent limitation standards through two phases. Phase I would require industry to apply the "best practicable control technology currently available" by January 1, 1976. Phase II would require industry to apply the "best available control technology" by January 1, 1981, if it is unable to eliminate completely the discharge of pollutants. A part of this concept is that all new point sources or discharge for 28 industrial groups (such as textile, steel, paper, chemical, etc.) will be required to use the "best available technology" and, if practicable, to meet a standard of performance which permits no discharge of pollution.

Industry representatives express concern over this concept because the legislation fails to define adequately what constitutes best "practicable" control technology, opening the possibility that the EPA or private parties in citizen's suits allowed under the act, might take the position that any control technology which is "possible" or "capable of being used" (the dictionary definition of practicable) is required. Since the two bills establish a precise standard of "secondary treatment" for publicly owned plants, they argue that precise standards should be applied to industry.

Industry is also disturbed over the logistical problem of meeting the Phase I January 1, 1976, deadline, since EPA regulations defining the treatment facilities will not be available until 1973. The design and installation of sophisticated treating facilities for large or complex manufacturing plants involve a lead time of several years. Moreover, thousands of plant owners will be competing at the same time for the equipment and construction labor. There is already about \$7 billion worth of waste treatment facilities for which federal financial assistance has been committed, construction of which is incomplete or not yet under contract. Still another problem is that Phase II will see a separate and more stringent standard for treating facilities. Thus, after massive investment in Phase I facilities, industry may quickly find that they do not satisfy the act's requirement.

#### NO SOLACE

The citizen's suits and administrative and judicial procedure set forth in the amendments comprise the fourth major concept. Since the act will permit citizen's suits to enforce compliance, industry may find no solace in the suggestion that EPA will be reasonable in applying the act and in resisting literal compliance.

The amendments would allow any citizen to initiate a civil suit against any party who is alleged to violate an effluent limitation or a federal or state abatement order, or against the EPA Administrator for failure to perform a non-discretionary act. If EPA or the state initiates a civil or criminal action on its own against the alleged violator, no court action may take place on the citizen's suit.

Any party who willfully or negligently violates its discharge permit or who violates several other specific provisions contained in the amendments shall be liable to a fine up to \$25,000 per day of violation and/or one year in jail. The penalty for the second conviction is \$50,000 per day and/or two years in jail.

The Senate bill requires a petition for review of EPA's promulgation of standards relating to new sources of toxic pollutants and any petition for review of the EPA Ad-

ministrator's acceptance or rejection of a state's procedure for controlling new sources or issuing permits to be filed within 30 days in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. A challenge to the Administrator's actions cannot be raised in civil or criminal enforcement proceedings.

#### FAIR SHAKE

Industry representatives argue these provisions substantially deprive interested parties, including the states, of access to judicial review. Since the U.S. Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia is characterized by some as a "liberal" court, they believe that they would receive a fairer shake if appeals could be filed in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the appropriate local circuit.

The House bill contains a provision which may prove to be a superior judicial procedure. It requires the President, through the Department of Justice, to study and make recommendations on the advisability of establishing an Environmental Court to resolve disputes over administration of pollution control measures.

The final concept embodied in the amendments is contract authorization. This would eliminate the budget-appropriation process of Congress and would give EPA direct authority to enter into contracts. At stake is the contracting authority to disburse vast sums of public sums. The House bill calls for a total outlay of \$27 billion over four years—\$7 billion more than the Senate bill. The Administration had originally recommended \$8 billion for the same time span.

Of the \$27 billion in the House bill, \$20 billion would be for sewage-treatment plants, including construction of collection systems. The Senate bill authorizes \$14 billion for plant construction. Both bills, in bypassing the normal budget-appropriation process, allow EPA to enter into long-term contracts with regional authorities. The federal share of construction costs under HR 11896 would range from 60% to 75%, depending on the state's contribution. This compares with 60%-70% in S. 2770 and 30%-55% in existing law. Both bills also authorize reimbursement to cities and states for their sewage plant construction work since 1965 (\$2.4 billion in S. 2770 and \$2.75 billion in HR 11896).

#### SIDESTEPS SAFEGUARDS

EPA Administrator Ruckelshaus, who would have the authority to disburse the billions of public funds, is opposed to contract authorization—as are a number of Senators. He says it "sidesteps all the safeguards and discipline provided by the budgetary-appropriation process."

The concept of contract authorization raises perhaps the most fundamental question concerning the potential impact of the water act amendments: will the economy be adversely affected?

Paul McCracken believes it may well be. In testimony before the House Committee last December he observed: "If new programs are taken in without seeing clearly the magnitude and character of future commitments, they may get out of line with our capability in the future to produce, thereby imposing severe strains and distortions on the economy. . . . We are already on an expenditure course such that federal outlays will tend to rise more rapidly than the increment of revenues that ongoing economic growth will yield with any given system of tax rates."

He warned that the impact of the water legislation could "turn out to be proportionately heavy on industries and products that are important to our foreign trade" and could lead to enlarged structural unemployment, the most difficult to control because it is caused primarily by disappearing markets.

In concluding, McCracken indicated his prepared remarks held three implications:

(1) "The commitment involved in H.R.

11896 is large. Required capital outlays for a sustained period would be equal to something like one-tenth of business fixed investment, and another like amount would be spent for operating costs.

(2) "... It would appear physically to be very difficult for this country under its system of construction as currently organized to produce the physical plants to achieve the level of effluent removal suggested by 1981 by either the Senate or House bills. Over the last two years the rate of growth of construction of waste disposal facilities has been 25% annually. This compares with a long-term rate of growth of approximately 6%. . . . Higher levels of activity in this sector could lead to more rapidly escalating inflationary pressure. . . ."

(3) The question of the economic feasibility of carrying the removal level to 100% "is not answered by whether even purer water is better but whether after achieving a reasonably high level of removal the large resources involved to achieve small further gains could contribute even more to our material welfare if they were to be used elsewhere. . . ."

#### IMPORTANT EFFECT

The economic common sense contained in McCracken's comments had an important effect. Committee members agreed to insert a new provision in their bill to require that within two years after enactment the National Academy of Sciences would complete and report to Congress a study of the social, economic and technological effects that would result from achieving the 1981 clean water goals. The requirement that industries must use the best available pollution control technology would not come into force until the Congress takes action to implement the findings of the National Academy of Sciences study. Practically, this might mean the 1981 requirement would not take effect unless Congress reimposed it.

Of course, even if provision requiring this study is retained in the bill on the floor of the House, it may be struck out when the House and Senate bills are sent to conference committee. Nevertheless, the McCracken testimony and the proposed study do serve to focus the attention of the entire House not on the question most frequently posed up to now: "Do we need this legislation if we are to clean up our waters?" but instead: "If we pass this legislation, will its environmental benefits be more than offset by the social, economic and technological costs required to implement it?"

If Congress enacts the water act amendments, President Nixon is not likely to exercise a veto. To do so, as Ruckelshaus says, would open him to accusations that he favors "dirty water." Accordingly, Ruckelshaus cautioned the House Committee members in enacting legislation: "We must be as careful as surgeons. We must take care not to throw the proverbial out with the bathwater."

#### TOTAL NATIONAL COSTS OF SUCCESSIVE LEVELS OF POLLUTANT REMOVAL

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Level of removal	Total cost	Cost per incremental percentage point of removal
85 to 90 percent.....	\$61.0	\$0.7
95 to 99 percent.....	119.0	6.0
100 percent.....	317.0	66.0

Source: Estimates of the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency. In effect the data are in terms of 1971 dollars, since no price inflation has been built into the data. Total costs include a 10-year program of capital expenditures and 20 to 25 years of operating costs for those facilities.

STATE MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE CO. OF AMERICA IN WORCESTER, MASS., LEADS THE WAY IN DEMONSTRATING THAT IT PAYS IN CASH, AS WELL AS IN HEALTH, TO QUIT SMOKING

#### HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as the Member of Congress representing the city of Worcester, Mass., in which the State Mutual Life Assurance Co. of America is located, I am proud of the most effective social development partnership for progress this great company has with all our community elements and I earnestly feel the company officials and employees deserve our universal congratulations and commendation for being the first in their field to provide incentives to consumers to quit smoking by offering them lower premiums on life and health insurance policies.

In this regard, a very enlightening article entitled "The High Cost of Smoking," by Walter S. Ross, in the March 1972 issue of the Reader's Digest, gave national editorial recognition to State Mutual's non-cigarette-smoker life insurance program in these extracted words, and I quote:

It started in 1964, when the Surgeon General's famous report disclosed that cigarette smokers had an overall death rate 68 percent higher than non-smokers. Subsequently, State Mutual Life Assurance Company of America began advertising, "The non-cigarette smoker is a better life-insurance risk. He's entitled to a better rate. So we've given it to him." State Mutual started selling life insurance in minimum amounts of \$10,000 at approximately a three-percent discount to all who could honestly sign the statement, "I do not now smoke cigarettes, nor have I smoked any cigarettes for at least the past 12 months." This would save a 31-year-old non-cigarette-smoking man \$15.60 a year on a \$30,000 policy. On larger policies, savings are higher.

Through 1971, State Mutual had sold more than \$1.2 billion of non-smoking insurance; today this insurance accounts for 35 percent of the company's new business. State Mutual finds that not only are the non-smoking policyholders better risks, but that they buy larger policies, and hold onto them more consistently. Perhaps it's easier for them to pay premiums because of the money they save on cigarettes. A 30-year-old man can buy \$10,000 policy with what he saves on a pack and a half of cigarettes per day. Today, 11 other companies have non-smokers' insurance.

Mr. Speaker, the very timely and interesting Reader's Digest article mentioned above emphasizes that cash incentives, to nonsmokers, are being extended in other business fields and they are part of a wholesomely developing national trend because most businesses are increasingly discovering that being concerned about and contributing to the improvement of the quality of life for the consumer is not only good citizenship but also good business in a better country. In its particular industry State Mutual Life Assurance Company of America has



shown the way; to others we simply say—go and do likewise—for your own, for your consumer's and for the Nation's best interest.

### THE CONSEQUENCES OF SEGREGATION

#### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, we need, I think, to be constantly reminded of the evil consequences of segregation in our society. In the recent debates on integrating the suburbs and the use of busing to desegregate the schools there has been little, if any, mention of the terrible cost of continued segregation for the minority communities. Yet while the debate continues, the heavy toll of lost opportunities is exacted daily, often beneath the level of our notice and hidden from our consciences. The just completed report of the 20th century fund on "The Job Crisis for Black Youth" gives us the latest accounting of the damage inflicted upon blacks by continued segregation and denial of opportunity. This report deserves the attention of everyone in the Congress, and I hope that we will all read it to become more aware of the human casualties we are creating daily in our society by our continued refusal to end the racial segregation which permeates almost every segment of American life.

I commend to the immediate attention of all in this body the recent Washington Post editorial on this important study:

#### PROBLEMS OF BLACK YOUTH

"When hope dies, its heirs are desperation and despair," said James B. Conant a decade ago, warning of the "social dynamite" planted in our cities by the enforced idleness and empty expectations of "hundreds of thousands" of young people. The warning is cited in a study of "The Job Crisis for Black Youth" conducted by a special task force for the Twentieth Century Fund (Praeger, \$3.95). It found that the "hundreds of thousands" have multiplied, particularly among black ghetto youth and that the "social dynamite" which some years ago exploded at Watts and the subsequent ghetto riots, is now detonating in a steadily increasing barrage of crime. "As against a white adult unemployment rate of 4.6 per cent during the second quarter of 1971," the task force reports, "the over-all black teen-age unemployment rate was 34.9 per cent—or more than seven times greater; in the poverty areas it was 39.1 per cent. For black adults between the ages of 20 and 24 the unemployment rate was 19 per cent."

The causes are numerous and, in part, obvious: our general failure to generate sufficient jobs at adequate wages for all who want to work; racial discrimination; the near-breakdown of the inner-city schools which permit young people to drop out or graduate from high school without the minimum skills required for desirable jobs; the lack of an alternative to formal schooling of adolescents and the reluctance of employers to hire young blacks and train them for other than dead-end jobs. Another often-cited

cause is the flight of industry to the suburbs which leaves the inner-city resident with fewer opportunities for low-skill jobs at the bottom rung of the ladder to upward mobility. But that, says the study, is somewhat of an oversimplification. Because of the growth in services and government activities the number of jobs for unskilled workers has actually increased. The trouble is that many of these jobs are filled by commuters from the suburbs and, more important, that the number of black migrants and poorly educated inner-city youngsters is increasing even faster than the jobs. This trend continues to accelerate. And so does the prospect for crime. One cause, of course, is the despair of ghetto life and the contacts youth makes on the street. But a major and most disturbing factor, says the study, "may be the rising 'legitimacy' of crime, to the extent that blacks see it as an expression of civil disobedience"—as a form of protest.

The task force acknowledges that there are no easy solutions and that a multifaceted attack is needed. It would give priority to creating public-service jobs for all young people who can't find jobs in private industry, step up funding of antidiscrimination efforts and expand services, including child care, family planning and part-time employment for young black women who suffer the highest unemployment rates.

In the end, however, the nation, including its black leaders, must recognize that the problems of ghetto youth are essentially the problems of the ghetto. And these problems will become worse, no matter how much we spend or how well we mean, as long as we continue to house the black and the poor almost exclusively in the inner city. We can, perhaps, ameliorate ghetto conditions. But we cannot eliminate its inherent evil until we eliminate the ghetto itself.

### RAIL PASSENGER CUSTOMERS NEGLECTED

#### HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the House, in its consideration of H.R. 11417, the National Railway Passenger Corporation Review Act, refused to accept the amendment to make the so-called inland route between New Haven, Conn., and Boston, Mass., a permanent component of the Amtrak system.

This amendment would have provided intercity rail transportation between New Haven, Wallingford, Meriden, Berlin, and Hartford in Connecticut, and Springfield, Worcester, Framingham, and Boston in Massachusetts. Such a provision would have done much to rekindle interest in rail transportation among the people of central Connecticut and central Massachusetts.

The inland route to Boston from New Haven includes over 1.2 million more people than the present Shore Line route. Although an important goal of Amtrak is creation of a balanced transportation system, Amtrak now runs 10 trains daily along the Shore Line route, but only one train daily from Springfield to Boston. Many more individuals would avail them-

selves of Amtrak trains if a more balanced route were inaugurated. Of the numerous people who drive from Hartford to Boston each year, a large number would gladly travel by train if the opportunity were offered.

Since the amendment considered would have required only a minimum of three trains daily along the inland route, it would not have jeopardized the existing Amtrak Shore Line route.

Instead of revitalizing intercity rail traffic, Amtrak continues to neglect potentially rich market areas by refusing to schedule rail service along those routes which would serve a large number of potential travelers. The Northeast is not alone in this problem. Other sections of the country also are without effective rail service. A large, untapped pool of potential rail passenger customers is being neglected by the current state of intercity rail transportation. Perhaps Amtrak will someday recognize this potential and take advantage of the promise it offers.

### SICKLE CELL ANEMIA: RESEARCH, TREATMENT, AND DETECTION

#### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is scheduled to consider legislation—landmark legislation—to fight the deadly sickle cell disease which afflicts black Americans. Sickle cell anemia, an inherited blood disease, strikes approximately one out of every 500 black children born in the United States. Most of its victims die a painful death before their 20th birthdays.

In December of 1971, the Senate passed S. 2676, a bill which would provide \$142 million over the next 3 years for Federal aid in the research, treatment, and detection of sickle cell anemia. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported out H.R. 13592, a bill less comprehensive than the Senate measure and providing \$105 million—\$37 million less than the Senate version—to combat this menace to our health. We in the House of Representatives would be remiss in authorizing anything less than our colleagues in the Senate to implement the National Sickle Cell Anemia Prevention Act. In addition, we have a moral obligation to guarantee that full appropriations swiftly follow enactment of this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join in support of this desperately needed action. Promising research developments based on years of work have been revealed. Increased programs to educate possible carriers of the genetic sickle cell trait are reaching the black communities of America. We must not let these hopeful signs be crushed by the failure of Congress to authorize and fund the war on sickle cell disease.

## EVALUATION OF COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY—A COMMENTARY

## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent historical commentary on the Council on Environmental Quality entitled "The Council on Environmental Quality: an Evaluation," by Mr. Richard N. L. Andrews, published in the January-February 1972 issue of the *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*:

## THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY: AN EVALUATION

(By Richard N. L. Andrews)

(NOTE.—Richard N. L. Andrews is a Ph.D. candidate in environmental planning at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.)

The Council on Environmental Quality has collected generous shares of both praise and blame for the course that federal environmental policy has taken in the past two years. However, it is not clear that how significant a role CEQ actually has played in this process. It is useful, therefore, to evaluate its powers, achievements, and problems during its first years of existence in order to put in accurate perspective both its potentials and its limitations.

CEQ was created by Congress as part of an unusual legislative package which not only established a "national policy on the environment" but included what were described as "action-forcing provisions" to assure implementation of that policy by federal agencies.<sup>1</sup> In CEQ, Congress created an ongoing institutional focal point for environmental policy-making and review.

The administration originally opposed creation of a statutory council, preferring instead to work through a cabinet-level coordinating committee. But Congress insisted, pointing out that while the cabinet committee filled a need for interdepartmental coordination, it had neither the time, the expertise, nor the independence of traditional departmental missions to provide consistent, expert advice to the president on environmental policies and trends.<sup>2</sup> CEQ was created therefore, as a three-member body of "exceptionally well-qualified men," appointed by the president and subject to Senate confirmation. To it was attached the staff of the Office of Environmental Quality, created by the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970. (Public Law 91-224).

## CEQ'S AUTHORITIES

By law CEQ is authorized to:

- Assist the president in preparing the annual environmental quality report,
- Gather information on environmental conditions and trends,
- "Review and appraise" federal activities affecting the environment.
- Develop and recommend environmental policies to the president,
- Conduct ecological and environmental investigations and research,
- Report annually to the president, and
- Conduct such other studies as the president may request.

Once congressional determination to create a statutory council became clear, President Nixon used the enactment of the law as a springboard for a sweeping set of environmental policy initiatives. He stressed environmental considerations strongly in his state of the union message, budget message,

a special environmental message to Congress in February 1970, and an executive order directing abatement of pollution emanating from federal facilities. One month later, in the executive order directing implementation of the procedures of the National Environmental Policy Act, he clearly went beyond the specific requirements of the law by authorizing CEQ to:

Conduct public hearings and conferences on environmental issues,

Coordinate (not merely review and appraise) federal activities affecting the environment,

Issue guidelines to federal agencies for compliance with NEPA, and

Issue such other instructions to the agencies and request such information from them as necessary to fulfill its responsibilities.

The significance of these added authorities hardly needs to be emphasized. First, they clearly underscore the commitment of the administration as well as Congress to environmental policy initiatives. Second, they give to CEQ powers otherwise held by few if any agencies in the executive office, except the Office of Management and Budget, to guide and influence the policies and actions of other federal agencies.

The administration's policy commitment to environmental quality has remained clear since that time as well in a stream of executive orders, legislative initiatives, and policy statements, including emphasis in each of the annual presidential messages to Congress. Thus whatever may be said of CEQ's actions, the actions have been taken in the context of a clear mandate from both Congress and the president to harmonize federal actions with environmental quality goals.

The limits of CEQ's powers must also be noted, however. CEQ is not an environmental czar, nor even a new national resources planning board. It has no authority to veto the actions of any other agency, nor even to require an agency to file the detailed statement of environmental impact required by Section 102(2) (C) of NEPA. It does have the power to review agency actions for environmental impact and to give advice both to the agency and to the president. But in any intractable conflict with another agency, CEQ's power is limited to its ability to persuade the president to take action. Its influence on the agencies can thus be explained only by its success in persuading the president to adopt its recommendations, or by its success in persuading agencies to adopt its recommendations voluntarily and thereby avoid later adverse consequences in the wider forums of congressional, judicial, and public opinion.

## ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO DATE

## Activities

Since its establishment, CEQ has been responsible for or contributed to a wide range of policy actions, including at least six executive orders: reversal of a ruling by the Internal Revenue Service denying tax-exempt status to nonprofit environmental law groups; discontinuation of construction on the Cross-Florida Barge Canal; formulation of the president's 1971 environmental legislative program; establishment, organization, and budgeting of the new Environmental Protection Agency; special studies leading to legislative initiatives by the president for control of ocean dumping and toxic substances; and regular advice, staff work, and recommendations to the president on such issues as eagle killings, oil spills, stream channelization, nuclear testing, the Alaskan oil pipeline proposal, international treaties, land use problems, and the upcoming United Nations Conference on the Human Environment.<sup>3</sup>

CEQ also has published two annual reports,<sup>4</sup> the first a primer on environmental problems, the second a more sophisticated discussion of present trends and recent prog-

ress in resource management, the innercity environment, and the relationships of recent developments in law and economics to environmental problems.

The most far-reaching of CEQ's activities in terms of impact, however, has been its oversight and guidance of the implementation of NEPA's procedures by federal agencies. CEQ issued interim guidelines to the agencies in April 1970 and in July of that year published a list of the agencies that should be consulted about particular types of environmental impacts. In January 1971 it issued notice of its intention to revise the guidelines. The revised guidelines were issued three months later.

Despite these guidelines and CEQ's continuing review and assistance to the agencies in implementing them, a substantial lack of uniformity is still evident in the quality of the responses by many agencies. To suggest the reasons for this unevenness, it is useful to look briefly at the guidelines themselves.

## Guidelines

Two basic policies are evident in both the interim and revised guidelines. First, although new procedures are required which may, in turn, affect choices between alternative projects and other types of actions, no new explicit rules of preference for making such choices are stated. The guidelines require that environmental impacts be considered in the decision-making process, and they imply clearly that some amount of bias in the direction of minimizing adverse environmental impacts must be introduced in the process of choice. But they do not show clearly how heavily such considerations are to be weighed against traditional agency objectives and budgetary constraints in making particular decisions or how much the administration is willing to sacrifice in attaining other goals (such as water resource development, highway construction, economic growth, and budget control) to achieve environmental goals.

The second policy is that much of the responsibility for implementation is left to the agencies themselves, minimizing the number of specific across-the-board requirements imposed by CEQ. There are obvious reasons for this policy, including the variation in situations and procedures among agencies which precludes governance of all by a single set of definitions and requirements, and also the newness and inexperience of CEQ which precludes sufficient understanding of the agencies' situations and modes of operation to prescribe operational rules for them. NEPA itself was written in general terms in recognition of the procedural differences that would be required to achieve its purposes in the varying contexts of different agencies. On the other hand, such a policy also made inevitable a chaotic transitional period of administrative adaptation.

Within these two policies, the guidelines serve to define particular points of ambiguity in the law, such as the "fullest extent possible" to which agencies are expected to comply with NEPA and the relationship between NEPA's impact statements and the water quality certification requirements of Public Law 91-224. The guidelines also suggest the range of topics that should be covered in the procedures and environmental statements prepared by the agencies.

In addition to clarifying and expanding somewhat this range of topics, the revised guidelines include one particularly significant policy change. They direct that no proposed administrative action significantly affecting the environment shall be taken until at least 90 days after a draft statement and 30 days after a final statement of environmental impact has been sent to CEQ and made public.

This requirement is, for better or worse, a significant departure in administrative de-

Footnotes at end of article.



cision-making. In effect, it establishes a public right to know of proposed administrative actions and their foreseeable consequences before they occur, increasing the possibility that opposition will develop from those individuals and groups who are adversely affected. As Haefele<sup>3</sup> pointed out, the requirement raises the issue of who should decide among alternative uses of resources and how.

Critics of the provision contend that such access creates chaos, opening the administrative process to interminable questions of effects and to repeated "bites at the apple" to stop or stall projects by opponents. CEQ itself initially opposed inclusion of the provision. The interim guidelines did not contain it, and it was included in the revised guidelines only after direct threats by Congress to establish it by statute.<sup>7</sup>

Advocates of the provision, however, argue that administrative problems can be cured by better administration and sensitive rule-making, by adapting to the law and bringing the environmentally concerned public into the planning process when alternatives are being generated and considered rather than by trying to keep it out until the last possible moment; that both the spirit of NEPA and the letter of the executive order implementing it in fact require such public participation as early and as fully as possible; and that during the first year of implementation before the guidelines were revised several agencies demonstrated clearly their willingness to suppress environmentally adverse information until the action was practically a *fait accompli*.

In summary, some difficulties that agencies have experienced in implementing of omission in the interim guidelines, due CEQ's guidelines may be attributed to errors largely to the newness of CEQ in governmental decision-making processes. Presumably, revisions in the guidelines have ameliorated most of these problems.

A greater portion of the agency difficulties may be attributed to the transitional problems of attempting to develop and implement new environmental planning procedures, especially in response to judicial interpretations of the law. Most of these problems also should subside as the transition is weathered and agencies settle into the new procedures.

The remaining problems which exist in some agencies appear to be the result of administrative failure to respond effectively to the new mandate. One such failure is recalcitrance on the part of some agencies not traditionally concerned with environmental quality. Another is the failure of some agencies traditionally concerned with conservation to make the much smaller adjustments that are needed, incorporate environmental quality considerations and early public participation at defined points by clear rule-making, write environmental statements from the data they already have, and get on about their work. Environmental evaluation and citizen participation in planning need not stifle administrative decision-making, as the new chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission has so ably shown. These processes, however, do represent a challenge requiring better evaluation and better administration, and CEQ's guidelines have catalyzed this challenge.

#### CEQ'S PROBLEMS

In addition to the legal limitation on its power to compel action, CEQ has suffered from several administrative problems during its first two years. None of these appear insuperable, however.

The first such problem was prolonged birth pangs. Heavy responsibilities were thrust upon it immediately after its inception, but it was not fully funded until December 1970. It thus operated for nearly a year with an inadequate staff borrowed from other agencies. In addition, it operated during a period of three major reorganizations of the executive branch and was given only six months

before it was required to submit its first annual report. These circumstances forced initial concentration on short-range programs rather than on the more comprehensive mandate of the law.

A second and ongoing problem is the small size and unbalanced composition of CEQ's staff. It would be impossible for any staff of only 23 professionals to review the environmental activities of all federal agencies by any more rational criterion than political controversy, simply because of the magnitude of the job, let alone conduct long-range environmental analyses in addition. Of CEQ's 23 professionals, as of April 1971, only four had advanced degrees in the sciences and two in economics, compared with eight in law and four in public administration.<sup>8</sup> The Council simply has not had the capabilities to carry out the full mandate of NEPA and has been forced instead to focus on the most politically controversial issues which are not necessarily the most environmentally important ones.

A third and related problem is the lack of any objective framework for systematically evaluating the environmental consequences of federal actions and weighing them against traditional costs and benefits. In the absence of such a framework, CEQ is limited to attempting to prevent the worst alternatives—actions which beyond any reasonable doubt would have seriously adverse environmental consequences—and to preventing the most politically controversial actions to protect the president's and, indeed, its own environmental reputation—actions which may or may not actually be the most threatening to environmental quality. The "squeakiest wheel" theory of administrative choice is hardly unique to CEQ, but it is a particularly important and difficult problem in a policy arena such as environmental quality where complex systems of solutions are needed, but quick, visible, and politically saleable solutions are demanded.

Finally, CEQ must operate aware of the fact that its future effectiveness is intimately related to the fate of the environmental issue in general, an issue presently in vogue but subject to all the uncertainties and instabilities of such issues. The reality that political support for environmental quality is primarily of the diffused sort characteristic of consumer issues makes it imperative that CEQ maintain public credibility and keep environmental quality alive as a political issue—to the extent that it can do so in its role as advisor to the president.

#### WHAT NEXT?

Despite its problems, CEQ has had considerable success and hopefully will continue to experience such as transitional problems are resolved and federal agencies become accustomed to planning and managing for environmental quality as a matter of course. CEQ's future depends no less than in the past on the ongoing commitment of the president to environmental quality goals since its power is limited to its ability to persuade him; but if present trends in environmental indicators are accurate, CEQ's area of policy responsibility will be an important subject for federal planning and action through the foreseeable future.

In addition to the proposals in the president's 1971 environmental legislative program, two particular problems appear likely to figure prominently in CEQ's activities in the near future. The first is land use, an issue on which several bills already are pending in Congress. This issue is a natural outgrowth both of concern over pollution and of national environmental policy since many if not most environmental problems result from the ecologically inappropriate use of land and its associated resources.

The second problem is project evaluation criteria, especially the problem of relating environmental quality criteria to traditional economic criteria for project justification.

Language in the conference report on CEQ's appropriation for fiscal year 1972 directed CEQ to consider economic effects in conjunction with environmental criteria<sup>9</sup> and the decision by a federal court of appeals last summer construed NEPA as requiring a balance of economic and environmental factors in decision-making.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, guidelines proposed by the Water Resources Council (but not yet officially adopted by the president) for the evaluation of water resource projects direct that such evaluation be carried out in a genuinely multiple-objective framework rather than under the present single criterion of natural economic efficiency.<sup>10</sup> The issue is a most difficult one, but one with which both CEQ and the Office of Management and Budget (as well as the individual agencies) must grapple. Possibly, a joint effort by these agencies might produce new and better methods for project evaluation that would provide clear information, if not preference rules, for trading off economic and environmental considerations.

CEQ, however, is only a focal point for environmental policy-making and not the sole repository of such policy-making in the federal government. The actions or inactions of nearly all federal agencies affect environmental quality. Responsibility for it rests with the agencies, not with CEQ, and its maintenance and restoration are probably the most challenging task to confront agency administrators and planners in recent years. CEQ's creation was a necessary but by no means sufficient condition for achieving national environmental quality goals.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Council on Environmental Quality. 1970. *Environmental quality—1970*. Washington, D.C. 326 pp.

<sup>2</sup> Council on Environmental Quality. 1971. *Environmental quality—1971*. Washington, D.C. 360 pp.

<sup>3</sup> Haefele, E. T. 1971. *Decision-making in common property resources*. J. Soil and Water Cons. 26 (4): 132-134.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Congress. 1970. *The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Public Law 91-190*. U.S. Code Annotated 42, Sec. 4321-4347. Washington, D.C.

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Congress, House. 1971. *Agriculture—environment and consumer protection programs, fiscal year 1972*. H. Rpt. 92-376. Washington, D.C.

<sup>6</sup> U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. 1969. *Council on Environmental Quality*. H. Rpt. 91-378. Washington, D.C.

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. 1970. *Administration of the National Environmental Policy Act*. Hearings, serial no. 91-41, part I. Washington, D.C.

<sup>8</sup> U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. 1971. *Administration of the National Environmental Policy Act*. H. Rpt. 92-316. Washington, D.C. 107 pp.

<sup>9</sup> U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit. 1971. *Calvert Cliffs Coordinating Committee vs. Atomic Energy Commission*. No. 24,839 and No. 24,871, decided July 23, 1971. Washington, D.C. 40 pp.

<sup>10</sup> Water Resources Council. 1970. *Report to the Water Resources Council by the Special Task Force*. Washington, D.C.

#### ANTI-COMMUNIST CHROME COMES TO AMERICA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Burnside affair attempting to prevent entry

of Rhodesian chrome into the United States leaves many questions unanswered. For example, where did the protesters who call themselves the Committee of Blacks Against Oppression obtain their information that the Santos Vega was loaded with "illegal" Rhodesian chrome and under whose discipline and orders were the so-called demonstrators reacting?

Importation of chrome from anti-Communist Rhodesia is by express orders of a law passed by the U.S. Congress and signed by the President which states that whenever a strategic war material can be obtained from a free world country rather than a Communist country, it should be so done. Actions against the Rhodesian chrome shipment as illegal can only be regarded as an act of disobedience against the laws of the United States. Certainly no American would disobey his own Nation's laws in the interest of national defense to support an emotional United Nations theory of economic embargo.

These misinformed and misguided demonstrators do not understand the law and facts; for if they act with full knowledge, then they are being used as nothing more than an activist lobby in support of the Soviet Union, which is not only the Communist nation supplying the military hardware—the MIG airplanes and SAM missiles killing American fighting men in Vietnam—but is an all-white nation where all of its people, even its own citizens, are oppressed.

For a so-called Committee of Blacks Against Oppression to lobby on the banks of the Mississippi River in the United States for continuation of a Russian monopoly on chrome is a ridiculous exploitation by whoever is calling the signals.

#### SPORTS CORPS—COACHES

### HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective, least costly, and remarkably successful Government programs designed to promote international friendship and understanding and to supply a critically needed manpower shortage in developing nations of the world has been the Sports Corps, a branch of the Peace Corps. Now slightly over one year old, the Sports Corps has placed 283 American coaches in some 25 countries around the world, many of whom will be serving as coaches for these nations at the upcoming Olympic games in Munich.

Sports Corps files are replete with enthusiastic praise for the work of these American coaches who have not only provided specialized athletic training, but have also instilled a deep sense of national pride and respect in the teams they coach. The success of the Sports Corps has not, however, been limited to the coaching of international Olympic teams; U.S. Sports Corps athletes receive the same warm and enthusiastic

welcome when they provide a heretofore lacking coach for a community high school or for a college in a developing nation.

Mr. Speaker, the enormous impact and importance of sports in forming and strengthening global understanding is, I feel, far too often overlooked, but it is an aspect of international relations that has, over the years, been highly successful. Recent history provides us with numerous instances when athletes from different countries have come together in mutual endeavors, while at the same time, political leaders from these countries have been unable to establish effective lines of communication among themselves.

Endeavors like the Sports Corps, the International Sports program operated by the Department of State, and the numerous private organizations contributing to international understanding through sports, deserve our fullest praise, support, and encouragement. They can and have very effectively opened many doors to better international understanding.

Two articles from last week's Washington News call attention to the achievements of the Sports Corps and its dedicated and talented director, Mr. Glenn C. Randall, a former world class athlete and National Olympic Coach, whose enthusiasm and talent have gone far in developing the Sports Corps. Glenn Randall's experiences in coaching Pakistan's Olympic Team in 1964, 1965 and his subsequent work in fostering international athletic programs have given the Sports Corps such a high reputation that requests from all over the world for volunteer coaches are flowing into Peace Corps Headquarters.

I am pleased to share the following two articles with my colleagues, which describe Mr. Randall's achievements, and those of Mr. Jay Jackson, a Sports Corps coach serving in Honduras, and I ask they be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

#### COACH MAKES GOOD IN A NEW PEACE CORPS

(By Tom Quinn)

The Peace Corps sometimes seems to sneak up on people. On Monday you're "considering" the possibility of leaving for awhile your comfortable suburban enclave and, boom—on Thursday you're halfway to Morocco or Malaysia or, in the case of Jay Jackson, Honduras.

For more than a year now, Jackson has been a one-man basketball program in that poor Central American republic. He returned to Washington, D.C., last week to pick up some textbooks for his nationwide coaches clinic in Honduras and to have a back operation.

This week he is back down there preparing the national all-star team for the upcoming Central American Championships.

Two things about Jackson struck me as unusual during a conversation just before he left for the South:

This 6-foot-4, lean, blond, blue-eyed man is not what people have come to regard as a "typical Peace Corps Volunteer."

He certainly is not a typical basketball coach.

In the first place, Jackson is 35 years old. He and his wife, Flora, not only volunteered themselves but also their children: Jay, 7, Jeff, 6 and Jim, 2. This is an example of a recent new emphasis under director Joe Blatchford for Volunteer families. When the

Jacksons decided to apply for the program over a year ago there were 30 participating families. Now there are 167.

But if Jackson had been the typical basketball coach of his high school team in Oak Harbor, Wash., he never might have considered the Peace Corps.

"But I wasn't. When I finished my fourth year as basketball coach at Oak Harbor I found I was disillusioned," Jackson said. "I always thought athletics were supposed to be for the kids, but I was beginning to realize that in the States it's not so much how you play the game but whether or not you win . . . or lose."

About that time, he ran into a friend who with his wife had taught in a Peace Corps program in Ethiopia. Jackson casually mentioned he wouldn't mind a change of scene and boom—three weeks later the Peace Corps called to ask if he'd like to go to Tunisia.

Within a few weeks, the Jacksons' destination changed from Tunisia to Morocco to Honduras but that's not surprising since the Peace Corps is a government bureaucracy whose organization is somewhat less together than its ideals.

"When we first got there, things were kind of slow. Flora got an intestinal problem and had to return to the states. I wasn't making much headway myself. In fact, I was overwhelmed with the lack of facilities, lack of discipline and general inertia in Honduras," Jackson said.

For example, in the Honduran capital, Tegucigalpa, three people handled the whole basketball program for four high schools and 16 primary schools. They would visit each school, one by one, twice a week for an hour each visit. On each occasion 60-80 children would vie for a chance to shoot the two or three basketballs allotted to each school.

"At that point we were discouraged but we decided to stick it out as long as possible," Jackson said.

Then a couple of things happened to change everything. Jackson traveled to the north coast of Honduras to give a clinic in San Pedro Sula. The people there were more enthusiastic than the Tegucigalpans and when the clinic was finished they flew his wife to San Pedro Sula for a special fiesta of thanks.

"Boy, I'll tell you, it was a real tear jerker," Jackson recalled. "And I went back to Tegucigalpa a new man. We felt accepted for the first time."

The Jacksons then moved out of their suburban, American-type home in the Honduran capital and set up housekeeping instead in a colonial building downtown.

"Now we were beginning to feel a part of the people," Jackson said.

Mrs. Jackson started a nutrition program in poor "barrios" of Tegucigalpa and she has had, so far, a 1,000 per cent success, dispensing vitamins and breakfasts to 120 youngsters. (She started out with 12.) The Jacksons are even trying to adopt one of the children who participates in the program.

Jay, meanwhile, has made headway, too. He is successfully conducting coaching and referee clinics and when he leaves next year he figures to have increased the number of qualified referees from six to 25 in the country and the number of coaches from three to 30.

The national basketball team is undergoing a weight program to strengthen the players for what Jackson calls a "pressing-running game—sort of a UCLA program without height." Indeed, there are only two players as tall as 6-4 on the team.

"It will take more than two years to build up the quality of basketball—I'd say the national team right now is about on the level of a good high school team—but at least we're laying the foundations," Jackson said.

In the meantime, the Jacksons have discovered they can get along fine without such



USA basics as the telephone, television, automobiles, frozen foods and hot water.

"The interesting thing is that in the past year and a half we have had more family life together than anytime in our 10 years of marriage," Jackson said. It used to be that everything was all work from seven in the morning to 10 or 11 at night back home.

"But this experience has really given us, as a family, a lot more sense of purpose and accomplishment. And we've made the kind of trans-cultural friendships that, well, were really hard to find back home.

"We had the feeling we weren't really of service to anyone in Oak Harbor but in Honduras it has been exactly the opposite. There we have come up against what I guess you could call 'real' rather than 'imaginary' problems.

"And it's been even more rewarding for the kids, who didn't seem to have our problems adjusting."

Listening to Jackson reminds me of what a radical friend told me recently: "The true revolutionary puts his flesh on the line with his ideals."

That does fit Jackson, altho he is probably more an "evolutionary" than a "revolutionary." His presence in Honduras is supposed to stabilize the country rather than revolutionize it.

Still, Jay Jackson is no phony. The world could use a lot more like him.

#### SPORTS CORPS BUILDS TEAMS—AND NATIONS (By Tom Quinn)

"Did you know that Pete Maravich got more to sign a professional basketball contract than the combined sports budgets of all the countries on the continent of Africa? Now that's a good example of the sports gap."

—Glenn Randall, director of Sports Corps  
When Glenn Randall agreed to coach the track and field team of Pakistan in 1964-65 neither he nor anyone else foresaw that experience engendering Sports Corps, a new and of Peace Corps.

"The West Pakistanis are direct descendants of Alexander the Great—a people who run like the wind and are as big physically as doors," Randall said. "When president Ayub Khan requested a coach, the State Department contacted me thru Sports International and I leaped at the chance.

"Pakistan was not much in Asia, but after months of preparation when we finally went to the Asian Games, we (Pakistan) set 18 Asian records.

"Overnight Pakistan became the track and field power of all Asia—just because of one American coach."

Randall did not forget that remarkable lesson. Five years later, he helped found Sports Corps with the intention of sending qualified volunteers to Third World countries in order to:

Teach instructors as well as students of these countries.

Form scholastic leagues and sports clubs.

Coach national teams and athletes to represent their country.

Today, only 16 months after the founding of Sports Corps, 283 American coaches are serving in 25 countries trying to do what Randall accomplished in Pakistan. Fifteen countries will have American coaches at the Olympic Games in Munich, thanks to Sports Corps.

The idea, Randall says, is not to train athletes simply to break records. "This is the easy, logical, safe way for us to form and maintain very strong friendships in these countries," he said in his office in the Peace Corps building on a corner of Lafayette Park.

"The fact is," Randall continued, "we are one of the few arms of Peace Corps that is immediately accepted and appreciated by all

countries. And with no suspicion and none of that Big Brotherism.

"Man, even President Nixon has said that sports and cultural activities are the best via of communication between us and the Communist block countries. It follows that sports is one of the most natural ways for 'developing countries' to get to know us and for us to get to know them."

Bill Toomey, Olympic decathlon champion and world record holder, was one of the first Americans to accept the Sports Corps challenge. Joe Blatchford, young Peace Corps director, and Randall decided to test out the idea of Sports Corps by sending Toomey to Venezuela, Ghana, Honduras, Ethiopia and Kenya. He returned full of enthusiasm.

"We watched a whole newly-formed nation—Kenya—being brought together by the strength of distance runner Kip Keino so we knew what a strong force sports could be in a country. Strong national figures or teams can instill incredible pride in the people," Randall said. "It may sound strange but we found if a people can believe in a team they often believe in themselves."

Just after Sports Corps formed in late 1970, Randall and Toomey toured 19 Asian countries and asked them if they would accept Sports Corps volunteers. "Everyone said yes unhesitatingly," Randall said, "tho many of these same countries were equivocal about the rest of the Peace Corps."

Toomey is now in charge of promotion and recruitment for Sports Corps, but others who embody the program include:

Mrs. Wilma Sutherland, M.A. in physical education and former Professor of PE at the University of California, is directing a teacher training program for the public schools of Valencia, Venezuela.

Bob Clotworthy, for 10 years the head swimming and diving coach at Princeton University and an Olympic gold medalist in diving is the national swimming coach in Venezuela.

Bill Sweek, a sparkplug on two recent UCLA NCAA champion basketball teams, is in Tunisia as national coach.

Bob Shul, Olympic 5,000 meter champion in Tokyo in 1964, coached the Malaysia track and field team to 18 gold medals in 24 events in recent South East Asian Peninsular Games. And Malaysia had never won more than six events in the games before Shul's arrival.

To this writer, the most important example of the effectiveness of Sports Corps is the case of Chile. When I passed thru Chile in 1966, students had shut down a university in Concepcion because of widespread belief that Peace Corps volunteers were CIA spies.

Whether or not this was true is not important. The Chilean government was about to ask the United States to remove the Peace Corps from Chile simply because they had enough problems without it.

Since then, Chile has voted in a Communist president and the United States has been cold in its diplomatic relations with the country.

Sports Corps, however, is going strong in Chile. It is accepted and lauded. The Chilean national swim and fencing coaches are both Sports Corps volunteers. Former University of Delaware coach Dan Peterson is not only the Chilean national basketball coach but five of his ex-players are distributed thruout the country in a highly organized network to develop Chilean basketball players.

Randall, however, is far from satisfied. Now he wants to:

Lead the United States into Red China. "We'd love to help the President set up an exchange program with Red China . . . we are the vehicle to do it and now is the time—in the spirit of the Olympic ideal."

Set up a National Academy of Sports in the

USA. "To promote American excellence in all sports. We're only good at five of 31 world sports."

Set up an international "Corps of Olympic Volunteers"—athletes and coaches from developed nations to spread thruout the Third World much as Sports Corps is doing, except on a multi-national scale.

Promote a "domestic Sports Corps" principally dedicated to speaking out FOR sports as an alternative to drug abuse among America's youth.

All of this seems like a lot to ask from a nation beset with the bills for problems at home and abroad—but it's not so much.

"The entire Peace Corps could be supported on what we spend for just two or three missiles," Randall said, "and, believe me, compared to the whole Peace Corps budget, Sports Corps is just taxi fare."

#### THE FAILURE OF PUBLIC HOUSING

##### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the failure of Baber Village in Prince Georges' County, following fast upon the decision to demolish much of the Pruitt-Igoue high-rise housing project in St. Louis, is a stark commentary on the failure of public housing to provide the decent, safe, and sanitary housing for the Nation's poor that has been promised in the national housing programs of the past 3 decades. During hearings by the Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on the enforcement of the fair housing laws by the Federal Government, we explored with administration officials and public witnesses the reasons for this failure. The answers we received were consistent with those set forth in the excellent editorial in today's Washington Post: public housing is doomed to failure so long as it continues to perpetuate the patterns of racial and class segregation which characterize our Nation's housing patterns. The Washington Post is right, what is needed is not new housing placed in the same old segregated patterns, but new communities that provide housing opportunities for all.

The Washington Post editorial follows:  
NEEDED: NOT HOUSING BUT COMMUNITIES

Great hopes were raised when only four years ago the nation's first Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Dr. Robert C. Weaver, broke ground for Baber Village, an apartment house project for some 200 families of meager means, at the Mount Pleasant area, just north of Central Avenue in Prince Georges' County. Here was to be a new approach to housing the poor that would avoid the old mistakes of public housing—a program that had become thoroughly discredited.

"Decent, safe and sanitary" public housing to provide shelter for those who cannot afford the going market price for it, first became a national program in 1936 under the New Deal. It has been in trouble ever since. One of the troubles was (and is) that public housing projects concentrate large numbers

of poor and poorly educated people in isolated ghettos. At least 60 per cent of the families who live in these projects are black or Spanish speaking. Another trouble is that, due to restrictions imposed by Congress (which at one time, for instance, would not tolerate such "luxuries" as a balcony) many, if not most of these projects were poorly designed, devoid of beauty and amenity. The worst trouble is that the public housing projects tend to provide just housing without the social services, recreation and education that the poor need more urgently than people of means. Most projects are located on the other side of the railroad tracks, as it were, far removed from shops, schools and job opportunities and all the other "facilities" that facilitate climbing the ladder of what the sociologists call "upward mobility."

Thus, public housing became highly unpopular, so unpopular, in fact, that many communities actually passed laws to prohibit it. In some instances even the poor themselves refused to move into these projects, preferring instead to live in "indecent, unsafe and unsanitary" slums. If the slums were razed for urban renewal, freeways and other new construction, they would crowd into other parts of town and thus create new slums.

Though none of this had anything to do with the principle of public housing, the program barely crept along. We have yet to build the 810,000 public housing units Congress called for back in 1949. And roughly one half of the public housing constructed during the 1960's was built not for large families most in need of it, but for the elderly (who need housing, too, of course, but are more acceptable, somehow, than a lot of noisy children).

The Kennedy and Johnson administrations, as a result, launched a bewildering proliferation of new federal housing subsidy programs. Baber Village was built under one of the first of these, known to housing professionals as 221 (d) (3). The idea of this section of the 1961 Housing Act is that non-profit organizations, such as church groups or labor unions, should house the poor rather than the government. It is done with generous federal mortgage guarantees and sharply reduced interest and insurance charges. Some hailed this approach because it seems to strengthen free enterprise. Others called it "a gimmick." The fact is that many of these 221 (d) (3) projects have worked out extremely well. The Sursum Corda development at First and M Streets, NW, for instance, a cluster of townhouses and small apartments for some 200 families, sponsored by a group of Catholic church organizations, is a model of its kind. Others, like Baber Village, which is sponsored by the African Methodist Episcopal Church, merely confounded the old public housing mistakes. Baber Village is isolated, poorly designed and far removed from shops, schools and job opportunities. What is more, its sponsor invested less than \$5,000 in the project and lacked all knowledge and experience in housing construction and management.

Afflicted by shoddy construction, crime vandalism, Baber Village is in dire distress. More than a quarter of the houses are vacant and the African Methodist Episcopal Church is unable to raise the money for repairs and the mortgage payments. They have therefore decided to ask HUD to foreclose the mortgage and to turn the problem back to the U.S. government.

The heart of the problem is, of course that decent, safe and sanitary housing alone—public, private or in-between—is simply not enough. It must be supplemented by adequate community services, police protection, medical care, transportation, recreation and the rest. In short, it is time to stop

building housing for the poor and to start building communities that include everyone.

### MASS TRANSIT, YES; MORE HIGHWAYS, NO

#### HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the cities of our Nation are choking to death on the automobile. Cities like New York have desperate need of a massive transfusion of Federal funds for urban mass transit. Such action by Government is long overdue and desperately needed. We have already arrived at a point where it is practically impossible to move large numbers of city residents across metropolitan areas with regularity. If we do not act swiftly, our urban areas as we have come to know them will cease to exist. Urban mass transit subsidies by Government are utterly vital.

When I return home to my district in New York, I hear on all sides the legitimate and increasingly desperate request by constituents for this kind of action. Many urban Congressmen have petitioned the administration, seeking some understanding of the plight of our people. In response we receive mumbling and promises of vague future actions.

It is most difficult to impress upon this relatively isolated group of powerful men and women the urgency of our need.

Instead of some truly swift, comprehensive policy, we receive more highway plans, complete with destructive impact upon viable neighborhoods of our cities.

When will the people who decide our transportation priorities understand the last thing we want or need or will tolerate is more expressways? Why should more suburbanites be able to dash through the heart of our cities on their way to work or to their homes in suburbs? These roads tear apart good neighborhoods, displace honest, hard-working urbanites and in the end only further pollute the air. In effect, new superhighways create far more problems than they solve.

America has been on a roadbuilding orgy for at least the past 15 years, mainly through the Interstate Highway System, with 42,500 miles in total mileage. It has been and is being financed by the trust fund through user taxes virtually every American pays. Yet these funds are untouchable for other, more vital purposes, such as urban mass transit. A massive, shrewd, well-organized and well-financed highway lobby prevents any such use of these moneys. Attempts have been made to bring into being a similar trust fund for urban mass transit. I, for one, have joined in sponsorship of legislation to accomplish this goal. Yet the highway lobby, working closely with the administration, has held mass transit forces at bay, frustrating their legitimate efforts to cut the Gordian knot of traffic we are choking on.

Costs of the Interstate Highway System have been immense in terms of actual dollars expended, environmental damage sustained and priorities reversed. Immense amounts of ill will have been created, particularly among city groups who have become victims of these roads and their people removal programs. It is vital that the Secretary of Transportation tell us what his transportation blueprint for the future is going to look like. It is also vital that he inform the Nation of what the cost of future roadbuilding is going to be in terms of environmental damage.

These roads promote suburban flight away from cities. This, in turn, leads to urban blight. As a corollary of such programs, commerce is siphoned away from cities, taking jobs and tax money away from where they are needed most. This, of course, leads to downgraded municipal services and lack of people in urban areas.

The Interstate system has uprooted people in huge numbers; 58,000 in 1970 alone. By making it ever easier to use cars instead of rapid mass urban transit, we deplete our oil reserves. Over 38 percent of annual petroleum production in the United States goes into making gasoline, according to the National Petroleum Institute.

Autos on roads cause at least 39 percent of the Nation's appalling, growing air pollution, according to the Environmental Protection Agency, and as much as 80 percent of it in certain cities. Yet this year, highways will get \$5.2 billion from the Federal Government, while rapid transit systems will have to be satisfied with \$750 million. This is senseless, especially to a State and city like New York, which pays into the Federal Treasury far more than it receives in return from all Federal programs.

Nevertheless, the handwriting is on the wall. In every city across our Nation people are coming to realize they just do not have to endure this kind of outrage on their pocketbooks, nerves, and lives.

Groups are organizing all across the Nation, and highways are being stopped one by one by outraged, alert, aware groups through court actions. Virtually every month another victory is scored against these roads.

Last November, the courts stopped a federally funded freeway in San Francisco because the State had failed to make an adequate environmental study. One week later, highway foes got Interstate 90 in Seattle halted for the same reason. Victories in Washington against freeways threatening neighborhood integrity of the city have heartened freeway opponents across the entire United States.

My Borough of Brooklyn desperately needs attention to its transportation needs through a Federal mass transit commitment. The people I represent will not accept further puerile excuses and delays. In every way we can, we shall oppose the highway juggernaut until some measure of sanity is restored to the Nation's transportation priorities.



# MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM, BY CAROLYN RUSS

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest.

This year nearly 500,000 secondary school students participated, and the winning contestant from each State was brought to Washington for the final judging for five national scholarships which were awarded as the top prizes.

I am extremely proud that the winner in Tennessee is Miss Carolyn Russ from my hometown of Kingsport. A senior at Dobyns-Bennett High School, Miss Russ is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Erwin Russ. She hopes to pursue a teaching career or a career in the humanities.

Residents of Kingsport have great pride in Miss Russ and it is significant to note that in 1966 her brother, David, won the same contest and went on to become national winner.

Miss Russ has an impressive record at Dobyns-Bennett. She is a National Merit Scholar semifinalist, a nominee as Outstanding Teenager of America, has won tournament awards for debating, oratory and impromptu speaking, as well as receiving awards in Latin, math, and Tennessee history.

She is a member of the National Honor Society, the Beta Club, and the Science and Humanities Seminars.

The theme of this year's VFW contest was "My Responsibility to Freedom." I have all the confidence in the world in our young people, and after reading Miss Russ' essay, my confidence is greater than ever before.

It is a pleasure to make this prize-winning essay available for readers of the RECORD. At the same time, I wish to commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars for its continued interest in the Nation's young people.

The essay follows:

## MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Carolyn Russ)

Freedom is a bell! "A bell is no bell till you ring it." How shall I ring it? What is my responsibility to freedom?

I view freedom as a gift, and consider a responsibility to be something which must be fulfilled. When considering my responsibility to freedom I find that the idea of preserving freedom seems to be the central one, with a cluster of related ideas around it. Foremost among these related ideas are two which are basic to the preservation of freedom.

The first is most often mentioned—the negative idea expressed as "refraining from abusing freedom". It is easy to see that abuse destroys freedom since it causes quick destruction. This is apparent even in elementary school. When the teacher allows whispering, and someone forgets and shouts, the freedom to whisper is quickly withdrawn. Abuse of freedom and restrictions are directly proportional: as one gets larger the other gets larger. But, restrictions and freedom are inversely proportional: as restrictions get larger, freedom gets smaller.

I accept the idea of not abusing freedom as one way I can preserve it.

Less obvious is the second idea that using freedom is a way of preserving it because destruction of freedom by non-use is a more gradual destruction. This gradual destruction like Sandburg's Fog, "comes on little cat feet", and therefore is possibly more dangerous. Like man's vestigial appendix, freedom unused gradually shrinks into uselessness.

I accept the responsibility of using freedom in order to preserve it.

How may I, a high school student, use my freedom? Here my point of view is limited. I have only limited experience. I have a limited area of influence. I have limited opportunities. Maybe the word "student" is the key. Learning is my job—my way of using freedom.

What do I learn? Again I start with the obvious: learning the historical and structural facts of our American government, from the names of the signers of the Declaration of Independence to the name of my congressman, from the provisions of the Bill of Rights to those of the 26th amendment. I must not neglect these.

But I cannot stop here. I need to learn what other generations have thought—their political, theological and scientific philosophies—to evaluate them, and to use them as a base upon which to build my own thoughts. Through a variety of experiences I need to learn the essential art of understanding and getting along with people. Finally, I must learn how to speak and write about my ideas effectively, for, if I cannot express myself, I have failed in using my freedom.

All this learning is going to take a while—the rest of my life, I guess—so, at the same time I will have to start working—working. I hope, with wisdom enough to work until real solutions are found. To illustrate how I feel about this, let me talk about the problem of pollution—something everyone feels he must do something about. We have an abundance of people going out on Saturdays and picking up aluminum cans and chewing gum wrappers. This is all well and good—so far as it goes. But I can see the day coming when everyone will say, "Look, there's no trash along our highways. The pollution problem is solved." And meanwhile dirty air and impure water will be killing us all.

Solving a problem in this manner can be compared with trying to get rid of an iceberg. A team of people chopping on the iceberg with icepicks pretty soon might chop away the peak above the water. Good! Yet seven times as much of that iceberg remains underneath the water and, with the top part gone, it's hard to see the iceberg is there until your ship is wrecked upon it.

What is my responsibility to freedom? It is to preserve it by using it, not abusing it, by learning all I can so as to be able to share it, to be concerned, and to act responsibly to reach real solutions.

Freedom is a bell. A bell may be rung so that it produces discordant noise or harmonious music. May I ring the bell of freedom with a tone that is clear and strong and pure, for freedom is my responsibility.

THE LATE HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

MR. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join those eulogizing our former colleague, James W. Trimble, for I feel a distinct, personal loss in his passing. When I was a young freshman in the Congress, he showed me many acts of

kindness. He was never too busy to take time to talk to me and to explain either the issues of the day or the intricate parliamentary procedures before the House. He was always available for advice and counsel and gave unstintingly of his time. I shall never forget his many deeds of kindness, and I am certain that many others benefited from his unselfish acts.

Jim Trimble was deeply dedicated to the public interest and served the 3d District of Arkansas well for 22 years. He was a member of the Public Works Committee, and later, the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives. He was greatly respected by his colleagues.

To his loved ones, I join many others in offering deep sympathy in this time of deep sorrow over his passing.

## INEQUITIES IN THE RENT REGULATIONS UNDER PHASE II

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the membership the following letter addressed to the members of the New Jersey delegation by Mr. Martin Aranow, president, New Jersey Tenants Organization, in which he cogently summarizes the inequities in the rent regulations under phase II.

The "horror stories" may be downgraded by the Rent Advisory Board, but they are all too real for a great number of tenants not only in New Jersey but throughout the Nation.

I have expressed my deep concern to the Chairman of the Price Commission and I hope prompt and effective remedial action will be forthcoming. If not, the Banking and Currency Committee, on which it is my honor to serve, will conduct oversight hearings to insure that the administration of the stabilization program is in compliance with the intent of Congress.

Mr. Aranow's letter follows:

NEW JERSEY TENANTS ORGANIZATION,  
March 14, 1972.

Congressman HUNT,  
Congressman SANDMAN,  
Congressman HOWARD,  
Congressman THOMPSON,  
Congressman FORSYTHE,  
Congressman WIDNALL,  
Congressman ROE,  
Congressman HELSTOSKI,  
Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN,  
Congressman RODINO,  
Congressman MINISH,  
Congresswoman DWYER,  
Congressman GALLAGHER,  
Congressman DANIELS,  
Congressman PATTEN.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: The federal wage price rent freeze is just not working.

Under the Phase 2 guidelines landlords are permitted to legally increase rents virtually without ceilings. We can document cases where landlords have raised rents 35% and 45%—all within the legal requirements of the Phase 2 regulations.

The regulations are confusing to landlords, tenants and to the Internal Revenue Service

In various locations throughout the state. The elderly and those on fixed incomes are not the only people being hurt. People who have leases are the most severely discriminated against. This happens to be predominantly middle class apartment dwellers.

We feel that we are literally "banging our heads against a stone wall" since our meeting with Rent Advisory Board Executive Director James Tanck only produced sympathy—and no changes. It is now up to you, our representatives, to try and do something. Perhaps public hearings or other types of pressure are in order to make the administration fully aware of what they are doing to innocent people. This fact is clear, it is morally wrong to limit a man's wages to 5.5% and allow his rents to skyrocket to as much as 45%.

We need your help now. When Mr. Tanck heard of the large rent increases occurring in New Jersey he said, "there are always a few horror stories."

Please feel free to contact us should you desire any further information. As of this point the outlook is bleak and it is our sincere hope that you can make the difference. We look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Very truly yours,

MARTIN ARANOW,  
President.

#### TRIBUTE TO JACK PROVO

#### HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 17, the Minneapolis Tribune carried an editorial praising the governmental career of Hennepin County Board Chairman Jack Provo. The occasion was Chairman Provo's retirement from the Hennepin County Board.

The editorial correctly identifies Provo's major achievement which was providing Hennepin County, a jurisdiction of over 1 million people, with updated capabilities which allow it to perform its duties effectively, efficiently, and economically.

From the day he began his service on the Hennepin County Board, Jack Provo relentlessly pursued excellence in county government. The present structure of Hennepin County government is testimony to Provo's effective work both in the legislature and among his fellow board members.

The people of Hennepin County will miss Chairman Jack Provo's leadership. The Tribune editorial follows:

#### PROVO'S COUNTY BOARD TENURE . . .

Hennepin County Board Chairman Jack Provo was not an original member of the Republican "Young Turks" who entered Hennepin County politics in the early 1960's to provide a decade of enlightened, progressive leadership in county and state government. But Provo fit this pattern when, after an intra-party fight for endorsement in 1964, he was elected a county commissioner on a platform that stressed expansion of the role of county government.

Since then, Provo has been an important part of the controlling board majority that accomplished just such an expansion under the chairmanship, earlier, of Robert Janes and, since 1969, of Provo himself. Buildings—the county Government Center and a new General Hospital—have been the most

obvious county board concern for a number of years. But the board's major contribution in the Janes-Provo years has been to reorganize and professionalize county government—equipping it with the capabilities necessary to shed its old custodial role, to accept new responsibilities and to concentrate on problem-solving during a period in which suburban population and political power expanded rapidly.

When Provo leaves the county board in September to become Hennepin County District Court administrator, most of the "Young Turks" will be gone. A few—Janes, Bill Frenzel—have moved to Washington; others—Wayne Popham, John Yngve—have, like Provo, chosen to retire from elective office. Replacing officials of such quality is not easy.

Both political parties have turned up some men of similar caliber—County Commissioner Thomas Olson and Minneapolis Alderman John Cairns, for example, and state legislators Arne Carlson, Thomas Berg and Robert Tennesen. Provo's resignation re-emphasizes the need and the responsibility of the parties, if they are to fulfill one of their major purposes, to offer more such candidates to the voters.

#### ANTIMILITARY COLLEGES

#### HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the cooperation between the military and our institutions of higher education has produced the finest military officers in the world. Recently, some of these institutions have let their political feelings be known by barring ROTC units from their campuses. It seems that educators who are supposed to instill the principles of understanding and objectivity in our youth are now violating those principles by letting their biases be known.

The editorial which I have inserted in the RECORD today makes an excellent case for eliminating Defense Department subsidies to schools which have lost their objectivity toward the military.

The editorial follows:

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel, Feb. 26, 1972]

#### ANTIMILITARY COLLEGES

More than a dozen of the big colleges and universities have phased out military training courses, or are in the process.

Yet some of these schools, Harvard in particular, have continued to receive Federal funds for teaching officers of the armed forces.

Rep. F. Edward Hébert, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has threatened to push a special law to bar military officers from colleges which have dropped ROTC or forbidden military recruiters on campus.

There already is a law of this type, but some Pentagon officials have said they didn't think it applied across the board.

The Pentagon has said it will send servicemen "to the most appropriate graduate school" despite Hébert's threat.

In any event, Hébert is in the process of using his formidable influence to prevent any service from sending officers to institutions which have banned either ROTC or recruiters.

As he points out, there are thousands of

colleges and universities in this country, and the armed forces surely can find schools which offer suitable courses without subsidizing institutions which otherwise don't want any part of the military.

The decisions to drop ROTC or bar recruiters were forced, in most cases, by dissident student groups or faculty groups. Schools which buckled to those demands hardly are appropriate places to send young officers for advanced or specialized training at taxpayer expense.

#### THE "WRONGS" COMMON CAUSE IGNORES

#### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in considering the problems facing the Nation, too many individuals and organizations tend to see only those alleged "evils" which tend to reinforce their own preconceived notions.

Businessmen, accordingly, rarely see the faults of businessmen, and labor leaders rarely see the faults of unions. Similarly, we do not depend upon Government bureaucrats to tell us what is wrong with the administration of Government agencies.

It would be expected, however, that an organization which holds itself out as one which seeks the public interest, rather than the interest of a particular group, would concern itself with "wrongs" wherever they might be found.

Common Cause holds itself out as such an organization, yet it has proven very one-sided in its assessment of the Nation's problems.

Two "wrongs" which Common Cause has failed to identify, according to Arthur Krock, former Washington bureau chief of the New York Times, are:

1. The monopolistic power of organized labor, derived from a combination of (a) legal immunities from acts, including "municipal diplomacy," which would be illegal if performed by any other group, and (b) the gratitude of politicians to the unions for large contributions to their campaign expenses through "educational committees."

2. The callous exploitation of elementary-school children as pawns by vote-seeking politicians and fanatic reformers who are racists in reverse.

Common Cause has not seen fit to concern itself with the excesses of union power and the hypocrisy of enforced school busing. School busing, opposed by more than 75 percent of the American people, yet imposed upon them by bureaucrats and the courts, seems of no interest to an organization which alleges to be a "people's lobby."

Mr. Krock points out that an organization which calls itself an "ombudsman" for the people should speak out in behalf of the deepest felt needs of the people, such as for safe streets. He notes that the public has a right to expect such an organization providing a courageous voice against—

The prevalent crimes of violence, and a detailed denunciation of a legal system which tolerates the hideous crime of rape by allow-



ing the rapist almost to count on going unwhipped of justice.

Yet what are the reforms Common Cause urges—a "date certain" for withdrawal from Vietnam and opposition to the SST. Mr. Krock concludes that—

If the Nation is to be "rebuilt," I do not find a likely bidder for the contract in the application Mr. Gardner has entered for Common Cause.

I wish to share Mr. Krock's article, which appeared in the Washington Post of February 11, 1972, with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time.

The article follows:

**THE POWER OF ORGANIZED LABOR AND BUSING: CERTAIN "WRONGS" WHICH COMMON CAUSE IGNORES**

(By Arthur Krock)

Common Cause, described by its founder, John Gardner, as a people's lobby working to "rebuild this nation . . . heal [it] and set it again on the path to greatness," has just issued over his signature an appeal for new members. In four single-spaced typewritten pages of lofty prose, Mr. Gardner has specified certain "wrongs" which Common Cause is "pushing" to correct. But conspicuously absent from these specifications, and hardly even to be inferred from a flood of generalizations, are two "wrongs" which bear down more heavily on the people than the safe and routine few Mr. Gardner has cited as reforms that Common Cause is "pushing."

These two wrongs are: (1) The monopolistic power of organized labor, derived from a combination of (a) legal immunities from acts, including "muscular diplomacy," which would be illegal if performed by any other group, and (b) the gratitude of politicians to the unions for large contributions to their campaign expenses through "educational committees." (2) The callous exploitation of elementary-school children as pawns by vote-seeking politicians, and fanatic reformers who are racists in reverse.

The "labor movement," to which Mr. Gardner referred as one of those reforms which "welled up out of the people" on the prompting of such citizens' organizations as Common Cause, began as a liberation of workers from the brutal exploitation of employers. But under legislative, judicial and executive favoritism it has developed into an economic and political tyranny which subjugates the general welfare to its own. In the process of so-called collective bargaining national unions are armed unilaterally with the weapon of strikes which, under the threat of paralyzing all communications and whole industries, confront management with the choice of agreeing to contracts that feed the fires of the inflation kindled by previous contracts, or shutting down their production.

When union strike funds are exhausted, the strikers can increase the burden on the taxpayers by going on welfare. If management attempts to continue production, the union involved in the dispute need only throw out a picket line to restrain the members of uninvolved unions from carrying out their contracts to remain on the job. And this despite the fact that the striking union may be shot through with corruption and its demands outrageous by any standard.

Yet no call for laws ending strikes which suspend national transportation is to be found in the statement of the aims of Common Cause.

If any protest against conditions that are "wrong" has "welled up" strongly from the people, it is against the crazy-quilt pattern of busing to effect a mathematical racial balance in the public schools. The doctrinaires, both the high-minded and the mush-headed do-gooders, plus the mercenary politicians and political judges who have

aligned with them, are uprooting small children from their neighborhoods, friends and families and sending them miles away by bus to areas from which other groups are being transported to the home neighborhood of the first.

Yet all the Supreme Court has ruled so far is that no state or sub-division may exclude a child from an elementary school by reason of his race. If a good school is nearby and the school of his choice is on the other side of town, the Supreme Court thus far has not said the state or sub-division must provide his transportation.

But a diligent search of Mr. Gardner's appeal for new Common Cause members discloses only this timid reference to a condition which is foremost among the things that are "wrong" with this country: "Your children attend crowded schools."

In a document with such a high degree of self-asserted righteousness of self-appointment as the ombudsman of the downtrodden, the reader also has a right to expect what he will not find—even a trace of—an extended arraignment, and a courageous one, of the prevalent crimes of violence, and a detailed denunciation of a legal system which tolerates the hideous crime of rape by allowing the rapist almost to count on going unwhipped of justice. Yet no violence committed by one person on another is more degrading to the victim than this desecration of a woman, or more capital a crime, justifying the extermination of the creatures who commit it and making detailed identification of the suspect the duty of the press.

Instead Mr. Gardner's statement reports that Common Cause is "pushing" reforms that require no courage to do this political voting rights, "a date certain" for total withdrawal from Vietnam, no SST, tax favoritism.

If the nation is to be "rebuilt," I do not find a likely bidder for the contract in the application Mr. Gardner has entered for Common Cause.

## CELEBRATE CENTENNIAL

### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the city of San Leandro, located in Alameda County on the eastern shore of San Francisco Bay is celebrating its centennial.

San Leandro is a viable community with lovely homes and supported by an industrial complex in no way detracts from the beauty of the city, and yet helps to support its activities.

The mayor of San Leandro is the Honorable Jack Maltester who has been honored by his fellow mayors by being elected president of the National Conference of Mayors and serving on several important government boards.

San Leandro is a good community in which to live and work, and I am proud to have it as a part of the congressional district I represent.

I want to join with San Leandrans in celebrating their 100th birthday and, as a part of these remarks, include a brief history of the city:

#### SAN LEANDRO

#### CENTENNIAL PHILOSOPHY

The Centennial has been planned as a community event. It includes activities reminiscent of past celebrations and also activi-

ties and events such as parades and dinners for San Leandrans and their guests.

The philosophy of the Centennial is to bring San Leandrans together to enjoy each other and their community, to work and play together and to remember San Leandro's history and its present as well. The Centennial Committee also hopes to provide the city with a permanent souvenir of the celebration. This is the Casa Peralta, which was purchased and donated to the city by Mr. and Mrs. Jack Brooks. Now housing the Centennial staff, it will be a public property to be used for cultural, youth, recreation and senior citizen activities, as well as for museum display purposes.

The Centennial is also planned as a way of rededicating ourselves to our city's future—to realize its prospects and opportunities and dedicate ourselves anew to working for them.

The first pioneers came thousands of years ago, in the great periodic migrations from Asia to the American continent. They were Indian people, hunters and gatherers. These shell-mound people lived on the San Leandro shoreline as early as 3000 years ago. They found a lush land, teeming with birds, game, and shellfish, and they stayed. They were probably the ancestors of the Costanoan people the Spaniards found when they explored the area 2800 years later.

The Spanish called them Costanos, "coast people." Anthropologists used the term Costanoan for the groups from the East Bay and the Peninsula (including San Francisco) down the coast to Big Sur and Soledad who spoke languages from the same language family.

There was no division into tribes, the people thought of themselves as belonging to villages—rancherías as the Spanish called them. To locate these rancherías we have to rely on the records of the Spanish explorers and missionaries, because almost all the rancherías had been destroyed or abandoned before the Americans came.

While the Spanish explorers in 1772 and 1776 never reported villages in Oakland or San Leandro, the Indians may still have had rancherías on the beach or in the redwoods.

There was an Indian village on San Lorenzo Creek, and there were another four or five to the south on each creek between San Lorenzo and Milpitas. They were of average size in 1772 and 1776, perhaps roughly 100 people in each. We do not know their names, although one ranchería near Mission San Jose was named Oroison.

The Indian way of life at San Leandro was in tune with nature. Before the white men came, the Indians lived in houses made of poles covered with tule matting. There was a temescal or sweathouse in every village, shaped like an inverted basket and covered with mud. The people took sweatbaths daily, which prevented several skin diseases. Women wore only short aprons, one in front and one in back, made of tule, deerskin, or fiber from bark. Their faces usually were tattooed in lines or rows of dots. Men and children went about naked, though in cold weather members of both sexes threw rabbit-skin blankets over their shoulders. The hair was left long but worn tied on the top of the head with twine, apparently by both men and women. Men often were bearded.

At the winter solstice a dance was held regularly at Mission San Jose by the Costanoans.

#### THE EXPLORERS, THE MISSIONS, AND THE RANCHOS

Two centuries ago, in the early morning of March 26, 1772, 16 men broke their camp on the San Lorenzo Creek and crossed into what is now San Leandro. They were the Fages-Crespi expedition, and they were the first white men to explore San Leandro. Captain Pedro Fages led the group, which included 12 soldiers, a muleteer, an Indian servant, and Father Juan Crespi, who per-

formed religious services and kept a diary. In the diary Crespi described San Leandro as part of a level plain with relatively few trees except in the creek. The land was good, though, and covered with wild grasses, herbs, and tules. The group did not apply a name to San Leandro or its creek.

Four years later, on March 31, 1776, another expedition, the Anza expedition, camped on San Lorenzo Creek and the next day explored San Leandro. Diaries were kept by both Captain Juan Anza and Father Pedro Font. Father Font described San Leandro Creek on April 1 as "an arroyo with little water but with a deep bed grown with cottonwoods, live oaks, laurels and other trees . . ." They saw four bears and reported them plentiful here, ". . . for we saw several Indians badly scarred by bites and scratches of these animals." Evidently these Indians were seen in San Leandro.

With the founding of Mission San Jose de Guadalupe on June 11, 1797, the padres really began to change the way of life at San Leandro. Almost all the local Indians were brought to the mission and converted to Christianity during the next 15 to 20 years. The majority lived in Indian huts around the mission (Mission San Jose). Their labor built the mission, plowed the fields, and tended the stock. This was a large job, because the mission lands extended north to San Leandro Creek.

Many of the Indians became vaqueros, and San Leandro became a place for rounding up the northern stock, El Rodeo de San Leandro. The name, after St. Leander (a Spanish bishop), may have occurred before Jose Joaquin Estudillo—the city's founder—arrived: or Estudillo may have been the first to use it, if St. Leander was his patron saint as Freeman once reported.

In 1834 the missions were secularized. That meant that the administration of the mission buildings, lands, and herds was taken over by the Mexican government. Some of the land and stock was given to the faithful Indians tending them in San Leandro and elsewhere. Some of it was dispersed in the form of land grants. In 1836 Estudillo brought 300 white heifers to San Leandro from Rancho Pinole and established his home here on the bank of San Leandro Creek, about where Donovan Drive and Brookside Street now meet. On January 8 of the following year Estudillo filed for a grant of the Rodeo de San Leandro, between the Arroyos of San Leandro Creek and San Lorenzo Creek. After waiting for five years, Don Joaquin realized his application must have been lost, and he filed a new one. Four months later he received the grant, October 16, 1842. It included all the land between the two creeks from the hills to the Bay, except the lands occupied and cultivated by Indians. He called it Rancho San Leandro.

When the Americans came, they bought or squatted on what land the Indians had held on to. As the ranchos broke up, the Indians gradually intermarried with the Mexican population and became indistinguishable from it, especially since most had Spanish names given them by the padres or rancheiros. No treaties or settlements ever were made. The descendants of the Costanoans reconstructed themselves as the Ohlone Indian Tribe in 1971.

Life on the Estudillo Rancho was gracious, pastoral, and unhurried. Don Joaquin made a good living from his rancho, and through the trade of hides and tallow with New England merchant ships was able to buy fine silks for his wife and daughters, casks of brandy for entertaining, and may other things that could not be produced here easily. He had more than 100 Indian vaqueros and servants at one time. There was time for roundups; dances; meriendas (picnics); bullfights; and visits to relatives in the East Bay, San Francisco, and Monterey. Life was good.

Estudillo had married Juana Martinez (March 30, 1805 to November 8-14, 1879) on February 6, 1823, and they had 10 children by 1842 when Don Joaquin applied again for his grant. The children were: Concepcion (born 1825, wife of John B. Ward), Ramon (born 1827), Gertrudis (born 1829), Antonio (born 1830), Maria de Jesus (1831-1909, wife of William H. Davis), Vicente (1833-1893), Luis (born 1836), Magdalena (born circa 1842, wife of John Nugent), Dolores (born circa 1841, wife of Charles H. Cushing), and Jesus Maria ("Chumalia") Estudillo (born circa 1844, died 1910). Their stories are told in Shaffer's history and San Leandro Recollections, Centennial publications.

The Estudillos gave the Plaza and land for the County Courthouse (Clarke and W. Estudillo), for St. Leander's Church, and for several parks on San Leandro Boulevard (formerly the ball park and the tennis courts). Davis and Ward laid out the town of San Leandro on February 27, 1855, St. Leander's Day. They drove around the county in a buggy to get votes to move the county seat to San Leandro, and they built the Estudillo House. Ward built the first dam across San Leandro Creek to provide water, and it was he who opened up Washington Avenue in 1860 as a street to San Lorenzo.

These are just a few of their activities that shaped the town. Magdalena, Maud, Sybil, and Elsie avenues were named after the Nugent family. Chumalia Estudillo (who usually went by J. M. Estudillo) was a town trustee and quite active in civic events.

Ygnacio Peralta owned all San Leandro north of the Creek (and Oakland to Church Street and to 69th Avenue). This was his part of the Rancho San Antonio grant (from San Leandro to El Cerrito) that had been given to his father, Luis Maria Peralta, in 1820. It was in 1842 that Don Luis rode up on the East Bay hills with his sons and divided the grant among them.

We do not know the exact year Ygnacio moved here, but he had built an adobe by 1842 on San Leandro Creek (near the end of 105th Avenue in Oakland). He was across the creek from the Estudillos in their first adobe. Ygnacio (April 3, 1791-May 9, 1874) and his wife, Rafaela (Sanchez) Peralta (born 1800), had 12 children: Marcia del Carmen (1819-1874), Jose Francisco (born 1820), Miguel Antonio (born 1825), Joaquin (1827-1869), Maria Ludovina Columba (1828-1917), Luis Maria (born 1831), Jose de Jesus (born 1833), Juan Bautista (born 1835), Maria Antonia (1836-1926), Gabriel or Barilla (born 1839), Rafael (born 1840), and one, possibly another Maria, who died young. Records of marriages of all but Joaquin, Luis Maria, Rafael, and the young Maria are in existence.

#### THE COMING OF THE AMERICANS—IMMIGRANTS 1850-1871

San Leandro had only a handful of American settlers before 1850. One of the earliest was William Heath Davis (1822-1909), who came to California as a cabin boy on one of his father's ships from Hawaii as early as 1831. By 1838 he had advanced considerably to supercargo, then became an owner of Yankee trading ships. He met his future wife in 1842. He soon ran a merchandise store in San Francisco. He finally married Maria de Jesus Estudillo in 1847 and came to San Leandro, where he lived with the Estudillos for several years.

The second American son-in-law, John B. Ward, came to California during the Gold Rush in 1849 (though he had visited the coast as a cabin boy in 1840). He came to this area after a try at the mines, and married Concepcion Estudillo in November, 1851. In late 1849 Thomas W. Mulford, Moses Wicks, A. R. Biggs, E. Minor Smith, and W. C. Smith, all of whom had come during the Gold Rush, crossed the Bay in a whaleboat and settled as duck hunters and squatters

in the area of the present Mulford Gardens. Mulford and Wicks remained and played major roles in the development of the large-scale farming, shipping, and oyster industries of San Leandro.

#### OBSERVATIONS ABOUT OUR LEGAL SYSTEM

#### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last December, a most significant message was delivered by a public-spirited, dedicated American citizen. The contents of this address touched me so deeply that I feel, in view of the timeliness of this message, that it should be brought to the attention of the Members of this body.

I refer to the address of Harry Goldsmith before the annual president's dinner of the Grand Jurors Association of Bronx County, N.Y. Mr. Goldsmith, the outgoing president of the association, delivered a most inspiring and forceful address in which he made certain observations about our legal system—observations which, if translated into action, would contribute immeasurably to the fight against the rising crime rate and the scourge of narcotics abuse.

I was particularly pleased to note that Mr. Goldsmith's colleagues in the Grand Jurors Association and his many friends and admirers have honored this remarkable man many times before. He is, to be sure, a very exceptional human being. Harry came to the United States in 1937, leaving the horrors of Nazi Germany behind him, and from that time on he has been an active participant in numerous civic and community projects. This man is indefatigable, his vision laudable, and his perseverance unmatched. As he has said many times "It has always been very easy for me to give—but very embarrassing for me to receive." This is the creed by which Harry Goldsmith lives and his friends and community are all the better for it.

I know personally of Harry Goldsmith's contributions to worthwhile causes through his unrelenting efforts to find solutions to the problems of drug addiction, particularly as it affects adolescents. Mr. Goldsmith served for several years as a member of the Lay Board of Riverside Hospital, the only facility in the world at the time dedicated solely to the treatment of preadult addicts. This institution was established by the city of New York nearly 20 years ago under a State-enacted adolescent civil commitment law which I was privileged to sponsor. For some while I served as chairman of that board and I witnessed first-hand the trials, the frustrations, the agonies of the addiction problem which began to plague us during the 1950's. Mr. Goldsmith, despite the discouragements that would have dissuaded a lesser man, became even more determined, even more relentless in his efforts to find the answers, and has been devoting every spare moment toward that end.



That is why I was so pleased with the recognition accorded Harry Goldsmith by the Bronx Grand Jurors. That is why his words—so sincere, so genuine—mean so much.

Mr. Goldsmith's speech on the evening of December 2 was guided by his usual inspiration and ability to see things as they really are. I would, at this time, like to share with my colleagues his speech of December 2 so that they might learn of this warm and dedicated community leader and reflect on his thoughts.

The speech follows:

THE GRAND JURORS ASSOCIATION, OF BRONX COUNTY, ANNUAL PRESIDENT'S DINNER, DEC. 2, 1971

Reverend Clergy, Distinguished Guests and Friends: Mr. Chairman, Judge Dollinger, thank you very much for your kind words.

It is with sincerest gratitude that I accept this gift from the Grand Jurors Association. It has always been very easy for me to give—but very embarrassing for me to receive. It is almost painful for me to answer when I am being praised and I am the recipient of a wonderful award presented on behalf of an elite group of citizens—by a friend, one of the outstanding jurists in our community.

My family and I accept this great token of recognition with the deepest humility and appreciation of the spirit in which it was presented.

In 1937 this country opened its door and gave me the opportunity to become a citizen, raise a wonderful family and blessed me with many loyal friends. During the first few years in this country I learned what the words poverty and desperation meant, but with hard work and some luck, I overcame these obstacles. Having fled from the injustices, prejudices and ravages of a Nazi Fascist ideology, I dedicated myself to the struggle for safeguarding our sacred democratic principles, which have provided equality and justice for all our citizens.

I have chosen to be active in the fight against drug abuse and have devoted my time to the Grand Jury system, which is pledged to the promotion of justice, and is one of the finest instruments in protecting the innocent. It encourages civic participation by the people. It enables the community to temper justice with mercy.

Those of you who have served on the Grand Jury know the feeling of disappointment and hopelessness, after spending weeks listening to case after case. However, we must not be discouraged, but continue to use the Grand Jury system to see justice done, because the delay of justice is injustice.

We are fortunate in Bronx County to have a human dynamo, a vigorous, energetic and forceful District Attorney, Burt Roberts, who is capably assisted by a brilliant, loyal and devoted staff.

We have in our county, under the outstanding command of Chief Anger and Inspector Courtenay, the finest and most efficient police force in all of the boroughs. We also have compassionate judges who are respected for their fairness, impartiality, and who sit for many a long day in judgment under extremely trying circumstances.

If we, ladies and gentlemen, analyze the phrase—"life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," we know, based upon our daily experience with the Grand Jury—that life is cheap in the streets of Bronx County; that liberty does not exist for many of our citizens, locked in their homes behind gates, after dark (and especially for many of our senior citizens who are involuntary prisoners afraid to walk the streets of our once safe borough). And—there is little happiness for those who want to enjoy the fruit of their labor.

We are all frustrated in our efforts to break the cycle of crime and injustice. We must, however, continue our pursuit to find some answers to these horrendous problems. I suggest that all of us, both in our public and private capacities, be first and foremost, citizens of courage, determination and deep conviction. We must be ready to struggle for honest and just values, regardless of the consequences. We must not yield to community pressure nor become instruments of political power groups.

After sitting for years on the Grand Jury, I have made certain observations, which I would like to share with you.

1. Innocent victims of crimes should enjoy the same constitutional rights and privileges that are given to the perpetrators.

2. We need a uniform Federal gun law, which would prohibit the sale of guns. Every time there has been a homicide, the perpetrator has had easy access to a weapon.

3. The Sullivan law should be rigidly enforced.

4. There seems to be an indiscriminate and flagrant amount of ball jumping. Ball should be set to guarantee the appearance of the defendant in court.

5. Ball should be revoked if a person is arrested for a felony while awaiting trial on another charge.

6. Ball should be denied if a person who is arrested for committing a felony has in his possession a shot gun, sawed-off shot gun, or a machine gun.

7. In felony narcotic cases, bail should be denied.

8. More emphasis should be placed upon the prevention of crime and upon the supervised parole and probation, rather than upon long jail sentences. To accomplish this, we need more qualified probation, parole and warrant officers.

9. Justice should be meted out in such a way as to have the greatest effect upon the defendant. His appearance in court must not become a revolving door.

10. Corroboration should not be necessary on a rape indictment, especially when children are the victims.

11. The facilities and the staff of the courts, and the D.A.'s office should be enlarged to meet the ever increasing volume of cases.

12. The fee of the Grand Juror should be sufficient so that no person who has the ability and desire to serve shall be denied the right for reasons of financial hardship.

Ladies and gentlemen, distinguished guests, you provide the hope to all New Yorkers who seek peace in their homes and safety in the streets. I hope that you will use your influence, when appropriation bills are being considered, both in the State Legislature and in the Congress, so that we can implement some of these ideas and improve all services. Let us all recognize that law leads to freedom and lawlessness to servitude. We are living on borrowed time, and the need for action is acute. Rousseau said "to live is not merely to breathe—it is to act".

I hope the father of all mankind will guide us in these troubled times so that we can cope with the many problems sweeping our community. Let us show compassion and understanding for those less fortunate than we are. Let us not talk brotherhood—let us be brothers. May life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness be once again the touchstone for every member of our community.

May I share with you a short story that sums up my sentiment?

There was an ancient philosopher who was challenged by a young man: "Tell me, old man, is the bird in the hand behind my back dead or alive?" And the man of wisdom replied, "The answer lies in your hand".

Ladies and gentlemen—the answer lies in our hands.

ANTHONY HENNINGER

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the role of a mayor in any of our American cities is indeed challenging and demanding. And, thank God, many of our more courageous citizens choose to "bite the bullet," and offer their talent, time, and dedication to the electorate as candidates for mayor of their respective cities. If the majority of the people are convinced of the candidates superior qualification, he is elected and as such assumes great challenge and responsibility.

I am sad to say that a man who met that challenge, a close friend of mine, died last Friday. He had spent his twilight years in retirement after rendering great service to his community.

I refer to the Honorable Anthony Henninger who served the city of Syracuse, N.Y., in truly exemplary fashion through the years 1957 to 1961. Mr. Henninger passed away on March 17, and his absence creates a real vacuum in my home community and certainly in the life of his wonderful wife, Susan, to whom I express my deep sympathy.

Mr. Henninger's life style is probably best expressed in the content of the following articles:

HE ENRICHED SYRACUSE

(By Joseph V. Ganley)

(Joseph V. Ganley who covers the Washington scene for The Herald-Journal, Herald-American, was city hall reporter in Syracuse for many years. Here he reminisces about Anthony A. Henninger, a mayor he came to know well in official and social circles and on the golf course as well.)

Former Mayor Anthony A. Henninger, who died yesterday in Crouse-Ingvar Memorial Hospital, came to Syracuse 50 years ago to shop for a transmission plant. He acquired an operation on Plum St., which later became the New Process Gear Co., and stayed to make Syracuse his home.

There is no doubt that the community has been a better place for his staying.

"Tony" Henninger was 80 at his death, but until his recent illness, he was one of the youngest men in town.

The results of that original purchase may be seen out on Fly Road where the modern New Process Gear plant operated by Chrysler Corp. is a testament to Mr. Henninger's industrial stewardship.

He served the city as mayor from 1958 through 1961 and the accomplishments of those years are all around us. Henninger High School on the East Side, named after him; Corcoran High on the West Side, named after another mayor, Thomas J. Corcoran; a couple of junior high schools, two or three elementary schools, the new airport at Hancock Field and the Lake Ontario water system, to name the major ones.

His public philanthropy is known. What is not so visible is the "secret" side of Tony Henninger—the side that dispensed financial aid to scores of young men for college education, and to old employees when they were in need.

Anthony Henninger's was a unique, many-sided personality. A strong character, carrying an imposing physical presence, he never lost his respect for his associates in those early days in the automotive business in Muncie, Ind., his birthplace, Toledo, Ohio, and Detroit.

Two of them, the famous Walter P. Chrysler and W. C. Durant, were never anything but "Mister" Chrysler and "Mister" Durant to Tony.

Many anecdotes could be told about Tony—he was one of the most generous persons around, yet would save pencil stubs and hated to lose a golf ball. He gave his \$20,000 salary quadrupled to charity when he ran city hall, yet he made a federal case out of saving soap and toilet tissue.

Few know that in his early days in Muncie, he peddled papers to earn money for his keep, and played piano and booked dance bands during his early youth. He played semi-pro baseball and loved the game all his life. He was a Yankee fan—he loved a winner.

There was nothing dull about Tony Henninger. Another unique character, the late Alexander F. "Casey" Jones caught the "flavor" of the mayor in an editorial in 1961 when Henninger was leaving city hall:

"If he pauses to look back on that old pile of drab colored stone, he will chuckle to himself and murmur: 'There was never a dull moment. Nice to have known you.'"

It was nice to have known you, too, Tony. And, with your beloved wife, Susan, we'll miss you.

ANTHONY HENNINGER CITED AS "MAN FOR ALL SEASONS"

(By Ramona B. Bowden)

A concelebrated Mass of Resurrection was conducted yesterday in St. John the Evangelist Roman Catholic Church for Anthony A. Henninger who died Friday.

Attending were leaders in the industrial, business, educational and sports world as well as former mayors, members of the judiciary, representatives of state and local government. With many friends and a long list of honorary bearers, they filled the large church to near capacity.

In the presence of the Most Rev. David F. Cunningham, bishop of the diocese, who offered the final prayers and gave the absolution, the Mass was concelebrated by the Rev. Msgr. Edgar M. Holihan, pastor, with the Very Rev. William L. Reilly, S.J., president of LeMoyne College, and the Rev. Robert F. Grewen, S.J., former president of LeMoyne. Assisting were Msgr. Richard Clark, Msgr. A. Robert Casey, the Rev. Charles Fahey, and the Rev. Francis J. Piereson.

In his eulogy, Monsignor Holihan said, "With the idea of death, our world today seems to be involved with the finality of leaving here a question mark. But Christianity gives the answer. We know what it says, but we do not believe it. But Christ means exactly what He says 'I am the Resurrection, I am the life.'"

"Every individual here was born into this life as a pilgrim to pass through in the companionship of man and with God, so that God will call him to eternal companionship with Himself. The whole purpose of creation is to do the best we can to the glory of God and the good of souls including our own," said the priest.

"When you have a magnanimous spirit like Mr. Henninger and know we have various shades of generosity, we see the example of one who is leaving us and going to God. We've seen the example, the courage, the success, the concern for others, and we see ourselves as little people with small awareness of others," he said.

"Mrs. Henninger, priests, ministers, family and all your friends, we offer you our deepest sympathy, our continual prayers for his eternal rest and our prayers for comfort and strength for yourself," said Monsignor Holihan.

In deference to Mrs. Henninger who is a member of Park Central Presbyterian Church, the pastor, the Rev. Bradford N. Pusey, gave his tribute to Mr. Henninger who had been a generous benefactor to Park Church:

"He was an industrialist of imagination and success. He was a champion for education and a promoter of the best in competitive sports. He demonstrated that government for and by the people works. He crusaded for community health and cultural enrichment. To everything he touched he gave generously of his resources, time, energy, skill and wealth. But over-arching all he did and was, Anthony knew himself to be a child of God. There was no necessity to translate his faith into words; his daily life-style exhibited that the heart of Christianity was the Sermon on the Mount and the Golden Rule.

"If ever the city of Syracuse shall raise up 'a man for all seasons' must it not be for this faithful husband, courageous leader, generous benefactor, trusted friend and mentor in the ways and will of God, Anthony A. Henninger?" said Mr. Pusey.

ANTHONY A. HENNINGER

For almost 50 years, the name of Anthony A. Henninger has been in the forefront of scores of movements to help make Syracuse a better community in which to live.

The passing yesterday of the handsome, white-haired former mayor marked the end of a career in which Tony Henninger became known as an enlightened industrialist at the helm of the old New Process Gear plant, as an enthusiastic backer of baseball whose generosity and hard work helped bring Triple A competition back to MacArthur Stadium, as a benefactor and Regent of LeMoyne College, and as a hard working mayor who gave the city strong leadership.

It became a by-word that when Tony Henninger got behind a good project, it was bound to succeed. His enthusiasm inspired many others to join with him, and his public gifts to LeMoyne College, Syracuse University, to his church and to all good causes won him the admiration of thousands.

Less than five years ago he, a devout Catholic, and Mrs. Henninger, a Presbyterian, contributed \$80,000 to purchase a chancel organ for Park Central Presbyterian Church as a memorial to their son, Robert Anthony Henninger.

Syracuse University conferred on him in 1951 its highest award, an honorary doctor of laws degree. LeMoyne College, where he had established the Anthony A. Henninger Scholarship Fund, gave him its Salterae (Salt of the Earth) medal in 1968 in recognition of 20 years of service as a charter member of its Board of Regents and former chairman of its board.

He was pleased when the new East Side high school near Teal Avenue was designated the Anthony A. Henninger High School as one of five schools begun during his administration. At that time, then-Mayor William F. Walsh noted, "Nobody has been more dedicated to the children of this city than he."

When a member of the school's first graduating class presented Mr. Henninger a Class of 1965 ring, the former mayor mused, "The last time I received a ring was when I was married. I don't mind being married to Henninger High School."

#### CAMP FIRE GIRLS

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, during the past 62 years, 4 million American women have participated in the Camp Fire Girls. The organization's emblem is, of course, a campfire, which symbolizes both the warmth of comradeship and the spirit

of the out of doors. Its motto reflects the Camp Fire Girls' worthy goals: "Worship God, seek beauty, give service, pursue knowledge, be trustworthy, hold on to health, glorify work, be happy."

At this time, we celebrate the anniversary of the founding of Camp Fire Girls by Dr. Luther Halsey Gulick. Over three generations, this organization has continued to grow and to have a positive influence on the daily lives of its members.

Our Nation has benefited from the good citizenship qualities exemplified by the dedicated leaders of the Camp Fire Girls. It was Dr. Gulick's conviction that because adolescence is such a critical period in the lives of young people, and because women are playing an increasingly important role in all aspects of society, an organization such as Camp Fire Girls is needed to provide young women an opportunity to develop to their full potential as community leaders and good citizens.

We are very grateful that Dr. Gulick was so successful in establishing such a program. For this reason, it gives me pleasure to salute the Camp Fire Girls—an organization that abounds in resourcefulness, energy, and imagination—on this important anniversary.

#### SEARCHING FOR CAUSE AND CURE OF COOLEY'S ANEMIA

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the medical research community searching for the cause and cure of Cooley's anemia is large and growing, but desperately in need of Federal financial support.

Federal support would earmark Cooley's anemia as a particular priority for intra- and extra-mural programs of the National Institutes of Health, and continued support of the clinical research program of NIH will provide the subsidies to research facilities necessary to support study and service for patients with this and other mysterious but widespread diseases.

The high quality of existing medical research in this field—demonstrating the existence of a base of knowledge nearly ripe for practical application—has been shown in reviews of work on Cooley's anemia in the medical literature.

In 1966 and now on the March 16, 1972, issues of the New England Journal of Medicine, for example, review is made of research into the basic genetic and physiological causes of Cooley's anemia.

In 1964 and again in 1969 the New York Academy of Sciences and the Cooley's Anemia Blood and Research Foundation for Children jointly sponsored symposia on the problems of Cooley's anemia, resulting in the collection and publication of research papers totaling over 1,300 pages.

Much basic research has been done, therefore, with little or no Federal help. It is well known, however, that particular areas of medical research blossom when Federal direction and support are given; researchers in basic areas are



more able to direct their studies to practical ends, the clinical or applied part of medical research is enhanced within the institutions and organizations that conduct sophisticated medical research, results are more easily disseminated within the scientific community, avoiding duplicative work, and the work stimulated and supported by private foundations or general purpose research grants is brought to its fullest scientific and practical fruition.

Cooley's anemia is not unknown to medical research, Mr. Speaker, quite the opposite, but the practical help available to the physician or pediatrician who deals with Cooley's anemia is pitifully small. It is time to give national direction and support for this work, so that the patients and families affected by Cooley's anemia will benefit from the best our Nation's scientific and medical community has to offer.

#### H.R. 9615—IMMIGRATION VISAS

### HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the passage by the House of H.R. 9615 is a welcome event in the lives of so many people. This bill creates additional immigration visas for a period of 4 years. It will do much to correct some of the injustices which resulted from the transformation of the immigration program from an earlier system based on national origin quotas to the present one of "first come, first served."

It was not so long ago that the system of national origin quotas led to the parting and long separation of families. While one member of the family might be able to come to America, others would be left at the docks—waiting for an opening in the restrictive quota system. Years would go by with fathers living far from sons; with sisters separated from brothers. Each year the list of requests for visas would grow; each year only a certain number from any one country would be granted. No provision in the old law would allow the unused visas of one country to be transferred to those in another country.

The Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965 eliminated the national origins quota system and provided for a certain period of transition to eliminate some of the backlog of previous visa requests.

But even this welcome legislation had its flaws. The case of the present fifth preference immigrant—the brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens—provides a prime example. When the old law was repealed, 158,696 individuals fit under this category. Because the terms of the old law were overly restrictive to Southern Europeans, Italy had the largest oversubscription. Its 114,717 registrants were more than two and a half times as large as the registrants of all the other countries of the world combined. Originally, a 5-year phaseout period for preferential admissions had been considered.

However, when this legislation became law, the final transition period for removing the backlog of preferential requests amounted to only 3 years. As a result, of all the countries of Europe, only Italy still retains a significant backlog of fifth preference requests for visas. Italian-Americans still wait for their brothers and sisters to join them in America. They still wait for the joy of seeing their brothers and sisters arrive to begin a new life.

The passage of H.R. 9615 will alleviate most of this backlog. Italy will receive over 28,000 of the nearly 40,000 additional visas created for the four-year life of this act. Families will be reunited. The long wait will then be over. Happiness and love will pour from grateful hearts.

In addition, the amendments of 1965 resulted in a type of reverse discrimination, as epitomized in the sharp curtailment of immigration from Northern Europe. Prospective immigrants from Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany have been unable to qualify under the new preference system. The new legislation passed by the House would help remove this distinct disadvantage through the formula of granting special visas to certain countries. Under the provisions of this legislation, Great Britain and Germany would receive the maximum total of 7500 visas annually. Ireland would receive 4096, while Poland would be entitled to 2970 visas annually for 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, the last vestiges of inequitable and discriminatory immigration system of the past must be removed. I was pleased to give my support to this legislation which passed the House, and hope that it will receive quick and favorable consideration in the Senate.

#### THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF OUR NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

### HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 100th anniversary of our National Park system, which began with the creation of Yellowstone National Park in legislation enacted by the Congress and signed by President U. S. Grant. Yellowstone was not only the first National Park in the United States, but the first such wilderness recreational area set aside by any nation for the benefit of future generations, and it set an environmental example for the world a full century ago.

In an unusual full-page public service advertisement in the March 1 edition of the Wall Street Journal, Sunset magazine and Books of Menlo Park, Calif., tells the story of the inception of our National Park system and urges Americans to celebrate the centennial by visiting one or more of them this year. With signs of spring all around us, it is a message well worth heeding.

The text of the anniversary ad follows:

PEOPLE LAUGHED AT JOHN COLTER—HE CLAIMED TO HAVE SEEN GREAT SPOUTING GEYSERS NEAR THE YELLOWSTONE, NATURALLY, NOBODY BELIEVED IT IN 1807

John Colter wasn't looking for geysers. He was looking for beaver pelt. Having left the Lewis and Clark expedition, he was on his own, and a man has to make a living.

Somehow, on his trapping jaunts, he happened upon the bubbling potholes, craters, and geysers near the headwaters of the Yellowstone. But nobody believed his story (any more than they believed Jim Bridger 20 years later). After all, weren't frontiersmen noted for telling tall tales?

In fact, it was not until 1870—63 years after Colter's first sighting—that a survey party out of Montana verified, in spite of their own previous disbelief, that the phenomena of "Colter's Hell" actually existed.

Suddenly those unbelievable geysers had become reality—and the whole magnificence of Yellowstone a nation's opportunity.

#### TODAY IS AN IMPORTANT ANNIVERSARY

Just 100 years ago this very day, on March 1, 1872, an Act was signed into law by President Grant, setting aside two million acres of Yellowstone's splendor as a "pleasuring ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people."

This was the world's first national park; the first time in history that a superlative natural resource had been set aside for purely aesthetic, emotional, and non-material satisfactions as a national park. Truly an environmental milestone.

And what an amazing chain reaction it started.

Since 1872, our National Parks have grown to include nearly 300 areas of natural, cultural, and historical significance in the American heritage. And vast new tracts of wilderness and reaction land are being added through a program which President Nixon has called The Legacy of the Parks.

The national park concept is also one of our most successful "exports." More than 100 nations have been inspired by our example to establish over 1,200 national parks and reserves of their own.

Think how all of these priceless treasures will be valued 100 years from now, just as we value our Yellowstone today.

#### WE'RE ALL INVITED TO THE BIRTHDAY PARTY

President Nixon has invited all of us in America, and all our good friends beyond our borders, to join in celebrating the 100th birthday of our National Parks.

The invitation is issued in the form of a Presidential Proclamation, designating 1972 as National Park Centennial Year.

#### So how does one participate?

The folks at Sunset Magazine and Books, being by nature do-it-yourself advocates, think the best way to celebrate this national birthday party is to go and visit a National Park. Or, better still, several.

It's the kind of party in which the guests have all the fun.

Why don't you go? You won't have to travel far, if you don't wish to, because these shrines of heritage are all around us. Or, if you're willing to journey a bit further, visit one of the fabled places you've heard about all your life, but have just been putting off until "someday."

It's a wonderful way for families to explore the richness of their country together.

While some parks are heavily populated on big holiday week-ends, their reasonably long seasons afford you plenty of other time choices. (Several parks have all-year accommodations and camping facilities.)

Some of your most rewarding experiences, by the way, will be the explorations you can make on foot, away from roads and beaten paths.

Hopefully, your visits will inspire you, as it has us at Sunset, to support the addition of more such worthwhile areas. To meet the expanding needs for human enrichment in the next century of parks, millions of Americans and their government representatives must make an all-out commitment to work together for more parks and wilderness areas.

And, if, perchance, you find yourself where it all began at Yellowstone, just quietly tip your hat to the same patriarchal geyser John Colter saw, and say, "Happy Birthday, Old Faithful."

#### WHY IS SUNSET SO INTERESTED?

Sunset Magazine and Books are part and parcel of Western America, where, by good fortune, nature has located a vast number of the most spectacular areas in the National Park System.

From Alaska's Mount McKinley to New Mexico's Carlsbad Caverns, Colorado's Rocky Mountain to Hawaii's Haleakala, we Westerners are blessed with an abundance of National Parks.

Because travel and exploration are important aspects of Sunset's service to its readers, our editors have become recognized authorities on the lore of National Park areas in Western America.

This goes back to 1898, when the maiden

issue of Sunset Magazine had a National Park, Yosemite, as its feature article.

Since then, literally thousands of pages in Sunset publications have been devoted to helping people derive enjoyment from their National Park experiences.

Why is Sunset so interested? Because we believe that the existence and influence of National Parks are among the most precious of American legacies—and that the dedicated people of the National Park Service make a matchless contribution to world communion.

That is why we invite you to share in cherishing, preserving, and enjoying these wonderful manifestations of man's best wisdom.

And why we have sponsored this anniversary day message.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 23, 1972

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

*Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth.—Psalms 124: 8.*

Our Father God, who art the life within our souls, the law within our minds, and the love which warms our hearts, direct us with Thy most gracious favor and further us with Thy continual help that this day may be a great day because Thou art with us and we are with Thee.

In the haste and hurry of a swiftly moving age may we be strengthened by Thy spirit to live by the light of love, to walk in wise ways and to serve our country faithfully with high honor.

Most heartily do we pray that Thou wilt bless our President, our Speaker, and Members of Congress. Grant unto them courage, faith, and wisdom, and so rule their hearts and direct their endeavors that justice, peace, and good will may everywhere begin to prevail: To the honor and glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

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

S. 1426. An act to establish the Van Buren Historic Site at Kinderhook, N.Y., and for other purposes;

S. 3129. An act to authorize the establishment of the Longfellow National Historic Site in Cambridge, Mass., and for other purposes; and

S. 3166. An act to amend the Small Business Act.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-1028, appointed Mr. HATFIELD as a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy in lieu of Mr. YOUNG, excused.

#### EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

(Mrs. GRIFFITHS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, not only do I want to thank all of you and all of the Senate for this day, making it possible for women to be considered as human beings under the Constitution, but also I wear these flowers today to celebrate the fact that Hawaii is the first State to ratify the equal rights amendment.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 88]

Abourezk	Eckardt	Murphy, N.Y.
Alexander	Edwards, La.	Nelsen
Anderson, Ill.	Eshleman	O'Hara
Ashbrook	Foley	Pelly
Ashley	Ford	Pryor, Ark.
Badillo	William D.	Fucinski
Baring	Forsythe	Rangel
Belcher	Fulton	Rees
Brooks	Fuqua	Riegle
Buchanan	Gallfanakis	Rosenthal
Camp	Gallagher	Rostenkowski
Carey, N.Y.	Gaydos	Saylor
Celler	Gray	Scheuer
Chamberlain	Hagan	Shoup
Chappell	Halpern	Springer
Chisholm	Hastings	Staggers
Clark	Hawkins	Stanton
Clay	Hébert	James V.
Collins, Ill.	Hull	Stokes
Conyers	Johnson, Pa.	Stubblefield
Davis, Wis.	Jones, N.C.	Teague, Calif.
de la Garza	Kemp	Teague, Tex.
Dellums	Kyros	Wampler
Dent	Landrum	Yates
Diggs	McKinney	Yatron
Dorn	Metcalfe	Zablocki
Dowdy	Mikva	
Dwyer	Mitchell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

#### FORTY-FOUR DAYS AND STILL NO WORD FROM PRESIDENT NIXON ON TAX REFORM

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, 44 days ago our esteemed colleague and chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS, wrote to President Nixon requesting him to submit to the Congress a plan for tax reform. The chairman asked that the President submit his proposals by March 15 in order for Congress to have time to act on them in this session. It is March 23, and nothing has emerged from the Nixon administration except silence.

Perhaps this silence is an indication that the administration believes the issue of income tax reform is a passing fad, drummed up by the media. It is not. When it is public knowledge that because of special tax loopholes more than 1,300 people with incomes in excess of \$50,000 paid no taxes in 1970, the issue of tax reform will not go away. When the public knows that because of the oil depletion allowance, our 19 largest oil corporations pay a smaller percentage of their combined net earnings in taxes—less than 9 percent of \$9 billion in 1970—than the worker who earns \$9,000 a year, the issue of tax reform will not go away. When our largest steel firm, with net earnings of \$154 million, can boast in a report to