

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HOPE FOR ARTHRITIS SUFFERERS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there have been great strides in medical research in recent years, with a considerable assist from the Federal Government.

This is a proper role for government and the National Institutes of Health has given assistance through grants over the years in many areas of medical research. The return has been manifold, providing not only relief for sufferers, but development of cures in many cases.

Recently, there was an international conference in Prague on rheumatic diseases. Attending was one of our distinguished Buffalo, N.Y., physicians, Dr. L. Maxwell Lockie.

An excellent and revealing report on the conference was assembled in a feature story in the Buffalo Courier-Express on December 28. Following is the text of the article:

HOPE FOR ARTHRITIS SUFFERERS

(By Anne McIlhenney Matthews)

There is hope spelled high in capital letters for sufferers of rheumatoid arthritis.

This is the word brought back from Prague in Czechoslovakia by Buffalo's Dr. L. Maxwell Lockie, world-renowned expert on the subject, who recently returned from the 12th International Congress on Rheumatic Diseases. Dr. Lockie who has pioneered in treatment of the more than 80 kinds of arthritis, was enthusiastic about the progress that has been made and extolled the reports presented there by doctors from all parts of the world.

There was a stunning attendance of 800 experts at the congress, and Dr. Lockie said that not only was there sufficient opportunity for discussion of some sensational benefits obtained by drugs but that "even the disagreement was valuable."

The value of a worldwide interchange of ideas, experiments, research, reports on painstaking laboratory adventures, and the recitation of the acid tests of time-proven case histories was never more pointed up than at a convention of this size and importance, Dr. Lockie declared. Unlike most conventions where just getting together and getting acquainted and getting ideas in an aura of conviviality is thematic, the International Congress on Rheumatic Diseases differs as an ultimate workshop where medical experts gather every four years to update the communal knowledge in their all-out war against the causes of this crippling pain.

PARTICIPANTS SHOW DEEP INTEREST

Few attendants missed the reading of the reports and papers and participation in the various seminars. All took home treasure in new knowledge of the advancements in experiments, new ideas for experimentation, and new concepts of treatment, Lockie said.

The last convention was held in Argentina at Mar-del-Plata near Buenos Aires. Prague was the scene this year in tribute to the eminence of Prof. F. Lenach, a Czech, who is a world-renowned expert on arthritis. The attendance of Dr. Lockie and the contingent of American doctors was approved by the State Dept., he said.

"Our trip behind the Iron Curtain was both stimulating and fruitful," Lockie commented. "Primarily, it was because of the discussions of the number of new drugs being used experimentally throughout the world. Of these only one is 'on trial' in the United States—Ibuprofen."

Dr. Lockie took the papers and obligingly ran down the list of reports to summarize the information on effectiveness or non-effectiveness of two of these once-hailed "wonder drugs" for this nonmedical-type reporter. The score card follows:

Ibuprofen—reported by Dr. N. Cardoze of England—as compared with phenylbutazone in rheumatoid arthritis and degenerative arthritis of the hip, it was noted there was more pain relief, very few side effects.

Myalex—reported by Drs. W. Hepworth and F. D. Hart of England and Dr. A. Brees of Belgium—research discontinued with this effective drug used in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis due to appearance of jaundice in four patients.

BUFFALO USING GOLD

Buffalo is one of the world centers using gold in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis and it has been generally approved for reversible rheumatoid arthritis, Lockie said.

"It was used earlier here, but there is now a more effective program of management," he said. "Doctors also may use other things: bed rest, physical therapy, exercise programs, aspirin; sedation for the patient depending on the degree of activity permitted. There also is extensive use of cortisone products or derivatives by mouth or injection.

"Reports on surgery in juvenile rheumatoid arthritis were very stimulating (children 3-14), but not much had been reported on the after-effects. Papers were presented by W. M. Granberry and E. J. Brewer Jr. of Houston. Listeners all wanted to know what the effect was on growth.

"There was considerable interest in synovectomy, where surgery removes the linings of joints, especially bad knees (including the so-called dry knees). There were not-so-good results here as in knees where there is a lot of fluid present. All agreed that a short hospital stay is the thing—get them (the patients) up and get them walking within a day or two, no holding back."

Granberry reported on 18 patients (3½ to 14½ years) with two years or more follow-up. He stated: "Good results. Nonfluid type not as good result as the fluid-filled joints." Drs. S. Jakubowski and J. Ruszczynska of Poland said their results were most encouraging and no interference with growth was noted.

EXPERIENCE IN HIP OPERATION

Dr. E. S. Eyring of Columbus, Ohio, reported on 48 operations with a generally short hospital stay and generally good results.

"Total hip replacement operations were accepted generally as good achievement everywhere," Locke continued. "This has been done for 10 years in England and several years in the United States. In Buffalo there have been more than 100 operations, scattered in all the hospitals, and all generally with excellent results. This involves cementing metal or plastic cups into the pelvic bone and replacing part of the femur with vitallium. These are machined to fit perfectly. Usually patients are out of bed in 10-15 days, home in three weeks, first on crutches, then walkers and canes. Generally the relief is spectacular.

"The operation is additionally noteworthy in that the cups are fitted into the pelvis, and prosthesis is cemented into the femur,

after the bone marrow has been cleaned out, with acrylic cement. This hardens in seven minutes so the work must be fast. The cement is new in the United States and can only be used for this purpose with the permission of the Food and Drug people.

"The total time of the operation is approximately 1½ hours. It started with people over 60, now it is being done on people in their 20s. Reports from England are favorable, with citations of success extending five years with no rejection from the body."

COMPLICATIONS REPORTED

Reports on steroid vasculitis indicated some serious complications on dosage with cortisone derivatives by mouth. These were numbness, tingling in feet, and sometimes severe pain. Dr. A. L. Rosenberg et al., of Denver, reported that a gradual dosage was the most effective form of treatment.

A whole day of the convention was taken up with discussion of the use of computers in collection, storage and retrieval of data on arthritic patients. Dr. Lockie, one of four councillors representing the U.S., who had presented a paper on this in San Francisco in 1958, was the presiding officer and papers were presented from Spain, Italy, England, United States, Soviet Russia, Sweden and Canada.

A paper on immunology was presented by Dr. Elias Cohen, Bernard M. Norcross and Dr. Lockie. "Photoelectrically Quantitated Rheumatoid Factor Precipitin," and Drs. F. A. Green and M. T. Hays of Buffalo presented one on "Joint Scanning."

Some of the new drugs reported on included these: Trimethagon, Azauridine-triacetate, Prednisolone Stearoyl Glycolate, Bucolome, Mervan, Benorylate, Droxyaryl, Artrisol, and new derivative of phenylbutazone. The reports ranged from "very effective," "definite improvements," "well tolerated," "pain relief," to some negative results. Gold obviously is in use for treatment all over the world.

NEXT MEETING IN JAPAN

The convention was held in Julius Fucik Park in Prague. The next convention four years hence will be held in Kyoto, the old capital city of Japan.

Lockie, who is a world traveler and a gourmet member of Le Chains de Rotisseurs, spent days after the conclusion of the conference exploring Prague and the surrounding area.

"Prague is a beautiful city," he said. "It is filled with monuments, palaces and museums, and there are magnificent paintings still there. The libraries are beautiful. I saw no evidence of Russian soldiers.

"But there is little in the stores to buy, and there is a considerable black market. The main currency is a crown, officially at seven to our dollar. If you are a tourist you get 16. On the black market you can get 40, but one out of three pushers of this coinage is a policeman, and if you get caught it is rough and a long time in jail no matter who you are. Food was excellent in the small restaurants, not expensive and service was excellent."

Dr. Lockie and his wife also toured the wine region of France, particularly in the Bordeaux (red wine) areas. They spent a delightful week in Innsbruck, and visited Vienna for superb food and the sight of the Lippizaner Horse Ballet.

"There is no unemployment in Austria," he said, "and France is once again gracious to Americans. We were treated well in Paris, and things are notably less expensive for American buyers."

AWAY FROM APPEASEMENT AND
TOWARD PEACE IN THE MIDDLE
EAST

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague from New York, the Honorable JONATHAN BINGHAM, spoke at the City Club of Rochester on United States-Israel relations. His subject, "Away From Appeasement and Toward Peace in the Middle East" is a most vital one and I am happy to bring it to the attention of the Members of this body:

AWAY FROM APPEASEMENT AND TOWARD PEACE
IN THE MIDDLE EAST: UNITED STATES-ISRAEL
RELATIONS, 1970

Originally I had planned to talk to this distinguished audience, in this your first session of the new year, on a very broad topic: "Which way America: Goals for the 1970s." With the permission of your President, I have decided to forego any such ambitious undertaking. I am going to deal today with only one goal for the decade: Peace in the Middle East.

At this hour, I cannot think of any more urgent topic. For I believe in recent months the Nixon Administration has embarked on a disastrous course in the Middle East. The latest moves by the United States in the big-power negotiations that have been going on in New York and Washington amount to nothing less than an attempt to appease the Arabs.

Now I know that appeasement is an ugly word. I do not use it lightly, but I say to you that if the present trend continues the necessary word will be an even uglier one: betrayal. The Administration's refusal is also a slap in the face to the Congress, which just last month, in action on the foreign aid bill, reaffirmed its support of the ideas of direct talks between the parties as the way to achieve peace.

Before I go on to give my bill of particulars in support of these charges, perhaps I ought to confess that I am by no means an impartial observer.

I not only admire the Israelis enormously for their courage, their incredible effectiveness, and their determination to remain as an island of democracy in a sea of terror and authoritarianism, but I am emotionally deeply involved.

In 1948 my wife and I gave blood for the Haganah. In 1952 we visited the struggling young country for the first time and wondered how her leaders could sleep at night, not knowing how they were going to pay for the next shipload of goods to arrive in Haifa harbor. We saw the cruel division of Jerusalem and the exclusion of Jews from their holy places. We went out on Lake Tiberias (Galilee) in a boat with Teddy Kollek and marveled at the courage of the Kibbutzniks who lived on the eastern shore a few yards from the border and directly below the Syrian guns mounted on the Golan Heights.

In 1964 we went back. The frontiers were still the same (Israel had given up the lands won in the Sinai in 1956, in return for assurances that proved worthless), but miracles had been accomplished in absorbing a host of immigrants, in building new cities and ports, in bringing water from Tiberias to the Negev.

Then, in 1967, after Nasser had chased out the U.N. forces and seized Sharm el-Sheik, we sweated out the first hours of the six-day war and rejoiced at the incredible Israeli successes. (I might add that, among my colleagues in the Congress at that time, I detected no pro-Arab sentiment; they were

all, as far as I could judge, rooting for the Israelis.)

An additional personal word: While I am pro-Israeli, I am not anti-Arab. In my capacity as Deputy Administrator of President Truman's "Point 4" program of technical assistance to developing countries, I visited most of the Arab countries in 1952 and listened at length to their side of the Palestine story. I worked closely with many Arab representatives during my three years at the United Nations with Adlai Stevenson and came to like and admire many of them. To turn a familiar expression around: "Some of my best friends are Arabs."

My quarrel with the Arabs is with their leaders' unwillingness to accept Israel as a fact of life, to recognize that Israel is here to stay. There are many deplorable aspects of that policy—the Arab leaders' sacrifice of home-front needs in pursuit of disastrous military adventures, their insistence on perpetuating the wretched refugee camps to serve as a focus of bitter hatred of the Israelis. But at the root of it all is the dream that some day they will be able to drive Israel into the sea. Today the Palestinian liberation front makes that dream their stated goal, and the Syrians, and sometimes Nasser, openly concur. Hussein and most Lebanese leaders probably do not feel that way, but out of weakness they have made terrible mistakes, and the Israelis, understandably, have not been willing to let them escape the consequences of those mistakes.

One final word by way of explaining my personal point of view: I am deeply concerned by the Soviets' obvious ambition to become the dominant power in the Middle East, and I believe we must stand fast against this ambition. But I am convinced the Soviets do not want a major war in the area and hence will not send massive Soviet forces to support an Arab attack on Israel because they realize this would almost surely bring the United States in on the other side. In addition to their unwillingness to risk war with us, I believe there is another reason why they would not join fully in a drive to crush Israel: the Soviets have no reason to want to see Israel destroyed; on the contrary, it is the continued existence of Israel which gives the Soviets the leverage they want with the Arabs. With Israel gone, that leverage would be gone. The Kremlin, to increase its influence with the Arabs, is willing to spend billions on supplying arms, but the Kremlin knows very well that, with those arms alone, the Arabs will not be able to achieve victory. Thus the present turmoil and instability will remain, which ideally suits the Communist leaders, those avid fishers in troubled waters.

Ever since 1967, the Israelis, established for the first time on defensible frontiers, have insisted that they would not retreat from any of those frontiers except as a result of negotiations with the Arabs.

Some observers and some participants in the U.N. negotiations have said from the beginning that this was an unrealistic position, that the Arab leaders would never negotiate with the Israelis, that they could not survive politically if they did.

The Israelis' reply has been very simply—and it seems to me incontestably sound—"All right then; if that's the way it is, then there can be no peace; but meanwhile don't expect us to give up the security we have gained at great cost in lives as a result of a war which we did not bring on and sought to avoid."

How can you argue with the Israeli position? As they say—and here I quote from a recent Israeli memorandum—"If there is to be peace there has to be reconciliation. If there is to be reconciliation there has to be negotiation."

Now until this past year the U.S. firmly supported the Israeli insistence on negotia-

tions between the parties as the only way to achieve a permanent settlement. But during the past few months there has been a basic change: while we still give lip-service to this position, we have in fact virtually abandoned it, because we have put forward a whole series of specific proposals as to what the settlement should involve. In other words, we are still saying there must be negotiations, but we are also saying how we think the negotiations should come out.

Clearly this undercuts the Israelis' bargaining position before the talks have even started.

We have spoken, for example, of the Israelis giving up substantially all the territory they won in 1967. Now I have no doubt the Israelis do not want to hold on to all that territory. They are probably ready to trade away vast areas of the Sinai and a large part of West Jordan, especially if some form of externally guaranteed demilitarization of these areas were agreed upon. But they very naturally say to us: "Let us make our own concessions; don't go making concessions for us, before talks are even in sight."

Incidentally, it was just such a development as this that the Israelis feared when they expressed their concern over the big-power talks: they were afraid that, in an effort to reach big-power agreement, the U.S. would make concessions that the Israelis would then find very difficult to resist. In other words, they saw a new effort emerging to impose a settlement, as was done in 1956.

It is bad enough that we have abandoned our support of the essentiality of negotiations by putting forward specific proposals. What makes matters worse is that we have made proposals which are totally unrealistic and which call for concessions by the Israelis that they clearly will not accept and should not be asked to accept, after the history of the last twenty years.

According to the New York Times (and the Administration has not questioned or denied the story), our proposals for a settlement with Jordan call for an arrangement whereby Israel would not only give up substantially all of the lands won in 1967 but would have to share control of Jerusalem with Jordan and would have to undertake to receive into Israel those Palestinians who fled in 1948 and now may want to return.

The Israelis have made perfectly clear that they are obviously not going to give up the Golan Heights, they are not going to let the Arabs send into Israel hundreds of thousands of potential terrorists in the guise of refugees wanting to return, and they are not going to give up Jerusalem. In each instance, they are not about to let the Arabs escape the consequences of their own mistakes, and who can blame them?

Take the case of Jerusalem, where now for the first time in twenty years there is free access by all faiths to the holy places. If the Arabs had accepted the decision of the U.N. General Assembly in 1948, Jerusalem would have been an international city; but the Arabs did not; they chose to fight instead, and Jerusalem ended up a divided city. In 1967, if Hussein had not chosen to join Nasser in his foolhardy adventure, Jerusalem would have remained divided. But Hussein ignored Israel's plea to stay out, and he attacked. He gambled and lost. He lost not only Old Jerusalem but all of West Jordan as well. The fighting, here and on the Golan Heights, was costly to Israel, especially in terms of brave and effective officers. The fighting was not Israel's fault. Can anyone fairly say that Israel, in these circumstances, should act as if there had been no war, no history of terrorism against her citizens, no endless parade of Arab speeches vowing Israel's destruction?

The question arises, what caused the shift in the U.S. position? How did we get into this position, which undercuts our only good friend in the area, and which accomplishes nothing because it is also rejected by the

Arabs for their own domestic political reasons?

There is no one explanation. Several factors have contributed.

First, there has been the constant pressure of those Americans, within the Government and outside of it, who have been sympathetic to the Arab point of view, including of course the great American oil interests.

Now I have no means of knowing how much influence the big oil companies have had on the Nixon Administration, but I do remember that Mr. Nixon has been a defender of the oil depletion allowance in the tax laws. And it was interesting, to say the least, that the very day the New York Times uncovered the U.S. proposals for an Israel-Jordan settlement, a high-powered oil company delegation visited Mr. Nixon to express their concern about the deterioration of America's influence in the Arab world.

The oil companies and their friends are always stressing the importance of America's oil interests in the Middle East, but they never bother to point out that what is involved is profits, not national security. The U.S. does not need the Middle East's oil, any more than the U.S.S.R. does. The Arabs' main market for oil is Western Europe, and if they lost that market they would have a tough time finding another one.

The line of the Arab sympathizers has never been overtly anti-Israeli or pro-Arab. It has always been that the U.S. should be "more even-handed in its approach." This idea of even-handedness, expressed for example by former Governor Scranton when he returned from a survey trip for the President-Elect a year ago, is superficially very appealing. But it overlooks the fundamental fact that, ever since the U.N. decision creating the new state, Israel has wanted peace and the Arabs have not. To be even-handed in such a situation is like a policeman being even-handed between a hold-up man and his intended victim.

The other thing that is wrong with the even-handed approach is that the Soviet Union has given tremendous support to the Arabs. Thus balance, even a precarious balance, requires that the Israelis have corresponding support.

A second factor underlying the Nixon Administration's recent activities must necessarily have been the belief—or at least the hope—that the Soviet Union shared our desire to achieve a permanent peace in the Middle East and would work with us to that end. If we had not entertained that hope, we would hardly have devoted as much effort as we have to the quadripartite and bilateral big-power talks.

But I would submit to you that in this regard we have been engaging in wishful thinking. As I have suggested earlier, it seems clear that the continuance of the Arab-Israeli dispute is ideal from the Soviet point of view.

If the Soviets were afraid of a general war erupting in the area, they might have a reason for wanting to see an Arab-Israeli settlement, but they no doubt feel that a general war will not occur so long as they and the other big powers are determined to avoid it.

At this point I want to say a word about the two Americans who have been most directly involved in the big-power negotiations, Ambassador Charles W. Yost in New York and Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Sisco in Washington. I know these men well and I have strong feelings of respect and affection for them. They are both experienced professionals and I do not for a moment question their motivation or their integrity. But I think they have been displaying a typical American complaint, that of impatience with the continuance of a messy, unpleasant situation and a refusal to accept the fact that for the present no solution is possible. The American side has simply been too anxious to try to promote a

settlement, not recognizing that the time for a settlement has not yet come.

By contrast, the Israelis have shown themselves to be masters of the waiting game, as well as extraordinarily brave and capable fighters. They have shown an admirable steadfastness, a willingness to get through the present difficult period, no matter how long it takes, until the Arabs come to their senses. They sorely want peace, but they are not over-anxious for it. Thus, the elderly Uncle Sam would have done well to display the same patience—the same "cool"—as the young Abraham (or should I say as the grandmotherly Golda).

The Israelis seem to see clearly—as we have failed to do—that the present situation, disagreeable and difficult as it is—is not nearly as intolerable for them as it is for the Arabs.

As the astute American columnist Joseph Kraft recently pointed out, "There is really no good reason why the United States should be forcing the pace for settlement in the Near East. This country can afford to sit tight there. It is the Russians and their Arab friends who are in trouble, who need to recover territory and reopen the Suez Canal."

There is another possible factor behind the recent U.S. moves which has little to do with our intense desire to promote a settlement and which may explain our putting forward ideas that we know will be unacceptable to the Israelis.

Perhaps we are concerned merely with very short-range political objectives. Perhaps we are trying to placate the Arabs and somehow to strengthen the relatively moderate elements against the extremists. It must be said in fairness that the recent Arab summit conference broke up in near-total confusion and dissension, and quite possibly Secretary Rogers' speech and the other U.S. moves are partly responsible.

But to explain U.S. policy this way is really to put the worst face on it. It may appear subtle, but it is in reality wholly dishonest, representing old-fashioned power politics at its worst.

Certainly we have seen some of this desire not to make the Arabs too angry at work in our posture at the U.N., and it is not a pretty sight. We have acquiesced in a series of one-sided U.N. resolutions condemning Israel's reprisals but never as sharply the acts that provoked them. And last fall, at a time when Syria was outrageously holding two Israeli citizens after a highjacking, we failed effectively to stop the election of Syria to the Security Council, a shameful travesty of what U.N. elections ought to represent.

For us to fail to stand up for the Israelis when we know they are right is bad enough. But the irony is that our efforts at placating the Arabs—appeasing them is the proper term—will not accomplish the desired result in the long run. So long as we give Israel even minimum support, the Arabs will blame us for helping their enemy.

Once the Arab-Israeli dispute is settled we will have no trouble reestablishing good relations with the Arabs, as we have with our erstwhile World War II enemies. And it will make little difference to the speed of this process how angry they got with us beforehand.

What then is our proper course? The Administration should very simply stop trying to play Mr. Fix-It in the Middle East. Instead, it should follow last month's Congressional directive and stand loyally by our friends the Israelis, returning to our prior support of the direct negotiations position.

To the extent the Israelis are unable to obtain the necessary arms and equipment elsewhere—by air-lifting them out of Arab territory or James Bond-ing them away from faithless friends—we should make arms and equipment available.

We may have to help Israel economically

also. The current semi-war creates a serious financial drain. Through UJA and Israel bond campaigns, the American Jewish community has been responding to Israel's needs with heartwarming generosity, but all Americans should be prepared to join in giving to this gallant democracy the wherewithal to defend itself against those who would destroy it.

How much will it cost? No one can say. It depends largely on how soon a new generation of Arabs will rise up in anger and demand an end to the fruitless policy of military adventurism. But however much it will cost, it will be far less than the billions the Soviets are pouring in to the area, and only a tiny fraction of what we have been spending to keep a military oligarchy in power in Vietnam (and we will not be asked to do the Israelis' fighting for them).

There is another step I believe we must take, however hard it may be. For 20 years, the U.S. has been supplying more than two-thirds of the funds for UNRWA, the agency that operates the Arab refugee camps. The Arabs have refused to let these refugees resettle elsewhere because the Arab leaders knew that the camps would serve as breeding grounds for a new generation of Israeli haters. In recent months many of the camps have actually come under the domination of the Palestinian terrorists.

We should embark on a policy of phasing out U.S. support for pure relief, and indicate our willingness to spend the same amount of money, or even more, in actual resettlement and retraining activities. Israel could take a limited number, on a carefully screened basis. Some might find homes, if assisted, in other parts of the world. Probably the great majority will want to build new lives somewhere in the Arab world, and they should be given the opportunity to do so. In the coming session of Congress I intend to press for legislation to give effect to such a policy.

In addition to these moves, I believe we should indicate our willingness to enter into firm commitments, by treaty if necessary, to guarantee any settlement that is negotiated between the Arabs and the Israelis. Such a guarantee could and should be even-handed, applying to both sides. If other big powers were willing to do the same, so much the better.

In the event of such an agreement, the U.N. would be the logical instrumentality to see that the terms are observed, for example by patrolling demilitarized zones. In that case, the Secretary General should be given a firm mandate to act by the Security Council, not subject to termination by one side acting alone.

We should also indicate our willingness, indeed our eagerness, to help the Arab countries conquer their age-old problems of poverty, disease, illiteracy and hunger, once they have indicated that they are turning their own swords into plowshares. Israel, of course, has long been ready, willing and able to do the same.

Most important of all, we should make more clear than we ever have before our determination not to let the Arabs drive Israel into the sea. If once the Arabs could be persuaded that their dream cannot be realized, then hopefully they would come to their senses and a new day of peace and friendship could dawn.

One final word: I have been very free with criticism and advice for the U.S. Do I have none for the Israelis? Yes, I do. Recognizing the terrible provocations they suffered, I nevertheless hope they can resist the temptation to escalate the intensity of their retaliations against terrorist attacks. Overreaction, however understandable, may well be counter-productive, both on the ground and in terms of support from overseas. Moreover, some Israeli leaders, no doubt feeling the euphoria of success, are showing signs of hubris, and a lessening of interest in dis-

playing "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind." These tendencies are human, but they are worrisome too.

I am sure that many Americans—devoted to Israel's welfare—feel the same way. We do not want to see the widespread support that Israel has enjoyed in America jeopardized. But let us also in fairness recognize that at the moment our advice may seem somewhat gratuitous. If we Americans want our advice to be heeded, let us start by extending assistance to Israel at perhaps a third the level of what the Russians are doing for the Arabs.

**WE SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT ON
VIETNAM**

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, in the January 3, 1970, issue of the Kentucky Labor News, there appeared an editorial entitled "We Support the President on Vietnam." The author, Mr. Sam Ezelle, is the executive secretary of the Kentucky State AFL-CIO. I think that Mr. Ezelle's remarks are food for thought and would be enjoyed by my colleagues.

The editorial is as follows:

WE SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT ON VIETNAM

A Kentucky state senator and three state representatives have sponsored an advertisement in the public press demanding that the United States get out of the war in Vietnam—"Now!"

Since our communist enemies do not agree to any peace terms proposed by our country, those who say "pull out now" are saying we should surrender. They may deny this of course, but we will leave members of this unhappy group to play their word games among themselves. If the United States should order an immediate cessation of our activities and order the troops home—"now"—with no conditions imposed upon an army we have fought for ten years, it would be so identical to an "unconditional surrender" that even Professor John Kenneth Galbraith of Hahvud could not find a scintilla of difference . . .

Some say that our country should ignore the strife in other lands. Our thoughts go back to the years preceding World War II. We remember the year 1931, when Japan seized Manchuria from China. China protested to the League of Nations, but a year later Manchuria became the Japanese puppet state of Manchukuo. It was a far away problem in a far away land. America stood by . . .

In 1935, Adolph Hitler violated the Versailles Treaty, and ordered the conscription of a German army. America stood by . . .

The same year, Italian dictator Benito Mussolini invaded Ethiopia. His son, Vittorio, described with sadistic delight the scene of Italian war planes dropping bombs on the black warriors below, armed only with shields and spears. Of the explosions bursting their bloody bodies, Vittorio Mussolini chortled, "I still remember the effect I produced on a group of Gala tribesmen. I dropped an aerial torpedo right in the center, and the group opened up like a flowering rose. It was most entertaining." The African monarch, Haile Selassie, appealed to the world for help against the cruel Italian marauders, who sprayed mustard gas on the wells, ponds, and villages until the air, water, and ground were equally contaminated. America stood by . . .

In 1936, heel clicking Nazi legions under Hitler marched into the demilitarized Rhine-

land, further violating the armistice agreement with America and our allies. America stood by . . .

In 1938, Germany marched into Austria, and later that year Hitler demanded Sudentenland from Czechoslovakia and took it all without firing a shot as America stood by . . .

Hitler then took Poland, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg and France. Armadas of German bombers tried to erase England. America stood by . . .

The massive attack on Pearl Harbor then swept away the great American dream that we could grow fat on war profits from desperate friends as we stood by without standing up!

We know now that America stood by too long. We could have lost World War II because of the pacifists who were unwilling for us to face an unpleasant truth.

What is the price—the total price of a pull-out surrender in Viet Nam?

Are those who buy the "peace now" advertisements prepared to pay it?

**ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1863 POLISH
INSURRECTION, JANUARY 22, 1970**

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, mankind has become somewhat callous to the significance of insurrections and revolts throughout the world. Hardly a week goes by but what some group somewhere rises up against the ruling power or seeks to break away from regimes alleged to deny man's fundamental liberties. Some of these most recent uprisings are but the vocal outbursts of a small group of dissidents which have been given undue publicity by avid news mongers. Many of the insurrections, however, are of great significance and may have lasting influence upon the shaping of future world affairs. Few of them can ever approach the historic significance of the 1863 Polish insurrection, the anniversary of which falls on today, January 22.

I am always impressed with the special significance which our fine Polish-American organizations attribute to this occasion. When one reads again the story of the valiant struggle of Polish patriots to oppose the czar's detested educational and political reforms, one can appreciate why Polish Americans today revere the courageous stand taken by their forefathers over a century ago.

During the period when our own Nation was torn with internal conflict over the question of slavery and States rights, the youth of Poland waged an unremitting war against the puppet regime of Czar Alexander II. Their hit-and-run tactics from well-concealed hideouts throughout the country became so increasingly effective that the czar had to utilize his massive military establishment to wipe out those who sought to oppose his rule and his dictates. To this end he was successful and the secret national government in Warsaw was eradicated. So, too, were hundreds of patriotic Polish citizens made to pay the supreme penalty for their efforts to win freedom and independence for their countrymen.

Mr. Speaker, this date serves as a firm reminder that the Polish people then and now have a deep yearning for independence and a fierce determination to remove the shackles of serfdom. Today as was true 100 years ago, the people of Poland are engaged in a struggle to regain control of their own destinies. The cry of the 1863 insurrectionists of "Poland for the Poles" is as vibrant today as it was a century ago. I know this to be true because of my return visit to Poland last August. Once again I had first-hand contact with fine sturdy Polish citizens who demonstrated their dislike for the Soviet yoke and their lack of appreciation and respect for economic, political, and cultural reforms imposed upon them by the Russians.

Both in Poland as well as at the great convocation commemorating the 25th anniversary of the capture of Monte Cassino in Italy, I met the cream of today's loyal and patriotic Poles. The dogged determination of Poles from the four corners of the earth as well as from the homeland itself demonstrated the same love for Poland and the same ambition for the attainment of a free Poland as that which typified the Polish patriots of 1863.

All America can be proud to share with our Polish Americans the observance of this important anniversary. All America can be proud of the sons and daughters of the Polish insurrectionists who were able to escape to this country. For it is from the descendants of these patriots that so many of this Nation's most loyal and dedicated citizens have come.

As I join my Polish-American friends on this occasion I want both to congratulate them on their magnificent ongoing contribution to the life and growth of this country and to pledge anew my own determination to strive for the attainment of that independence for Poland for which so many patriots died 107 years ago this date.

**YOUNG PEOPLE WALK TO FIGHT
HUNGER**

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a report from Miss Karen McBroom, Montana's lone representative to the recent National Young World Development Conference. This group is related to the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation. Miss McBroom writes "The basic goal of the group is to educate the American people, or make them realize that unless the problems of hunger, population, and pollution are brought under control, all mankind will suffer." The group conducts "Walks for Development" during which contributors pledge a certain amount of money per mile walked by its members; the funds are then donated to worthy causes. I wish to commend the efforts of this fine young people's organization before my distinguished colleagues.

THE JOURNEY AHEAD

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the dawn of a new day, after years of decline of the American maritime industry, was indicated by an unprecedented attendance of the Propeller Club, Port of Washington, D.C., luncheon meeting on January 21, at the Rayburn Building special dining room. The occasion was significant especially because one of the speakers was the Maritime Administrator, A. E. Gibson, the architect and author of the new proposal of the Nixon administration to rebuild and restore the sadly deteriorated American merchant marine, hearings on which are scheduled for next week in the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. Gibson's talk to the Propeller Club will be of great interest to all Members of Congress and the public, and accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of his remarks at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE JOURNEY AHEAD

We at the Maritime Administration deeply appreciate the honor done us today by the Propeller Club, Port of Washington. I am particularly pleased to share the honors with my charming colleague from the Federal Maritime Commission, Mrs. Bentley's staunch advocacy of a strong U.S. Merchant Marine has been instrumental in winning the support of the Nixon Administration for the revitalization of our industry.

We often lament our tendency to talk to ourselves, but today I am glad to have the opportunity that this occasion affords of speaking to representatives of all the groups that comprise our many-sided Merchant Marine. The Propeller Club alone brings them all together in one friendly gathering—representatives of ship builders and operators, labor unions, suppliers of components, congressional committees, government agencies—the lions and the tigers (there are no lambs in this industry) eating, drinking, and talking together amicably in this no-man's land.

I believe we have much to celebrate today. Just a year ago President Nixon took office, and already we have a maritime program hammered out which we believe is workable and acceptable to all the agencies of the Government, with their diverse interests, and which has been, at least initially, received with almost unanimous support by congressional and industry spokesmen. Considering the backing and filling, the frustrations and furor that accompanied previous attempts to work out a maritime program, I think we can count this as a significant step forward.

But let's face it—it is only the first step on the long, hard journey that lies ahead. The Administration proposes, but Congress disposes. It disposes in accordance with the democratic process—its understanding of what its constituents want. These constituents are represented by the groups which appear to testify before the Committees considering legislation, by the interest shown by individuals as reflected in their letters, and by editorial comment throughout the country. Certainly we do not expect complete unanimity of support for every detail of the President's program and the enabling legislation we have presented. But if the program and the legislation are torn to bits by groups seeking a little more for themselves or a

little less for someone else, the result can well be, once again, no program at all.

Let us say, however, hopefully, that the program is enacted promptly, with little substantive change. This will be only the second step toward the goal of a revitalized Merchant Marine.

Fundamental to the program is the building of new ships—some 30 a year for 10 years. But they must be productive ships, designed and built for multiple orders at a cost that will result in sharply lowering government subsidy. The shipbuilders have assured us that, given a chance to participate in the design of these ships, and given assurance of large enough orders over a long enough period of time, they can indeed substantially lower the cost in the 7 years ahead.

The Maritime Administration has taken the first steps to make this possible by letting contracts for development of basic designs for American ships of the 1970's. The teams working on these designs include naval architects, shipbuilders, suppliers, and operators. The new designs should be ready by this spring.

We have also sought industry advice on long-range plans for research and development projects that can most usefully be undertaken by the Government as a means of meeting the challenge of the future, leaving to the industry those projects which show promise of near-term pay-off.

Ships on the drawing boards carry no cargo. Steamship lines must place orders for the ships and put them into operation. They must work out schedules and services that meet the needs of our trade in a better way than ever before. The operators have assured us that they need and want new and more productive ships and will order them if they are given the chance to do so at competitive prices.

We will give them the chance to carry out their plans. We expect to contract for 13 to 16 ships by next June to get the program underway with the use of multi-year procurement and an additional 20-25 ships in the following year. By the year after, the 30-ships-a-year program should be in full swing, including not only liners but bulk carriers and tankers as well.

We have also taken a number of actions to reduce the paperwork burden on the operators, to simplify subsidy accounting systems, and to remove the heavy hand of government from their shoulders wherever it can be done without risk to the taxpayers' interests. These steps have been designed to make more efficient operation possible and profitable.

In order to put new ships into service, however, the unions and management must be able to resolve the manning scale problem that will make it possible to realize the full potentialities of the improved designs on an equitable basis without resort to work stoppages. A number of unions have given assurance that with a meaningful long-range program, giving promise of a strong and growing industry, they will cooperate in this effort.

Ships are only a means to an end—the transporting of cargoes. Without the willingness of American and foreign shippers to consign their cargoes to U.S. ships, we will have a lot of fine ships sailing half empty or tied up at the pier. It is my belief that the industry can depend on the support of American importers and exporters if they can continually provide fast, dependable, uninterrupted service on which shippers can rely to deliver their goods when and where needed.

The Maritime Administration has already undertaken to step up our trade promotion efforts and to give greater encouragement to intermodal transportation. In the final analysis, our efforts must be geared to providing more and better service for those who engage in foreign trade.

If then we have the new ships, built and

placed in operation, properly manned, loaded with cargo—what more shall we need? The answer has to be reasonable expectation of profits. If we have all this and yet lose money, investors will look elsewhere, and the whole structure will collapse for want of the necessary support from the private sector that must balance the government's investment. We have no assurances from investors. Their interest is not in the Merchant Marine as such but in return on their capital. Yet we know that when an industry is soundly based and healthily growing, the funds for investment will be available. Our programs for Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance and Ship Exchange have shown that capital is available for economically justifiable shipping projects.

The pitfalls ahead on our journey are clearly marked. In the past single groups have blocked forward progress for many others. But no one group can bring about success by itself. It will take all of them, each making its own special contribution to the forward movement of all. The process is of course not so simple and clear-cut as I have pictured it here. Many of the decisions and actions of various groups must be taken simultaneously. Interactions among all the groups will be going on all the time. The attitudes and plans of one will affect the responses and programs of the others. But the important thing is to recognize that we are all taking this journey together, and none of us will make it to the end unless we all do.

I cannot believe that any of us are willing to be responsible even in part for the consequences of failure. Without an adequate Merchant Marine, the world's greatest trading nation must surrender her trade to her business rivals. Without responsibilities be at the mercy of those who, for their own reasons, might or might not wish to see them carried out.

We are setting out together on a voyage as adventurous as that of Columbus. The dangers are many, but the rewards can be great. The young people keep telling us that this is the Age of Aquarius. All us old navigators know that yesterday the sun entered the sign of Aquarius. The stars are with us. This is our decade—the decade in which we shall build a Merchant Marine of which we can speak with pride rather than apology.

As the leaders of all the groups within the maritime industry on whose cooperation our success depends, I call upon you to back the President in his efforts to revitalize the U.S. Merchant Marine. I urge you to accept the challenges and the opportunities he has offered to save from oblivion an industry on which our nation's economic and military strength depends.

The stars are with us—all we need now is the will to pull together to reach our goal.

CABINET COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just before the close of the first session of the 91st Congress the House and Senate passed legislation establishing a Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People. This action dramatically demonstrates the concern of the Congress and the administration for those Spanish-speaking people living throughout the Nation.

This legislation provides the new Cab-

inet Committee with several responsibilities, chief among them being:

First, to advise Federal departments and agencies regarding appropriate action to be taken to help assure that Federal programs are providing the assistance needed by Spanish-speaking and Spanish-surnamed Americans; and

Second, to advise Federal departments and agencies on the development and implementation of comprehensive and coordinated policies, plans, and programs focusing on the special problems and needs of Spanish-surnamed and Spanish-speaking Americans.

The President will also facilitate the Committee's operation by appointing an Advisory Council on Spanish-Speaking Americans, which will counsel the Committee on a wide range of issues.

Mr. Speaker, in perspective, the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People will strive to assure that Federal programs reach all Spanish-speaking and Spanish-surnamed Americans. In addition, the Committee will work to develop new programs designed to make the great American dream a reality to this group of valued Americans. These twin goals are worthy of our dedication and our concerted efforts.

ADVANCE FEED GRAIN PAYMENTS

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which would require the Secretary of Agriculture, Clifford M. Hardin, to allot advance feed grain payments of a minimum of 50 percent this year. Congressmen who are interested in advance feed grain payments can now join me in calling for an immediate hearing before the Agriculture Committee to consider this vital legislation.

Advance feed grain payments have my total and unequivocal support. The benefits derived from early payment and for the full amount per acre have historically given the agri-business community a seasonal economic shot in the arm. The spring of the year brings many expenses to the farmer, and to delay feed grain payments until July or August would work an economic hardship upon the Nation's food producer. Failure to make advance payments would force the farmer to sell his crop in early spring when the prices are low, or would necessitate the borrowing of money, if available, at high interest rates.

The logic expressed by the Bureau of the Budget in recommending delayed feed grain payments is based on fuzzy financial reasoning. The Bureau contends that savings in Federal expenditures could be made by delaying payments. However this would in reality be only a paper savings, since the funds would simply be carried from one fiscal year to

another. This is merely an attempt to manipulate the books by shifting the expenditure of Federal money.

As a Member of Congress, I have heard the word "discrimination" used frequently. However, when it comes to the interests of the agricultural minority, representing only 5 percent of the population, the Government treats this group as a stepchild. Whenever the Budget Bureau swings the economic ax, it is the food producer and the agri-business community that suffer. Why is it always the farmer? Why make the agri-business community the fall guy? For the past 20 years, billions of dollars have been spent on countless wasteful programs. The Government has pumped billions into the economy of foreign countries. The Office of Economic Opportunity has been given a virtual blank check in promoting extremely questionable programs. Why sock it to the farmer?

The time has come to put things back into proper perspective. If the feed grain program is to serve the purpose for which it was intended, the farmer must be offered an adequate inducement to participate.

THE U.S. JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. RAY BLANTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there are countless volunteer organizations across the United States which contribute to the total environment of our lives. Volunteer participation in civic action groups is a tradition in this country, and we can all be thankful for it.

This week, one of the largest, and one of the most important volunteer civic organizations in America is celebrating its 50th anniversary. I speak of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, an organization of young men which I believe exemplifies the spirit of dedication and pride in our way of life.

The Jaycees have a commendable record for concern about the problems of our towns, cities, and Nation. But they have transferred this concern into action, and you will always see a Jaycee group in the forefront of most important civic action work in any town in this Nation.

Worldwide they have inspired young men to volunteer their time and skills and imaginations to tackle the problems which face us. Their selfless attitude of freely giving of their time for the betterment of society has motivated vast improvements throughout all sectors of our lives.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to these fine young men. I congratulate them on a half century of service to mankind. And I wish to them success in all their future undertakings as they embark on another half century of service to their communities.

THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL REPUBLIC

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 52d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Ukrainian National Republic and 51st anniversary of the act of union, whereby all Ukrainian lands were united into one independent and sovereign nation. The independence and the act of union were proclaimed in Kiev, capital of Ukraine on January 22, 1918, and 1919, respectively.

The Ukrainian National Republic was recognized by a number of foreign governments including that of Soviet Russia. The latter, however, almost simultaneously with recognition declared war and began invasion of Ukraine. For almost 3½ years, Ukrainian people waged a gallant struggle in defense of their country, alone and unaided. The free Ukraine was subdued to a puppet regime of Soviet Socialistic Republic.

The freedom-loving people of Ukraine have not accepted Soviet Russian domination and regardless of harsh persecutions, artificial famine and genocide Russian policy have been fighting for reestablishment of their independence by all means accessible to them for the last 50 years. During World War II, the Ukrainian people organized a powerful underground Ukrainian Partisan Army—U.P.A.—which fought against Nazi regime and against the Soviets as well.

Stalin and Khrushchev unleashed bloody persecutions and reprisals against the Ukrainian people in the late 1940's.

Relentless and severe persecutions of Ukrainians continued after the death of Stalin and after the ouster of Khrushchev from the top leadership in the Kremlin. Brezhnev-Kosygin leadership is bent on keeping the Soviet Russian empire intact by persecutions and deportations of Ukrainian youth, students, scientists, and Ukrainian intellectuals.

Recently the international press has been providing a vast amount of documentation of the suppression of Ukrainian culture. Briefly, the Kremlin rule in Ukraine can be described as follows: Exploitation of Ukraine's economic resources for the benefit of Moscow and its imperialistic ventures in Asia, Middle East, Africa, and Latin America; genocide and systematic deportation of Ukrainians to central Asia; arrest and trials of Ukrainian patriots including Ukrainian Communists defending freedom of their country.

Persecutions of all religions in Ukraine and enforced Russification aiming at the cultural and linguistic genocide of the Ukrainian people.

All the available evidence of the Western observers shows that ever-increasing tempo of repression has failed to intimidate the Ukrainian people, therefore, the Russian leadership in the Kremlin took brutal measures against liberal movement in Czechoslovakia, since Kremlin

leaders were convinced the liberal ideas of Czechoslovakia would help Ukrainian liberals and other captive nations.

Both the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States have expressed their concern over captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. by enacting the Captive Nations Week resolution in July 1959.

The American-Ukrainian community in North Dakota and in the whole United States will observe the forthcoming 52d anniversary of the Ukrainian independence and the 51st anniversary of the act of union in fitting celebration.

This anniversary provides an appropriate occasion not only for the U.S. Government and American people but the free world to demonstrate their sympathy and understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian people.

DEFICIT SPENDING FEEDS
INFLATION

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, inflation is one of the major concerns of citizens everywhere, and on January 19 the Streator, Ill., Daily Times-Press commented editorially on the causes and cure for rising prices. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this timely editorial herewith so that colleagues in the House might read it also:

DEFICIT SPENDING FEEDS INFLATION

Federal budget deficits and inflation are kissing cousins, with excessive government spending a keystone in the inflationary frame of U.S. economics. Both deficit spending at Washington and inflation is a potent opiate, attractive and pleasing to the citizen who is not aware of the dangerous consequences.

High prices and high labor rates go hand in hand up the spiral until there comes a time when money ceases to have value. There have been times, not too many years ago, when the citizens required a wheelbarrow full of Marks to buy a loaf of bread in Germany. France, Italy, England and other countries around the globe have felt the lash of inflation's demanding whip.

For years in this country we have experienced continuing higher prices for goods and wares, higher labor, higher taxes, higher cost of services. Up and up and up has gone the gross national product when measured in dollars. And with each impetus given inflation the dollar has been reduced in its buying power.

Contributing grossly to inflation has been government spending at Washington in excess of national income. Uncle Sam has been a most liberal spender, ignoring deficits which have been piling up to plague future generations, and to be a vicious factor in lowering the value of the dollar.

The government has set the example and every business and every worker has voluntarily or involuntarily participated in the economic spending spree.

It will be interesting to note how much favorable response President Nixon receives as a result of his drastic attack on deficit spending at the capital, and its effect. Since his inauguration, he has been attempting

to find ways and means to slow down the runaway which has been exhilarating but which leads to tragedy.

The President is insisting that spending be limited to income and there be a balance, something which has been possible only a very few times in past decades. He has ordered cuts in every department of government, in the military, in the space program and other areas where savings could be effected. Surplus employes are feeling the axe and contracts are being restudied in the effort to economize.

Congress must cooperate, but of even greater importance, Americans in toto must cooperate if inflation is to be successfully battled. It is the citizenry which puts the pressures on Congress and the administration to spend without regard to costs.

The greedy hand of inflation plays no favorites, for it reaches out to every individual, employer or employe, to the professions. The problem is not one alone for the President, but he is making good his promise to do something about halting the rising trend of everything. It will not be an easy conquest. He is entitled to credit.

A CONGRATULATORY ADDRESS TO
THE JAYCEES ON THE OCCASION
OF THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to commend the Jaycees of the United States on this, their 50th anniversary. It is an organization whose lifeblood is this Nation's young men and whose work has benefited countless facets of our lives.

From its very beginning in 1920, the Jaycees have illustrated an ability to maintain activities contemporary with the thoughts and issues of the times. It began as a small nucleus of men with few chapters and limited funds. One of its first themes with which these men concerned themselves was "Know America." An impressive expansion has taken place over the past 50 years, resulting in a membership numbering well over 300,000 people and resulting in a corresponding expansion of activities. From the simple "Know America" emphasis, this organization has moved toward grappling with more complex issues such as community development, mental health facilities, and physical fitness, to name just a few.

The Jaycees impress me also with its continued recognition of problems and its dealing with them before the general public is moved to take action. The Jaycees' emphasis on conservation in 1932, for example, helped achieve the formation of the National Wildlife Federation in 1936, long before conservation became the great concern of today. Another example is the willingness of the Jaycees to voice the thoughts of American youth. At the time the Jaycees were first established, relatively few young people were given serious consideration as to what they thought about certain issues. The Jaycees have been consistently youth-oriented in their programs

and they have exemplified a positive trend toward developing human resources. Their motto: "Creating an Environment for Change Through People," is proof of their desire to achieve progress by way of the people.

With the prevailing atmosphere of confusion and turbulence of thought on the part of our young people today, the Jaycees have provided an invaluable channel through which ideas may be aired and constructive action can be taken. Today's youth clamors for programs to solve relevant problems. Current Jaycee activities zero in on improvements of city transportation, race relations, and adequate housing, as well as supplying aids to finance education and programs of rehabilitation.

Their record of extraordinary success speaks for itself; it presupposes good leadership and keen imagination applied to programs which benefit the people of this Nation and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I again heartily congratulate the Jaycees on their auspicious 50th anniversary. They have more than proven their worth and I sincerely hope that with the continued support of the people we may enjoy the good they are doing for many years to come.

ENGLAND AND HER YOUNG

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 18, which would amend the Constitution to allow persons who reach their 18th birthday to vote, I have been keeping a close eye on a similar move in Great Britain.

As my distinguished colleagues know, England reduced its voting age requirements from 21 to 18 on January 1, 1970.

WABC Radio has a most interesting editorial on this subject. I am placing it in the RECORD, and asking my colleagues to take a few moments to read it. I am sure they will benefit from this editorial. It follows:

ENGLAND AND HER YOUNG: GREAT BRITAIN
MOVES AHEAD OF THE UNITED STATES IN
GIVING EQUAL RIGHTS TO 18 YEAR OLDS

The United Kingdom has not fallen in the past three weeks . . . much to the surprise of many people who don't trust teenagers. On January first . . . the legal age in England dropped from 21 to 18. Some 3 to 4 million young people now have the right to vote . . . Marry without parental consent . . . Take out loans . . . In fact do everything their parents do. This is an important move . . . in the opinion of WABC. We are strongly in favor of lowering the voting age to 18. So far the adult voters have turned down the idea at the polls. If you have any doubts about lowering the age . . . pay close attention to what's happening in England. There has been no rush to the altar . . . no bankruptcies and the government hasn't been toppled. During the next year . . . follow the events in Great Britain. Maybe you'll agree with us the next time you vote on the question.

ASSAULTING THE ARISTOCRACY

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a perceptive editorial from the Wall Street Journal discusses the important role of Vice President AGNEW, in "assaulting the aristocracy" of the United States—an aristocracy which has in some ways separated itself from the mainstream of American life, through arrogance and contempt for "ordinary Americans."

This article points up the sometimes narrow outlook of this so-called aristocracy—an unwillingness to recognize its own mistakes, or to accept all Americans as essential parts in a democratic society. I commend this thoughtful article to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 12, 1970]

ASSAULTING THE ARISTOCRACY

From a political-social-cultural viewpoint, the most arresting news of the past year was the advent of Spiro Agnew. An understanding of this phenomenon almost certainly will tell us a good deal about this juncture in time, if not indeed about a dawning era.

All the more so because the Vice President excites such intense passion among both his supporters and his critics. Dr. Gallup tells us Mr. Agnew now ranks third, behind Richard Nixon and Billy Graham, among the nation's most admired men. This popularity among the masses, though, is mirrored by apoplectic convulsions among the elite. No doubt the elite generally views the Vice President the way a friend of our does, as rallying "the rednecks" against "the thinking people."

Take away the loaded phraseology and he is not far wrong. Indeed, the phraseology is unconsciously revealing. The heart of the Agnew phenomenon is precisely that a class has sprung up in this nation that considers itself uniquely qualified ("thinking people"), and is quite willing to dismiss the ordinary American with utter contempt ("the rednecks"). Mr. Agnew has merely supplied a focus for the inevitable reaction to this arrogance.

Mr. Agnew's targets—the media, war protesters, rebellious youth—are representatives of a class that has enjoyed unusual moral and cultural authority through the 1960's. Seldom before has such wide influence been wielded by the highbrows, the intellectual-beautiful-people-Eastern-liberal elite. Yet how well have the members of this elite discharged this authority. What has been the record of their decade?

Oh, the highbrows can write off the war as due to a Texan, conveniently ignoring from whom he inherited it and from whom he took advice. But the elite policies were followed, insofar as practically possible, in such domestic programs as the new economics and the war on poverty. Has the economy been well managed? Have the cities prospered?

Even more telling are the results in the many fields where moral authority is exercised directly, without the dilution of the political process. Whose theology culminates in the death of God? Whose artistic advice culminates in pornography? Whose moral advice culminates in "anything goes" with sex and drugs? Whose children sack the universities?

Coupled with this record has been the

contemptuous approach so well described to a Harper's reporter by S. I. Hayakawa: "When the PhDs from a prestige university try to impose on the natives a sophisticated culture, they're like Parisian intellectuals trying to bring enlightenment to Algeria, and they despise the cultural forms of Algeria which they don't respect or understand. If the teachers are successful, the Algerian wants to become a Parisian, and looks down on the culture from which he sprang."

"And as soon as the American college student is successfully propagandized by the American intellectual, he looks down on the mainstream of American culture—the American Legion, the Grange, the Rotary, the Lions Club—because he's all wrapped up in Beckett, Camus, Pound. But the American Legion and the Rotary Club have just as much importance in a democracy as the New York Review of Books. Damn sight more, maybe."

Naturally, all this has left a raw nerve in the body politic, and quite justifiably so. Raw nerves nearly always have a potential for danger, and at the extremes this one spills over into outright hatred of the highbrow. It could turn into a period of nasty anti-intellectualism; and as part-time highbrows ourselves, we hope the Vice President starts to give this danger a little thought. But it is far better the nerve be touched by him than by, say, George Wallace. If history is a guide, as such feelings are incorporated into the two-party mainstream, their worst excesses usually are pared away from their legitimate core.

In this case that core is substantial; Moral authority used both badly and arrogantly by the prevailing elite. The battle is over whether that authority should now be withdrawn, and Mr. Agnew has placed himself at the vortex. He deals with politics on the grand scale, raising an issue transcending that of who should hold office. He raises the issue of who shall allocate the status and rewards this society provides, who shall have prerogative to separate the good guys from the bad guys, who shall decide which is the thinking person and which the redneck.

That is why Spiro Agnew attracts such intense feelings. He has hold of that most primeval political cause, the assault on the perquisites of a vested aristocracy. And it is an assault this particular aristocracy has brought upon itself.

JAYCEE WEEK

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, during the past 50 years the United States Jaycees has been an exciting force in our society, channeling the energy of young men into constructive action.

I am proud of the many young men of Pennsylvania and this Nation who have participated in, and who now are participating in, this outstanding organization.

Congratulations to the Jaycees on their golden anniversary. May the next 50 years be just as productive and beneficial to our local communities and to our Nation as a whole. As a former member of this fine organization, I salute its great accomplishments.

RESPECT, PATRIOTISM, AND LOVE

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, just recently Mr. Jim Bishop of the King Features Syndicate, Inc., reflected on some of the dimensions of American life as it is today in an article entitled "Respect, Patriotism, and Love." Because this article reaches into some interesting corners of the United States and raises some rather important questions with respect to the future of America, I submit the article to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and recommend it to the attention of my colleagues:

RESPECT, PATRIOTISM, AND LOVE

(By Jim Bishop)

Respect, patriotism and love are gone. I mourn them; I grieve for their passing. The United States of America was a straight, tall redwood among a world of nations which seemed, for a time, to be ferns around her roots. The tall tree, I am convinced, is infested with dry rot and great sections of the bark are falling off.

I am not one of those everything-is-going-to-hell men. It requires a great deal of evidence for me to condemn a person, an institution, or a land. In retrospect, it seems to me that America has become turbulent, tempestuous and unreliable within the past 15 years.

This would take us back to the May, 1954, decision of the Supreme Court which gave to all of us, black and white and red and brown, a legal equality of services. Anyone who argues that this has advanced the case of the American Negro had better speak to some of the blacks who have been burned out, bombed out, shot at, harassed and unemployed.

The ruling was intended to be a good thing for all Americans. Neither side was adult enough to live with it, and it is in the finest traditions of irony that the ones who might have profited most by a new standard of equality—black youth—fought with fury against it. Name for me which blacks, which whites, are living more a peace today.

Nor is this the only sign of America's failure to rise to the challenge of the last half of the 20th century. Events now dictate to men. Elect any President you please, but he will inherit the same problems; and worse—the same superficial solutions as his predecessor. Party doesn't mean anything any more. A conservative Democrat and a conservative Republican are brothers.

A liberal Republican and a liberal Democrat are identical twins. Politicians are wearing the wrong masks. Can anyone explain why it is that the dollar we had a few years ago is worth 84 cents now? Can they do anything about your grocery bills and mine? Everything we need is out of reach.

The president says that we will phase out of Vietnam by 1973. Phase out means that the last of our youngsters—except a heavy cadre of advisers—will be home by then. If so, our little foray into Southeast Asia will have cost us about 60,000 dead and about two hundred and ten billions of dollars.

We will have been in it about a decade—the longest war in our history. No one wanted it. No one wants it now. No one wants to live with it until 1973. And our young men, by the thousands, perhaps millions, schemed with their parents regarding ways and means of keeping out of it.

No war is popular. In World War II, we put 14,000,000 persons in uniform. Today we must devise new ways of dragooning whimpering bearded boys to report for duty. They run off to Canada, they hide, they beg off, the heavy-weight champion of the world weeps that he is a minister—military, America is only as strong as its cold weapons.

Our young preach love as though they invented the word. No generation within my purview shouts "love!" with so much venom. Their emotions are so flaccid that they require drugs to make their world palatable. To them, sex is not God's blessing upon an honorable union. They use it for the opening handshake.

I do not require respect from any man, except from myself. In my past is a trail of sin like old embers, but there was never a solitary day of my life that I didn't try to hitch up my pants and be just a little bit better than yesterday. I can't find youths who will even look at me when they speak. They study the mud on their shoes.

All through the repetitive debates in the churlish congresses, I have kept faith in this land because, in all history, none has been so blessed. But now my spirits flag and I study an expensive do-nothing Congress and I think those senators and representatives owed it to our President to give his plans a chance. They rammed bills down his throat which he dared not veto. His own party made him look bad.

It doesn't matter whether a man is in Nixon's corner or not—he's every American's President. He works for all of us and gets paid by all of us. He was entitled to one year of cooperation—and now the year is gone.

Isn't it about time that all of us, every last one of us, returned to fundamental virtues of respect, patriotism and love? Would it hurt so much to try, or is this land of milk and honey to be like ancient Rome—a few fluted columns, a history book of desolation, a forest of blackened trees?

LAND OF THE FREE

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I received a poem in the mail recently, and I was deeply impressed with its message.

Its author is Miss Helen Thayer of New Orleans, who lives in my congressional district. Her poem was indeed heartwarming, and I wanted to share it with all Americans.

Therefore, I insert Miss Thayer's work, "Land of the Free," at this point in the RECORD:

LAND OF THE FREE

(By Helen Thayer)

I am a free American; I own a portion of this land.

I'm free to speak and free to pray. I'm thankful that it is this way.

I'm free to cherish what is mine; accept an offer—or decline.

I'm free to go where e're I may. I'm thankful that it is this way.

I'm free to work, or idle be. I'm free to differ—or agree.

I'm free to vote and have my say. I'm thankful that it is this way.

If this you take away from me, in bondage I would surely be.

I'm thankful for the U.S.A.; God grant 'twill always be this way.

OXVI—55—Part 1

UNBELIEVABILITY OF CHARGES AIRED

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, we are being exposed these days to a great deal of emotional talk about the dangers of DDT. Unfortunately, the reaction of the press and the public seems to be more based on emotion than reason. It seems that these days we are ready to follow any piper who can play a tune, and the anti-DDT pipers are building up a substantial following.

I was pleased, therefore, to read a report in the Portland Oregonian recently which seems to put this whole matter in a better perspective. The article was written by a professor of entomology at San Jose State College in California and it brings out some of the facts that we would all do well to keep in mind as we listen to the noise being made all around us about DDT.

Because of the importance of the subject matter and the timeliness of the information in the article, I ask to have it placed in the RECORD:

[From the Portland Oregonian, Dec. 28, 1969]

DDT DEFENDED: "UNBELIEVABILITY" OF CHARGES AIRED

(By J. Gordon Edwards)

The author of this hard-hitting defense of DDT, the "miracle insecticide" hailed for a quarter-century but now under attack by environmentalists, is professor of entomology at San Jose State College. He is a leader among a group of scientists opposing all-out bans on DDT and questioning the safety of substitutes. He wrote this article at The Oregonian's request. We believe the case for DDT should be heard in consideration of the need for controlled use of all insecticides and pesticides.

For 25 years DDT has been a great benefactor of mankind, and it seems incredible that anyone could deliberately seek to deprive us of this remarkable ally in our fight against death, disease and starvation. Recently, however, we have been exposed to a barrage of anti-DDT propaganda which is remarkably untruthful and misleading.

Scientists who are thoroughly familiar with the facts could scarcely believe that anyone would take such accusations seriously. After all, we thought, there are some things (like motherhood, patriotism, and DDT) that simply do not need defending . . . at least, not until recently. Alas, we now hear many shallow-thinking counterparts of the anti-vaccination, anti-iodized salt, anti-chlorinated water radicals pointing at DDT and shouting "wolf."

Unfortunately some of their most posterous claims have been publicized by "sensationalist" news media, and the public came to believe that some of them are "scientific facts." Documented rebuttals by famed scientists with a lifetime of experience in toxicology, nutrition, cancer research, and other pertinent specialties were accorded very little attention (after all, who gets excited about statements that "DDT is proven not to cause cancer?")

Statements by the chief toxicologist for the U.S. Public Health Service and by the chief of toxicology for the Food and Drug Administration were entirely discounted by many news media, but an assistant professor of chemistry (who never had a course in ecology) became recognized as a "leading authority" on toxicology, nutrition, and ecology.

Similarly, the testimony of leading cancer specialists has often been discounted, in favor of unfounded charges by non-medical men that "DDT may cause cancer," actually, cancer has steadily declined ever since the advent of DDT (except lung cancer, of course), and no cancer has been caused among the hundreds of employees in the huge DDT factory in California during more than 20 years of operation. The other anti-DDT charges appear to rest on equally shaky ground.

Irresponsible persons often state that: "DDT is everywhere, and is not broken down in the environment," yet this is demonstrably false. Numerous scientific investigations have proven that DDT is broken down by environmental heat, cold, bacteria, alkaline soil or water, soil micro-organisms, aquatic plants, and chemicals within insects and vertebrate animals. It seldom persists more than a few days or weeks, under natural environmental conditions.

Many official agencies regularly analyze our soil, air and water, and the majority of samples contain "no trace" of DDT, even in the Columbia River and in the Mississippi and its tributaries (draining some of the most heavily-sprayed fields in the world).

Methods of detecting DDT and other insecticides were very crude until recently, but gas chromatography now provides a very sensitive means of detecting their presence. Unfortunately, different chemicals sometimes give identical readings, which last resulted in some gross errors.

Apparently about half of the material identified as DDT in many recent analyses actually is not DDT, but may be PCB (polychlorobiphenyl compounds), which are not of insecticidal origin but are very widespread in the environment.

DDT experiments with mice and birds are very misleading, for they always involve DDT concentrations thousands of times stronger than those ingested by any humans. (We only take in about 0.0005 p.p.m., or "parts per million, daily.)

On long-term diets with 10.0 p.p.m. of DDT (20,000 times as much as in our diet) mallards reproduced much better than those with no DDT, and pheasants fed 50.0 p.p.m. (100,000 times the concentration in our food) were more successful than the "control" birds. Birds are certainly not being "extincted," as the "scare-mongers keep insisting . . . in fact, they seem to thrive because there is more food available and because they have fewer insect parasites to transmit diseases such as avian malaria, fowlpox, and Newcastle disease.

The Audobon Society bird census shows that robins, blackbirds, doves, quail, pheasants and ducks are much more abundant now than during the pre-DDT years, as every outdoorsman will confirm. In November, 373 bald eagles were counted in a single morning by park rangers at West Glacier, Montana, and in 1969 ospreys were increasing in uninhabited areas (but decreasing where towns and resorts have ruined their habitats).

As for fish, the Columbia River salmon run in 1969 was the greatest since counts began, and the Coho salmon in the Great Lakes have multiplied beyond all expectations. In Wyoming tests, young trout fed on DDT diets for more than a year grew bigger than the "controls. Corvallis (Oregon) tests recently showed that aflatoxins (molds, not pesticides) in hatchery food were responsible for liver tumors in rainbow trout being reared.

The President recently launched a campaign to "end hunger and malnutrition in the United States. That program is doomed, unless DDT and its allies remain available for use against destructive agricultural pests. Food prices will soar if DDT is banned, for substitute insecticides must be applied 4 to 15 times more often and each application costs 2 to 5 times as much as a DDT treatment.

In October, 8,000 Washington orchardists' petitioned the Department of Agriculture not to ban DDT in that state, and California cotton-growers have found that production costs increased seven-fold when substitutes for DDT were used. In 1969, 13 spray pilots have been killed in California by those deadly substitutes and dozens of farm-workers and children became ill from phosphate pesticide poisoning.

Substitutes for DDT also eradicated 83,000 colonies of honey-bees in southern California this year (an effect DDT never had) and thousands of pheasants died there from ingesting Azodrin (a highly-recommended substitute for DDT). Last month the American Beekeeping Federation and the American Honey Producers Association told the USDA that substitutes for DDT are decimating bee colonies in Arizona, California and Washington, and expressed great concern for the agricultural future of those states after the insect pollinators have been killed off.

The condition of Oregon's forests is of great concern to Oregonians, and DDT plays a most important role there. When Douglas-fir Tussock Moths threatened thousands of acres near Burns, Forest Service officials used DDT to control them. An excellent "Surveillance Report" (1968) documented the lack of ill effects on fish, wildlife and cattle. It was stated that: "DDT still remains the only known effective insecticide for control of the Douglas-fir Tussock Moth" (ultimate losses prevented by the spray program were estimated to be more than \$16 million). Another excellent report, in 1969, dealt with the highly successful Willapa Hemlock Looper control program, and proved that DDT did not adversely affect non-target organisms in the forests, streams or bays.

Fortunately, many sincere citizens are now becoming concerned enough to listen to the scientific evidence that refutes the charges against DDT. The anti-DDT campaign is faltering because of its own unbelieveability, and the public is becoming more aware of the truth about this marvelous chemical compound.

As a result, housewives, tradesmen and business executives will surely join agriculturists, foresters, nutritionists, toxicologists and public health authorities in a belated recognition of DDT for exactly what it is—the safest, most dependable, and most economic ally of mankind in the struggle against environmental waste, pestilence, disease, and starvation.

TRIBUTE TO THE JAYCEES

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Jaycees. Because of my past membership in this organization, I am well aware of the tremendous service the Jaycees can provide and the high ideals they uphold as stated in their creed. The Jaycees have exemplified the results of what can be accomplished when people are conscious of the problems in their community and are energetic enough to solve them. I have always felt that young people have the ability to plant the seeds for growth and prosperity. The activities of the Jaycees have certainly strengthened my conviction in this belief. I want to congratulate the Jaycees for their fine record of achievement and to wish them many more successful years.

THE REQUIRED VETO

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, though every thoughtful person agrees on the necessity for improving our Nation's educational system, there is a tendency on the part of some to think that merely spending more and more money will solve any problems. The fallacy of this belief—especially in the area of impacted aid—is clearly explained in an editorial from the Washington Star of January 15.

The inequities of this program alone would be sufficient grounds for a complete reexamination and revamping of this area, before any additional funds are added. But combined with the dangerous inflation confronting our country today, the addition of \$1.3 billion—half a billion dollars to this faulty impacted aid program—would be disastrous. Therefore, a Presidential veto would become an absolute necessity.

I urge my colleagues to consider carefully the points raised in the following editorial:

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 15, 1970]

THE REQUIRED VETO

Everyone is in favor of better education. Everyone is in favor of curbing inflation. These two universal drives have converged at the opening of this congressional election year, putting Congress and the President on seemingly unalterable collision courses.

The issue is the \$19.7 billion appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare. The House has tacked an additional \$1.3 billion to the administration's request. The Senate is almost certain to follow suit. The President has announced his intention to veto the bill. And Congress, from all present indications, will try to override the veto.

It would be easy enough to write off the actions of Congress as a cynical shirking of fiscal responsibilities in a quest for short term political gain. Conversely, the President's anticipated veto can be attacked as a cold-hearted disregard of basic human needs, an accountant's approach to government. Both charges are oversimplifications.

The social needs are real. So is the inflation. Both have political potential. The reality of the inflation cannot be used as an argument against all social, health and educational programs. But it does make it mandatory that the vast sums of money required in these areas must be spent wisely and well.

In the case of the \$1.3 billion in dispute, the bulk of it—approximately \$1 billion—would go for increased funding of education programs. Half of this sum would be spent on an increase in grants to schools in federally impacted areas.

Aid to impacted areas was initiated in 1950 to help school districts shoulder the cost of educating children whose parents lived and worked on federal property. It was needed at that time, when newly created federal installations reduced the taxable properties of many local jurisdictions and simultaneously provided more children to be educated.

It has largely outlived its usefulness. And the fact that the richest county in America—Montgomery County—received \$5.8 million impact aid in 1968 while the 100 poorest counties were dividing up \$3.2 million, testifies to the inequities of the program.

Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and John-

son tried in turn to trim impacted area aid and ran into the political reality that the aid is funneled to some 400 congressional districts, none of which was or is anxious to give up the income. Appropriations have been steadily increased.

The time has come to reverse the trend, to accept the urgency of the inflationary crisis and to start phasing out impacted area aid. It must be realized, too, that the other programs involved are, for the most part, not going to be materially improved by an increase in funding at this late date. Qualified teachers cannot be found, constructive educational programs cannot be instituted during this school year. And the money would have to be spent in the next six months, before the end of this fiscal year.

The proposed increase in spending fails to meet the requirements of urgency and effectiveness. The Senate should decline to follow the House's lead. Failing that, the President should veto the measure. And the veto should stand.

FOUR CHEERS FOR NIXON

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's efforts to trim the Federal budget, cutting out unnecessary, ineffective programs and restoring Federal spending to more realistic levels, are being recognized as a substantial step toward relieving the American taxpayer.

This "spending reform" is praised in an editorial from the Miami Herald. I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

FOUR CHEERS FOR NIXON AS HE CUTS THE BUDGET

Not content with present budget levels for fiscal 1971 (which begins in July) President Nixon has repaired to Camp David to comb over the figures and cut them further.

This calls, we think, for a minimum of four cheers.

At its very lowest the Federal budget probably will cross the \$200 billion mark for the first time. As the President's former economic counselor and new chairman of the Federal Reserve System, Dr. Arthur F. Burns, has pointed out, eight years ago the rising curve of federal expenditures first went above \$100 billion; thus at \$200 billion "we will be adding as much to the federal spending rate in a mere nine years as it took nearly two centuries to achieve previously."

In an expanding economy beset by population pressures there can be no objection to substantial taxation if taxes are properly levied and tax dollars are properly spent.

This is Mr. Nixon's objective. But realizing it will be difficult. War and its rumors have provoked heavy spending. Recently a Senate committee detected some \$20 billion in inflated prices for military hardware. Yet the fact remains that defense outlays have accounted for only about one-sixth of the increase in the cost of government since the end of the Korean war.

We hope that Mr. Nixon will be guided and will act upon two suggestions of Dr. Burns.

The economist, educator and author believes that spending reform is even more important than tax reform. The need is particularly acute in areas of domestic spending.

One spending reform is the new congressional ceiling on expenditures, adopted in 1968 and reaffirmed last year. An effort to resist pressure for special appropriations, it will require firmness on the part of Congress in its mandate to the President.

The second reform is the proposed concept

of "zero-base budgeting." Formerly the bureaucracy began its budgeting with what it raked in last time and simply added to this base in the new budget year. The zero routine would compel government departments to go back to the beginning and justify all that they requested, not just the new programs.

To this end, as Dr. Burns has pointed out, President Nixon's request of the Budget Bureau for "a list of programs judged to be obsolete or substantially over-funded" is a "first step toward zero-base budgeting."

At long last there appears to be some daylight on the horizon of federal spending. We hope it can be reflected in a smile, so many years overdue, on the countenance of the American taxpayer.

HOUSING BREAKTHROUGH IN AKRON, OHIO

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker after 8 years of promises without fulfillment, it is with the greatest satisfaction that I can report the fantastic change in the housing picture for Akron, Ohio, under the Republican administration. As you all know, when selected by President Nixon to head the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Secretary George Romney promised this Nation that the desperate need for housing would be met by bringing American technology and American industry into this long neglected sector.

The first city to respond to Secretary Romney's call was Akron, Ohio, and, in particular, the Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority. This authority, under the leadership of its executive director, Mr. Jack Saferstein, went into the American marketplace to find a company ready and willing to respond to the challenge of instant quality homes—for performance to replace the tons of paper planning of the previous administration.

Mr. Saferstein found for Akron such a space age manufacturer in the Stirling Homex Corp. of Avon, N.Y. It seems that Mr. David Stirling, Jr., the corporation's chairman of the board, had already answered the challenge. Discarding the old methods, Stirling Homex had commenced the construction of modular housing units in a plant near Rochester, N.Y., which was literally capable of building a neighborhood of fine homes overnight or as many in 1 week as many builders I know can produce in a year.

But, it may be asked, "What about the unions?" On June 17, 1969, an agreement was signed before Secretary Romney between Stirling Homex and the 900,000-member carpenters union to supply labor to erect Stirling's factory-built houses at job sites throughout the Nation, including those forthcoming in Akron. In keeping with President Nixon's call for training and not charity for the unemployed, this same agreement called for the establishment of training centers under an arrangement with the National Urban League.

I am delighted to report that the promises of last June have become the proud

homes of December. In Akron, 315 families spent Christmas in their own fine homes. These 315 dwellings are a part of the total of 2,000 that have been added by Mr. Saferstein to the housing inventory of metropolitan Akron through leasing, acquisition, and turnkey to provide housing for families and our senior citizens. This is splendid evidence of what local leadership and American industry can produce when it knows that the administration in Washington respects these great American institutions and has confidence in them. Neither Mr. Saferstein nor Mr. Stirling have made a secret of the fact that the progress in these townhouse units and the incentive to open new technologies can be traced to the inspirational leadership of Secretary Romney and Operation Breakthrough which was developed by the Secretary at HUD.

Significantly, Mr. Saferstein's program in Akron has not dried up as so many others in the country once did under the previous administration. In less than 2 years, Mr. Saferstein has progressed from president of a chain of Akron supermarkets to the Nation's pace setter in housing. He is a true product of the pride and initiative of this great Ohio city.

Thus, under financial assistance contracts approved by Secretary Romney, an additional 850 housing units will be produced for the Akron municipal area in 1970. These astounding figures, which would once have represented a city's 10- or 20-year plan, may soon be taken as typical when the full impact of Secretary Romney's Breakthrough program becomes apparent on the American scene.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has heard many great and inspiring speeches, but President Nixon's state of the Union message today will rank high among them.

It was a summons to action to a Congress which has been slow to act. Yet he rose above narrow partisanship and called for a common advance on behalf of all Americans. He placed our priorities the way the great majority of citizens place them—peace, solvency, safety, and improvement of the quality of life.

There was hope and inspiration in the President's eloquent speech. His are not impossible goals but we can achieve them only by working together in a fresh climate. I hope Congress, even though majority control is in the hands of the President's political opposition, and this is an election year, will rise and respond to President Nixon's statesman-like appeal in the same constructive and conciliatory spirit. I am sure the American people applaud and support this style of leadership from the White House.

STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SHOW CONCERN ABOUT DETERIORATING ENVIRONMENT

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative from the Second District of Wisconsin, which includes the University of Wisconsin at Madison, I was particularly pleased to read in the January 22 Washington Post, a report by Colman McCarthy regarding the concern of University of Wisconsin students about the deteriorating environment.

The student body in Madison is rapidly emerging as the Nation's most active college group that is involved in dealing with environmental problems, whether they be found on the university campus, in the city of Madison or throughout the State of Wisconsin.

Sparking the student interest in environmental issues are the Ecology Students Association, the Daily Cardinal, the student newspaper, and faculty members, such as my good friend, Prof. Harold "Bud" Jordahl.

Mr. Speaker, the motivation and constructive efforts of the Wisconsin students and faculty in preserving and enhancing the quality of our environment can serve as a model for all the Nation's colleges and universities to follow. I strongly commend the McCarthy article to the attention of my colleagues:

STUDENTS DIGGING IN FOR ECOLOGY FIGHT

(By Colman McCarthy)

MADISON, Wis.—No group is more concerned, or more disgusted, about the growing destruction of the American environment than the young—the largely voteless and powerless kids in high school and college coming into their first push to adulthood. Their concern and disgust is based on two facts: first, they are less guilty than anyone in the current crime wave against America's air, land and water. This is not because the young are morally superior to the old, as some middle-aged cheerleaders for the kid-cult seem to believe; but mainly because they haven't been around long enough to become accomplices in the pollution violence, assuming they might want to. Second, the young are more concerned about saving the environment because they will be the worst casualties if it is *not* saved. They have more years to go on the ecologically damaged planet than the middle and elderly aged.

Although many student environmental activists are using little more than the scream method that a few in the antiwar movement could never rise above, others are digging in for a long siege. They are finding out exactly what the environmental problems are: the politics, the economy and the technology of it all.

Among the nation's most active campuses in environmental issues is the University of Wisconsin at Madison. On a recent Friday afternoon from 4 to 7 p.m., 19 students met in a seminar on environmental problems. Under the direction of Professor Harold C. Jordahl, the seminar was vocal and highly intelligent. During the three hours, the students discussed and evaluated each other's term papers on such subjects as the hazards of a proposed nuclear power plant in Minnesota, the planning vacuum behind the recently rejected proposal for the Everglades

jetport, the politics behind the SST—"it really makes sense," said one student, "we spend billions of dollars getting to London 3,000 miles away in half the time when we'll soon need twice the time getting to and from the airport 10 miles away"—the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Great Lakes dredging controversy, the lack of regional and national power planning in the U.S.

Prof. Jordahl, delighted to be working with students who bring brains as well as passion to the course, says: "This is the nuts and bolt work of recovering the environment. When a student has enough sense to go beyond outrage, then he is on the way to doing something, not just shouting something, about a given problem. In a few years, most of the students in the seminar will be working in government, in politics, in journalism, the park systems. They're learning the fundamentals now, so that when the time comes and they have the power to act, they'll know what to act for."

"On a deeper level, courses like these aren't only about the environment. They're survival courses."

Aside from the classrooms, numerous campus organizations actively lobby and agitate for antipollution goals. The Ecology Students Association recently sent a report to the University's hierarchy recommending several measures for local control of "resources and pollution." The ESA report said that since the internal combustion engine was the main cause of air pollution, cars and buses on campus should be limited—with a final goal of excluding them entirely. The University steam generating plant, described by ESA as "one of the pollution landmarks of Madison," should be controlled. The University's open space and greenery, or what remains of it, should be respected—despite the administration's "apparent urge to pave every square foot of land."

Further recommendations urged immediate action from the administration to restrict the use of pesticides, to cease using high phosphate detergents, to control silting of nearby Lake Mendota and "ending the use of university property for field testing of pesticides." The first position paper of the ecology students was a condemnation of U.S. militarism in Vietnam; it linked the destruction of life and property in that country to the exploitation and damage to the environment in this country.

One reason the University of Wisconsin is perhaps the country's most environmentally active campus is The Daily Cardinal, the lively and crisp campus newspaper. It regularly runs front page stories on pollution and ecology. Last November, it reported extensively on a group of underdog Madison residents trying to save a local wooded area from the inevitable commercialists, who wanted it for an apartment house site. "The fight," wrote the Cardinal, "might be called a mini-battle, for across the nation it is much the same story. It's the old struggle between those who would develop and build in the name of 'progress' and those who would save and preserve what little is left of our American landscape." Other recent stories in The Cardinal included ones on the city planning commission, Madison's air pollution problems, the Navy's Project Sanguine which threatened the ecology of northern Wisconsin.

Several editors of the Cardinal will come to Washington in late February for the U.S. Student Press Association's annual meeting of college editors. The entire meeting this year will be on ecology and the environment.

On April 22, E-Day will occur on hundreds of campuses, a teach-in on environmental problems and the options for survival. E stands for ecology, environment, earth, perhaps most basically, existence. Many believe that the new awareness will replace Vietnam as the main issue of campus activism. If so, it would figure. Wars come and go, but so far pollution just comes, comes and comes.

DIRECT TALKS IMPERATIVE FOR MIDDLE EAST PEACE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the conflict in the Middle East is of concern to all citizens. Solutions to the problem are not easy. One thing is certain, however. Peace must come to this war-torn area. All our efforts must be guided by this objective. I am convinced that direct negotiations between the hostile nations are essential for lasting peace in the Middle East.

President Johnson, shortly after the 1967 "6-day war" expressed similar sentiments. He said:

Clearly, the parties to the conflict must be the parties to the peace. Sooner or later, it is they who must make a settlement in the area.

In other words, if the nations of the Middle East are to live in peace, they must negotiate their own peace.

In supporting the direct talks, I do not discount any role which might be taken by either the United Nations or by the major powers. All nations must play an active role through economic assistance and international leadership if there is to be permanent peace in the Middle East.

Within this context, the United States must assume a steadfast position in its continuing search for peace—in the Middle East as in the rest of the world.

Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson all committed unequivocal allegiance and support to Israel. Two years ago, candidate Richard Nixon pledged continued support of this commitment. Mr. Nixon said:

The United States has a firm and unwavering commitment to the national existence of Israel, repeated by four Presidents, and after Inauguration Day next year, it will be repeated by another President.

America supports Israel because we believe in the self-determination of nations; America supports Israel because we oppose aggression in every form; America supports Israel because it is threatened by Soviet imperialism; and America supports Israel because its example offers long range hope to the Middle East.

We recognize Israel's predicament; its enemies can afford to fight a war and lose, and come back to fight again. Israel cannot afford to lose once. America knows that. And America is determined that Israel is here in the family of nations to stay.

Now, however, recent statements by Secretary of State Rogers—who must be judged as a spokesman of the Nixon administration—seem to indicate a change in America's commitment. In his December 9 speech last year, Secretary Rogers severely undermined the direct talks approach when he asked that other parties be involved in negotiations and that some vague and unidentified binding agreements be attached to the ultimate settlement.

Undermining the possibility of direct negotiations significantly weakens the possibility of a lasting peace—and, more dangerously, threatens Israel's stability and survival.

I do not agree with the Nixon admin-

istration's new direction on the Middle East, and I feel that as long as the administration continues this approach, chances for a quick and just settlement are remote.

My concern in this regard is not limited to the problems of the Israeli people themselves. All will benefit from a peaceful settlement—both Arab and Jew.

And my concern for the Jewish people also does not apply to Israel alone. Jews around the world—within Arab nations, within the Eastern bloc—still encounter stiff government-sponsored discrimination. Late last year, along with 56 of my colleagues, I called upon the United Nations to recognize the existence of just one of the many current forms of anti-Semitism—the persecution within the Soviet Union—and to take appropriate action through the U.N. Human Rights Commission.

The world must know that the United States will not overlook or close its eyes to the threats upon Israel's survival or upon the rights of Jewish people anywhere.

WHO REALLY PAYS?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been abnormal attention given the Rumanian Government since President Nixon's stop there last summer.

The domestic situation in Rumania, which, of course, relates to its diplomatic behavior, is of interest. In a column in the Joliet, Ill. Herald-News, the distinguished international correspondent of the Copley Press, Dumitru Danielopol, discusses the situation in that Iron Curtain country. It follows:

[From the Joliet (Ill.) Herald-News, Dec. 29, 1969]

WHO REALLY PAYS?

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—A recent letter from a Romanian to a friend in Western Europe asked for a kilogram of potatoes.

It was no joke.

Romania, once the most productive country in the breadbasket of Eastern Europe, is now facing disastrous food shortage.

Farm problems have been chronic ever since the Communists applied Marxism to agriculture. Dairy products, fish and meat always were hard to come by for the man in the street as the regime hoarded such items for export or foreign tourists.

This year however, the situation has reached desperate proportions. Even bread, flour, onions and potatoes are hard to find.

In his harvest speech last October, Party Secretary Nicolae Ceausescu depicted the state of Romanian agriculture in the gloomiest terms. He blamed this year's mediocre crop on the weather but he added that low yields in an important number of collectives were due "less to the weather than to organization and technological failure."

He accused both the Higher Council on Agriculture and the National Union of Agricultural Production Co-operatives of bungling.

Poor organization, bad planning, carelessness, lack of technicians and lack of incentives on the part of the farmers cost much of the harvest to be lost, he intimated.

Ceausescu grumbled also that 30,000 agricultural experts with university and secondary school education prefer working at the desk rather than "where the harvest is gathered." He warned farmers that "their work could not be limited to certain hours but must be done, if necessary, by day and night."

That is a far cry from Marxist dogma. It sounds more like "capitalist exploitation of the workers" . . . But without the profit incentive.

Agriculture was not the only target of his attacks. He berated the farm implement industry. Breakdowns and poor equipment cost Romania 6-8 per cent of the 1969 harvest, Ceausescu said.

He blamed the Ministry of Chemicals for a shortage of fertilizer.

But, characteristically, Ceausescu did not attack the real culprit which caused this debacle—Marxist theory.

Both in industry and on the collective farms the workers have so little incentive that they work only part-time. Farmers concentrate their efforts on the little private plots they are allowed. These meet their families' needs, but do little for the man in the city.

"Whether we work or not," one farmer recently told an American newsman, "we get the same pay so why bother?"

Meanwhile Ceausescu negotiates to buy food processing factories in the West. And he proposes to pay for them in exports of food.

You figure who will really pay.

THE BANNING OF HIGH POLLUTION INTRACITY VEHICLES

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, former New York City Councilman Eugene P. Connolly recently proposed a practical way of cutting air pollution in New York which has implications for other cities as well.

Mr. Connolly suggested that high polluting intracity vehicles be phased out over a 5-year period and replaced by vehicles with low pollution power sources.

Trucks, delivery vans, buses, and taxis are major sources of air pollution in urban areas. Almost everyone has experienced the vile emissions of a bus or truck. At the same time, their fleet operation makes their conversion to low polluting alternative power sources most easily achieved.

Here is a practical step cities and States can take now to insure that the dire predictions we have been hearing about our future do not come true.

The full text of Mr. Connolly's suggestion follows:

PHASE OUT POLLUTANTS

Former City Councilman Eugene P. Connolly today called upon City Council President, Sanford A. Garelik, Majority and Minority Leaders Thomas J. Cuite and Eldon R. Clingan, to take immediate steps to plan a phase out of one of the city's worst pollutants.

"New York might as well face the fact that it is losing the battle against pollution. While much brave talk takes place, many avenues where bold, forward-looking action can be taken now are ignored and

the problem continues to grow in intensity," he said.

Every study clearly indicates that the internal combustion engine is a major factor in pollution. With the constant increase in use of such vehicles, we must realize that unless we act at once to curb such pollution, it will overwhelm us in the coming decade. In the city of London over 40,000 electric-powered vehicles are in daily operation. In New York City at least 150,000 vehicles so powered could be placed in use.

I propose that, beginning at a period five years from the date of passage of the legislation, no gasoline or allied powered vehicles, used only in intracity traffic, be permitted to operate. The legislation would apply to trucks, delivery vans, busses and taxis operated within the city limits, while passenger cars which present a special problem would be exempt at this time. The five-year phase out would enable owners of vehicles involved to replace present equipment with battery-powered, steam or other non-internal combustion vehicles without hardship as most such vehicles would have reached obsolescence within the period designated. Costs would be comparable to present prices of gasoline or diesel powered equipment, and no problem of speed exists because of existing speed limits for city traffic.

New York City could take the lead in this area and passage of such legislation would immediately stimulate manufacturers to escalate research and production of the needed equipment.

INFLATION AND MEDICARE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is under heavy attack these days by the President and by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for suggesting a strong money bill for those social services. The Members of Congress are being accused of fanning the fires of inflation. Actually, the administration itself is contributing to inflation by doing such things as raising the costs of part B coverage under Medicare and looking the other way when insurance carriers and doctors fleece the public under that program.

Recently, the American Patients Association, a national consumer health organization, protested the Secretary's action. The APA's letter was widely quoted in part by the press, but I think it would be instructive for the Members to have the full text available in order to see how inflationary Secretary Finch's Medicare action really was.

I include below the APA letter with an extract from the November 26 issue of the organization's publication, *American Patient*. The letter refers to certain insurance carrier information which is well explained and documented in that extract.

The material follows:

AMERICAN PATIENTS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., December 26, 1969.

HON. ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We appreciated being informed in advance of your decision to raise

the monthly premium for Part B coverage under Medicare. However, we are deeply disturbed at the size of the increase, the justification given for it, and the effect this increase will have upon this Nation's major domestic problem: inflation.

The new rate—a rise from the present \$8.00 per month to \$10.60—is to be borne half by the taxpayer and half by the elderly citizen. Both these constituents of your Department, as of July 1, will have tolerated a 77% increase in Part B premiums in less than four years. However, neither HEW nor the medical profession can document in any way that service to patients has also increased 77% in volume or quality. Your December 27 announcement demonstrates that Part B is to be administered as a benefit primarily for physicians who wish to escalate their personal incomes.

Mr. Secretary, the President of the United States has repeatedly asked workers and managers in every other industry to exercise maximum restraints to control inflation. Our Association finds your announcement for the health industry directly contravenes the President's view. It stimulates inflation in the \$60 billion health industry. While you say you "estimate" a 6% increase in doctor fees next year, what you have actually done is invite doctors to raise their fees no less than 6%. Three years of Medicare experience—during which office visit fees have risen 23% and house calls have disappeared—ought to prove that Medicare "estimates" are in reality non-negotiated guaranteed annual income raises to doctors, with no strings.

As if this were not enough, you announced that your Department is also providing a 4% "margin for contingencies" because "the estimates are based upon minimum reasonable assumptions," etc. Again, past experience amply proves that the medical community will use every political and economic weapon available to seize all "cushion" monies provided by any governmental agency—Federal, State, or local. It is clear that your announcement is a self-fulfilling prophecy that doctor fees will rise no less than 6% and as much as 10% next year.

We also question which "minimum reasonable assumptions" you have reviewed. Your Department has already revealed to our Association that of the 50 insurance carriers reimbursing doctors under Part B, 11 have insufficient administrative controls or fee data (Metropolitan, Nationwide, Pan American, and 8 Blue Shield plans). In other words, your own Department has enough evidence to indicate that doctor fees under Medicare will rise with no controls by public or private agencies; the "contingencies" have been—and apparently will continue to be—built into this program, which is the key "minimum reasonable assumption" in this entire inflationary announcement.

We are fully aware, Mr. Secretary, that you are required by law to set a premium rate each year that is actuarially sound. You have acquitted yourself of this legal requirement, but in the narrowest of terms. Your decision may be actuarially sound, but it is fiscally and administratively irresponsible. You set a new rate that will take not \$4.00 but \$5.30 from the pocket of each older American who needs and wants Part B protection. But you did not direct the carriers to immediately install the administrative controls they still lack after three years of participation. Neither did you direct the medical profession to hold the line on fees unless it could prove an increase in the volume and quality of health service. And neither did you seek the counsel of the one who will actually contend with this fiscal and medical chaos: the consumer of health service, the patient.

There is, of course, time to amplify your announcement to include these and other vital elements of cost control and better medical management. In addition, we strongly recommend that the Department conduct an in-depth study of Part B between now and July 1. This study should have a major contribution by consumers of health service. We would hope that from such a study would come recommendations for making Part B a rational, non-inflationary component of the health industry or suggestions for its abolition. Certainly the present structure and mechanisms of the program, reflected throughout your announcement of December 27, are totally out of keeping with the health needs of the elderly citizen today or the health planning for all citizens tomorrow.

The American Patients Association, respectful of your Office and its grave responsibilities, stands ready to provide whatever assistance or counsel it can to help resolve these and other serious issues affecting the lives and well-being of all our countrymen.

Cordially,
THEODORE O. CRON,
President.

A Special Report: Medicare part B—Is it a program living on borrowed time? Future is in doubt.

Part B is pricing itself out of existence. Who says so? The American Hospital Assn., in testimony recently to the House Ways and Means Committee. Next month, when HEW announces the new Part B rate—probably \$10.40 monthly (half paid by the old folks and half by the Treasury)—a political storm will intensify. Fiscal conservatives, aghast at the rising costs, and liberals, who see costs precluding expansion of Medicare to outpatient drugs, are unhappy with Part B.

AHA wants Parts A and B combined in the long run, with prepayment over the working years covering hospital and physician expense in retirement. AHA sees the two-part separation of Medicare "cumbersome and quite wasteful in terms of administrative costs."

Administered by the friends of physicians, as Part A is by friends of hospitals, Part B is an administrative nightmare from the consumer viewpoint. Some \$211 million annually is paid through carriers that lack adequate control data on doctor fees.

On request of American Patient, SSA named 11 of the 50 carriers as having insufficient data. They include 8 Blue Shield plans and Metropolitan, Nationwide and Pan American life insurance companies. The table below, first publication of '69 experience, shows enormous variation in ratio of administrative cost to benefits. On analysis, 20 BS and 7 other carriers are more than 20% higher than or less than the ratio of New York City BS, picked as a "standard" carrier.

In enacting Part B Congress believed carriers had the necessary control data on doctor fees. In early 1966, SSA found they did not. Last year, more than two years after Medicare began, 18 did not. Early this year, most carriers still lacked the data or technical capacity to effect an SSA-ordered freeze on doctor fees as recognized for reimbursement.

Foot-dragging and resistance to public accountability have characterized many carriers, insiders say. SSA has had to overcome carrier resistance to making doctor fee profiles available for Medicaid use. Even the Senate Finance Committee met resistance when it asked carriers to list physicians with high Medicare earnings.

SSA Actuary Robert Myers has yet to calculate the new Part B rate or get instructions on any reimbursement thaw. The two go hand in hand: the bigger the thaw, the

higher the rate. HEW can elect to keep the freeze, end it, or reduce it; the last seems most likely now.

Evidence to prove the freeze really held down Part B expense is hard to find. Putting a lid on fees but not number of billed units of service seems futile.

Using fee schedules might be a last resort to keep Part B intact. For example, Medicare could set ceilings for each type of service, the patient paying the difference between them and physician's total bill. The ceilings could be set unilaterally by Medicare or by negotiation with organized medicine, a prospect former HEW Secretary Wilbur Cohen dreaded.

Perspective: Part B's record will figure in the debate over national health insurance. The big lesson may be that political expediency in 1965 has exhausted any usefulness in 1969. Appeasing physicians who fought Medicare enactment by letting them and their carrier friends be judges of reimbursement may have been a costly experiment. Will patients have a voice in the next go-round?

WHERE YOUR PT. B MONEY GOES, FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND BENEFIT COSTS—BY BLUE SHIELD AND OTHER CARRIERS IN FISCAL YEAR 1969

[In millions of dollars]

	Administrative	Benefit
Blue Shield:		
Alabama.....	1.0	57.3
Arkansas.....	.7	51.8
California.....	16.8	161.9
Colorado.....	5.7	16.3
Delaware.....	.4	2.6
District of Columbia ¹	1.1	13.5
Florida.....	5.4	98.2
Illinois.....	3.7	49.3
Indiana.....	1.9	25.9
Iowa.....	1.8	16.1
Kansas.....	1.5	13.8
Maryland.....	1.3	11.9
Massachusetts.....	4.3	50.7
Michigan.....	4.5	50.3
Minnesota.....	.8	8.9
Missouri.....	1.3	13.3
Montana.....	.4	4.0
New Hampshire-Vermont ¹	1.0	8.1
Buffalo, N.Y. ¹	1.1	10.7
New York City.....	1.1	12.5
Rochester, N.Y.	8.9	119.2
North Dakota.....	.6	6.0
Cleveland, Ohio ¹3	4.2
Pennsylvania.....	5.6	83.6
Puerto Rico ¹3	5.3
Rhode Island.....	.6	8.3
S. Carolina.....	.7	9.3
South Dakota ¹4	4.0
Texas.....	5.5	82.2
Utah.....	.4	4.4
Washington ¹	2.4	23.3
Madison, Wis.....	1.6	18.6
Millwaukee, Wis.....	.7	8.4
Subtotal.....	75.8	934.0
Others:		
Aetna Life.....	3.0	50.0
Connecticut General.....	1.2	20.7
Continental.....	1.8	20.6
Equitable.....	2.3	31.5
General American.....	1.9	23.9
G-H-I (New York).....	1.6	15.4
John Hancock.....	1.9	19.6
Metropolitan ¹	3.4	38.2
Mutual Omaha.....	.8	10.7
Nationwide ¹	4.0	52.4
Occidental.....	5.5	72.0
Pan American ¹	1.7	17.7
Pilot Life ²	2.0	19.2
Prudential.....	3.5	60.3
Travelers.....	2.5	50.3
Union Mutual.....	.5	5.9
Oklahoma DPW ³7	7.8
Travelers RRB.....	4.4	60.3
Subtotal.....	42.6	576.4
Total.....	118.4	1,510.3

¹ Carrier lacks full fee control data.

² No longer a carrier.

³ Oklahoma Department of Public Welfare.

OIL IMPORT QUOTAS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, shortly before our Christmas recess a remarkable statement, cataloging the many unjustified special privileges enjoyed by our domestic oil industry, was made in Montpelier, Vt. by State Representative John T. Alden, of Woodstock.

Mr. Alden, who now serves as the assistant majority leader in the Vermont House of Representatives, began his statement with a dramatic, symbolic gesture—the burning of \$200 in stage money. This sum represents the average cost in artificially high oil prices the average Vermont household must pay as a result of the intolerable oil quota system which has cost the American consumers in the neighborhood of \$50 billion since its creation in 1959.

If significant reform of that inequitable program is forthcoming in the wake of the report of the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control, it will be due in no small measure to the leadership of many able people in government at the State level. And Mr. Alden's role in that effort has been considerable.

In a concise and hard-hitting fashion, the Alden statement explodes the myth promoted by the oil barons and their special pleaders that reforms such as the limited reduction in the depletion allowances, and the hoped-for reform of the quota system will cause them undue economic hardship. Mr. Alden makes crystal clear that no segment of our society has benefited more from unwarranted Government largess than the oil industry.

For the information of my colleagues I now include a copy of Mr. Alden's statement:

STATEMENT TO THE PRESS BY JOHN T. ALDEN, ASSISTANT MAJORITY LEADER, VERMONT HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MONTPELIER, VT., DECEMBER 16, 1969

Gentlemen, I am now going to proceed to burn two hundred dollars.

I fully understand the Federal Law and more fully understand the economy of The John Alden Family, thus will not burn legal currency, but will use two hundred dollars of stage money. The act will be symbolic, but the message will be loud and clear. And that message is: My family, your family, and every family in Vermont will actually burn \$200 a year—not in stage money, but in hard earned cash right out of their wallets.

In the Christmas season, when parents are stretching budgets to provide a merry Christmas to their children . . . in an inflationary period when heads of households are striving to make ends meet, isn't it almost a state and national disgrace for me to have to sit here and report that the people of Vermont are required to send up in smoke more than \$20 million needlessly every year to feed a greedy industry which is entitled by Federal Law to earn unprecedented profits at the expense of every Vermonter who drives a car or heats his home with oil.

I cite—and indict—specifically, the Federal Law that permits the oil industry in the United States, under the oil import quota system to limit the import of less expensive foreign oil to 12.2%. This system affects the Vermonter in these three ways:

1. It costs the average Vermont household \$195.92 per year.

2. It costs the Vermont consumer nearly \$21 million a year.

4. It prevents the establishment of an oil refinery in the entire New England area which would substantially reduce the cost of gasoline and heating oil to every New England State.

Sitting here in the tiny State of Vermont, I cannot stand by idly and watch my neighbors pay sucker money to the oil interests who have manipulated Federal laws to the disadvantage of the hard working people of Vermont. My role in this matter should be clearly defined. I am a Representative in the State Legislature of Vermont. If a local situation presents itself in Woodstock, I will act. If a state situation in Montpelier presents itself I will act. But if a situation outside our state boundaries affects the livelihood of any Vermonter I will not hesitate to use every resource to act on behalf of the people who elected me.

If some outside power chooses to tell us that we must pay \$21 million in tribute to their greed, then I will act to expose them, and do everything within my limited power to correct a Federal law that is oppressive and unfair to the people I represent.

Who is this power that drains off \$21 million from Vermont pocketbooks? I have spent, personally, countless hours to learn the nature of the creature that, legally, plucks hard earned dollars from us. That creature is the oil industry. Let me now review for you how they conduct their business:

1. Oil depletion allowances: In essence the oil depletion allowances, permitted through Federal Law are the greatest license to steal in the history of American government. Since its inception, the oil depletion allowance has cost about \$140 billion—paid at the expense of the American taxpayer. No industry in New England has ever been the beneficiary of such largesse.

Yet, no region has been hit harder by such federal largesse than New England.

As a human being, I fully understand that it is difficult to paint a broad picture of an avaricious industry. Industry, like all activity, is people. Let me, therefore, describe the personal appetite of the man who was successful in selling this oil depletion allowance theory to our United States Senate. His name was Boise Penrose, from Pennsylvania. One evening he consumed for dinner a dozen oysters, chicken gumbo soup, a terrapin stew, two ducks, six kinds of vegetables, a quart of coffee and several cognacs. Another time he consumed nine cocktails, five highballs, twenty-six reed birds in a chafing dish, wild rice and a bowl of gravy.

It is not surprising that he weighed 350 pounds. Nor is it surprising that he was an equal gourmand in his requests for the oil industry. But it is of utmost importance to the people who are paying each day for his efforts to know that he was paid many dollars to defeat the Federal Child Labor Law. He also has the questionable distinction of having handpicked, as a kingmaker, two Presidents of the United States. Does he sound like the kind of man who would be interested in how much a Vermonter would be required to pay for the products of his clients?

2. Import quota system: This inequitable system of permitting the oil industry in America to limit to 12.2% the amount of cheaper imported oil has caused the State of Vermont to pay an unnecessary premium of \$21 million a year. By forcing New England to pay Federally supported high prices, this area of the United States is unable to have an oil refinery located here.

The additional cost to Massachusetts is \$206 million, New Hampshire, \$29 million, Connecticut, \$95 million, Rhode Island, \$31 million, Maine, \$43 million. If we are to be

a nation of fifty states, where in the literature of The United States Senate, is any act that works to the advantage of The New England States, as the oil quota system works to the advantage of the oil producing states?

3. Taxes: This oil industry, with such liberal allowances for the conduct of its business, has been assailed by Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin, "A man making \$600 of taxable income has to pay 14 per cent. But the big oil companies, making hundreds of millions of dollars and in some cases billions of dollars in net profits, pay an average of 7.7 per cent, or half of what the poorest income taxpayers in this country pay."

To extend Senator Proxmire's statement, I submit these verified percentages and I would like every Vermonter to compare them to his own personal tax obligation: In 1967 Standard Oil of California paid 1.2%; Texaco, 1.9%; Mobil, 4.5% and Atlantic-Richfield paid absolutely zero in Federal income taxes although they had an earning of \$130 million. To the Vermonter I would like to ask, "Did you pay zero in taxes? Did you earn \$130 million profit?" Of course you didn't. But this industry grows fat while you cough up \$21 million a year. No wonder they grow fat!

4. Ghost foundations: In addition to the Santa-like tax breaks the oil industry is getting, they further feather their nests with shadowlike foundations that are nothing more than tax-evasive structures that skim \$100 million out of the normal tax revenues of the Federal Government every year. As one Federal official described them, bluntly, "Frequently the only purpose of these foundations is tax avoidance." The indictment of the oil industry could go on.

5. I cite the fraudulent advertising games in which they participate. I will bring just one statistic to your attention, there are many more: The Gulf Oil Corporation offered \$1,366,800 in prizes in a nationally advertised sweepstakes. That's what they offered. Here's what they paid: \$77,750, or a 5.7% payoff of what they offered.

6. I cite the oil industry's reluctance to bring more than 12.2% of import oil into the United States yet over 80% of the non-petroleum related sales (radios, cookware, etc.) of these companies are imported.

7. I cite the recent oil leases they have purchased in the State of Alaska for \$1 billion from which they anticipate retail sales of over \$100 billion in petroleum products.

8. I cite the continued pollution of our shore lines which pours millions of gallons of oil onto our beaches, killing fish, wildlife and our natural playgrounds. It got so bad recently in Santa Barbara, California, that a group of individuals had to band together to attempt to stop the rape of the seacoast in Santa Barbara. No Federal agency was able to prevent the oil companies from damaging the shoreline with the leakage from their oil towers.

Santa Barbara citizens, known to be very conservative in their political leanings, all of a sudden became vocal activists in their disapproval of the very companies in which they held substantial shares of stock.

9. I cite the shortage of fuel oil which, every winter, threatens the homeowners of Vermont and all of New England. This, then, is the nature of the adversary who, with governmental blessing, tells you in Vermont that you must pay a \$21 million a year tribute while they enjoy a tax ride without precedent nor equal in the history of our country.

I am just one lone Representative in the Legislature of the State of Vermont. But I cannot stand still for this condition. I will act within the limits of my position. But I will act.

These are the steps I have taken:

1. I have discussed this inequitable situation with Governor Curtis of Maine, Governor Sargent of Massachusetts, Governor Light of Rhode Island, Governor Peterson of New

Hampshire, Senators Aiken and Prouty of Vermont, Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin, Peter Flanigan of the White House Task Force on Oil Imports, Congressman Silvio Conte of Massachusetts, Congressman Robert Stafford of Vermont and Public Service Board Commissioner Ernest Gibson who represented Vermont at the November 24th White House conference of New England States on the Oil Import Quota System.

In my personal communications with these people they have authorized me to make these public statements in their behalfs:

Senator Aiken: "The administration must not condone previous policies which cut off imports and forced Vermont to pay tribute to the domestic oil industry in the form of discriminatory prices." Senator Aiken also noted that the Northeast is the only section of the country without a refinery.

Senator Prouty: "I know you will appreciate the intensity of feeling that occurs where the economic interests of one region are placed ahead of the interests of another. Precisely that situation now obtains in connection with the impact of oil import controls on New England."

Senator Proxmire: "If we should ask the first hundred people we met on the street to name the most notorious loophole—the least justifiable loophole in our tax law, 85% to 90% would promptly say, 'The oil depletion allowance.'"

Governor Peterson: "The citizens of my state have paid artificially high prices for petroleum products for too long and the time has come to remove the barriers to free trade that support these prices."

Governor Curtis: "It is certainly important that all New Englanders be aware at this time of the high costs of the present oil import program."

Governor Light: "For too long, Rhode Islanders and other residents of the northeast section of our nation have been forced to pay more for heat and gasoline than other citizens of The United States. The reason for this unfair situation is our import control program, which limits the importation of foreign crude oil so severely that it is not feasible to construct New England-based oil refineries."

Governor Sargent: "The result of the present system is that we pay more than we should for oil, and that we risk not having enough of it."

Public Service Commissioner Gibson: "How can the Presidential Task Force ignore New England?"

Congressman Stafford: "Vermont has suffered too long the burden of the highest heating oil prices in the country. We need immediate relief from this intolerable situation."

Congressman Conte: "If anyone had any doubts that winter is here, the oil industry erased them with its almost annual cold weather announcement that once again prices will go up. It's getting so the oil barons jacking up prices is just as good an indicator of when winter will begin as the groundhog is of how long it will last."

2. Further, I have discussed this with other significant administrative and legislative leaders throughout the country to gather information and find what course I should follow to correct an obvious discrimination against the people of Vermont.

This is the course I will follow:

1. I will place this document in the hands of every Vermont State Legislator.

2. I will introduce a resolution in the Vermont Legislature to call for the repeal of the Federal Oil Import Quota System.

3. I will call on the two United States Senators and one Congressman from Vermont to exercise their legislative influence to rescind the Oil Import Quota System.

4. I will place this document in the hands of every New England governor.

5. I will place this document in the hands of all New England members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

6. I will place this document in the hands of every United States Senator, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Labor, the head of the White House Task Force on Oil Imports, the director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness and President Richard Nixon.

7. I will further offer copies of this document to every head of a Vermont household so that he can see in tangible form what his burden is and what steps are being taken on his behalf to relieve him of what I consider to be an unfair picking of his pocket.

It has been widely announced that the White House Task Force's recommendation on the Oil Import Quota System is imminent. If this goes against the best interests of Vermont then I strongly suggest that all Vermonters regardless of political philosophy or party, rally their best talents of articulation and persuasion to eliminate this system.

I know the heat is on today in Vermont homes. I think greater heat should be put on Washington. Thank you.

UNITED STATES JAYCEES—YOUNG MEN OF ACTION

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 50th anniversary of the founding of the United States Jaycees, an organization that has given our Nation hundreds of thousands of outstanding leaders. Scattered throughout my congressional district are scores of public officials, civic leaders, businessmen, educators, farmers, and professional men, who received their introduction to public service through Jaycee activities. Each of them has made a contribution not only to their community, but to California and the Nation.

There are eight chapters in my district with an approximate membership of 385 men. As I said, each of these chapters and their members have made notable contributions to their communities. For example, the Forterville chapter saw the need for a city park, so they took it upon themselves to construct and equip such a park; the Lindsay chapter had a project that lead to the improvement of the downtown area of Lindsay; the Visalia chapter has worked with the Mexican-American community to make them feel more a part of the total community; the Bakersfield chapter was influential in the election of one of its members to the California State Legislature in 1966; and numerous other projects that have contributed so much to the communities and to the entire State.

I know this record of accomplishments and achievements can be duplicated throughout the United States and the world. Because since its beginnings 50 years ago, Jaycee chapters have spread to all the 50 States and to more than 80 foreign countries. They have increased not only in numbers, but in their services to God, humanity, country, and world brotherhood.

As a nation, we owe a great deal to the Jaycees. Their record of achievements and accomplishments is endless. The success of their many projects is Ameri-

can democracy and the free enterprise system at work. It is the story of young men building a better world by developing themselves and their communities.

I believe their positive approach of involvement in making constructive changes in our society should be more universally applied to the many problems facing our Nation. They have set an excellent example that we would be wise to follow.

I am proud to salute the United States Jaycees. I wish them continued success.

ON THE WATERFRONT

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, crime on the waterfront in New York City is as pervasive today as it was 17 years ago when the Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor was created to combat it. I am certain that what is taking place in the harbor of New York takes place in many other ports of our great Nation and something must be done about it. I am appending for the interest of our colleagues an article by Mary Nichols, of the Village Voice, exposing some of the corruption. That article in my opinion was responsible for the long awaited report of the Waterfront Commission on a case involving the Mafia. I am setting forth the New York Times January 22, 1970, digest of that report as well as an article in the same paper bylined by Martin Arnold. The articles follow:

MAFIA ON THE WATERFRONT: WHO'S KEEPIN THE LID ON?

(By Mary Perot Nichols)

Various assorted "new politics" liberals were quite shocked when the New York Times reported in August that the name of Anthony Scotto appeared on the FBI list of Mafia families as a member of Carlo Gambino's tribe. They were shocked because Scotto has enjoyed a liberal public image as president of the powerful Brooklyn Local 1814 of the International Longshoremen's Association, and because Mayor Lindsay had only a few weeks earlier announced Scotto as a founder of his new Independent Party for re-election and as a member of his Committee on Vacancies in that party.

Scotto's reputation had already been sullied by articles in Life magazine about the power of organized crime on the Brooklyn waterfront in 1967 and by a story by Milton Lewis (now on Channel 7's "Eyewitness News") in the World-Journal-Tribune in 1966. The Lewis story reported that Scotto, in the company of Anthony Anastasio, president of Local 1716 of the ILA, had paid a visit for help in a personal matter to the Mafia chief of Utica, Joe Falcone. At the time, Scotto denied to Lewis that he had made the trip, and said, "I wouldn't know Joe Falcone if I fell over him. I feel I'm sophisticated enough not to be with the wrong people." (See The Voice articles of September 11 and 25, 1969, on this subject.)

At any rate, the naming of Scotto as an alleged capodecina in the Gambino family did not come as a surprise to a number of Mafia-watching newspaper reporters or to law enforcement officials. In September, when I was writing those Voice articles about Scotto, I learned of an unusual secret hearing before the Port of New York Waterfront

Commission the previous fall in which a waterfront carpenter had sworn that Scotto had tried to recruit him into the Gambino family. The Waterfront Commission case, which goes by the innocuous name of the Romano-Crivello hearing, also established that Scotto did indeed make the visit to Falcone.

Along with others watching the situation, I had expected the Waterfront Commission to have concluded its determination on the Romano-Crivello hearing by now. But a determination in the case would make the minutes of the hearing, which are politically hot stuff, available to the press. The foot-dragging on the case is coming, according to reliable sources, not from the New Jersey commissioner, Stephen Berck, but from the New York one, Joseph Kaitz. Berck is a tough anti-Mafia lawyer who has received the Mafia seal of disapproval. In the De Cavalcante tapes, a labor union "biggie" in New Jersey assured "Sam the Plumber" De Cavalcante that Berck, who had been defeated for reelection as mayor of Elizabeth, would never get to be prosecutor of Union County. And he didn't. But, unfortunately for the Mafia, Berck did get appointed later, by Governor Richard Hughes, to the Waterfront Commission.

Kaitz is a Republican Party wheelhorse who was appointed to the Commission in 1962 by Governor Nelson Rockefeller. He was known as "Walter Mahoney's boy" (Mahoney was the former majority leader of the State Senate) and was for some years in the insurance business with Mahoney. If the Crivello-Romano case remains suppressed, it may come to haunt Governor Rockefeller in the upcoming gubernatorial campaign where the subject of organized crime is expected to be a big issue.

What is it that the Waterfront Commission has been sitting on for well over a year? First, there is the detailed, sworn testimony of one Salvatore Passalacqua, formerly head cooper at Pier 1 at the Brooklyn Port Authority. Passalacqua says that Gasparo Romano, a union hiring agent, not only pressured him to join the Gambino family, but, on a Sunday in July of 1965, actually invited him to a meeting at the union office with Carlo Gambino, Anthony Scotto, Joe Colozzo (one of Gambino's strong men, according to Life magazine), and various Scotto or Gambino relatives and others.

Passalacqua testified that there, in a large room, across a table loaded with food and drink, he was issued a formal invitation by Colozzo, and seconded by Scotto, to join Gambino's family. In September, after Passalacqua made it clear he wasn't joining the family, he claims he was fired on a trumped-up charge that he left his post at the pier without permission. Passalacqua claims he had permission to leave to sharpen a saw.

Now the Passalacqua testimony was only the word of one man over others, but the fact that two defense witnesses, including one New York City official, tripped all over their stories in trying to discredit Passalacqua's, gives his story considerable credibility. The New York City official's testimony should be read carefully by the city's Department of Investigation because it was to him that Passalacqua originally went for help when he lost his job. In fact, this official did get Passalacqua a job for a time through Scotto at the Brooklyn Army Terminal. One might speculate that if Passalacqua had been such a bum on his original job, he would not have been given another one on the waterfront, unless it was hoped to silence him.

The second important revelation in the Crivello-Romano hearings was testimony by former State Police Sergeant Edgar D. Crosswell, presently the city's Deputy Commissioner of Sanitation. (Crosswell, then an upstate police sergeant, unveiled the famous 1957 underworld convention at Apalachin.) Crosswell testified to the Waterfront Commission that Scotto and Anastasio had visited

Falcone, who had been a delegate to the Apalachin convention. There was other testimony to the same effect which I would think was irrefutable but which will have to come out when and if the hearing minutes are made public.

Oddly enough, late Friday afternoon while I was still checking into all the above, I received an unsolicited phone call from one Anthony Scotto. He called me ostensibly because I had mentioned him in a Voice story the week before, but he seemed remarkably unsurprised about what I was working on. (Could there be a leak to him at the Waterfront Commission?) He even speculated as to my source, whom he claimed was a Villager who "had an obsession about him." The fact is there has been a lot of chattering about this case not only among law enforcement officials but among legislators because Passalacqua also testified a few months later at the Joint Legislative Committee on Crime headed by Senator John H. Hughes of Syracuse. The Waterfront Commission hearings, although closed to the press, were attended by other law enforcement officials.

Scotto then made a comment, which the Voice lawyer says may be libelous, on the state of Passalacqua's mental health. What could Passalacqua's motives have been? Scotto answered, "This is about the third story he concocted about me. . . . I got his job back for him three or four times. . . . He got fired. He's a disgruntled worker."

Scotto said Passalacqua's story had been discredited by a packet of information he had presented to the Hughes Committee. I promised to see Scotto's lawyer and inspect the information this week. The Hughes Committee took its testimony in executive session and it is not yet open to the press.

The ILA leader also claimed that the Waterfront Commission hearing officer had refused to take testimony from a witness who would have alleged that Passalacqua had tried to shake him down.

I asked Scotto why, if it weren't true, a man like Passalacqua would want to make a career out of testifying about something that he might get killed for saying. Said Scotto, "I think he really believes it. That's why he makes such a good witness."

Then Scotto proffered the thought that if he were the Mafia chieftain Passalacqua was claiming he was, what Passalacqua was doing "wasn't exactly normal" in that he was risking his life and limb. There are people, I suggested, who simply have to tell the truth no matter what kind of trouble it gets them into. I asked him if he'd seen the movie "Z" where there was another carpenter who just might be like Passalacqua. Scotto said he hadn't but promised that he would go see the movie.

There still remains the second problem—whether or not Scotto went to see Falcone. I told Scotto of Crosswell's testimony. Scotto's answer: "I've testified before the grand jury in the Eastern District on that." Well, I said, if your testimony before the Eastern District grand jury exonerates you on that charge, would you sign a letter to the United States Attorney there requesting that I be allowed to see your testimony? Scotto's answer: "No."

The talk turned to Scotto's listing as a Mafia capodecina on the FBI list. I asked why he didn't make efforts to get his name off. "I know it's not true," said Scotto, "I'm not going to run around for the rest of my life being psych'd by that. There are plenty of articles around saying I'm a knight in shining armor but I'm not that either." He also said, "If my name was O'Malley, I wouldn't be on there." I couldn't resist saying that a man named O'Malley would hardly have been named a capodecina by any Mafia family.

The Waterfront Commission was set up

in 1953 to try to shake the hold of organized crime on the waterfront of the New York port. The exceptional delay in the Crivello-Romano case raises serious questions. Perhaps it's time for some superior law enforcement agency—or a Congressional committee—to look into just how effective the Commission has been against organized crime.

WATERFRONT AGENCY IS SPLIT OVER TESTIMONY ON MAFIA

The two members of the bistate Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor split yesterday over a dock worker's charge that Brooklyn longshore leaders, including Anthony Scotto, wanted him to join a so-called Mafia family led by Carol Gambino. The split meant Commission dismissal of that charge.

The New Jersey commissioner, Steven J. Berck, declared that "but for the courage of a single witness, Salvatore Passalacqua, this web of criminal domination might have gone undetected."

But the New York commissioner, Joseph Kaitz, declared Mr. Passalacqua was an "inconsistent, contradictory and untruthful witness" with "a strong motivation to lie," and refused to accept his story that he lost his job as a foreman-cooper because he wouldn't join the Gambino group.

This was the first split between the two states' commissioners in the regulatory agency's 17-year history. But in a joint decision, they barred two respondents, Gaspar Romano, a hiring agent, and Thomas J. Crivello, a longshoreman, from licenses for six months.

The two men were held to have acted wrongfully to discharge one worker, Francesco Pinto, a cooper, so his job could be given to Mr. Crivello's son, Peter. The original proceeding had also charged Mr. Romano with having set up the Gambino bid to Mr. Passalacqua.

SCOTTO DENIES CHARGE

Mr. Scotto, a vice president of the International Longshoremen's Association and president of Brooklyn Local 1814, was listed as a Gambino family captain by the Department of Justice last August. He has bitterly denied this, and last night he again insisted he had never attended the meeting portrayed by Mr. Passalacqua.

In fact, Mr. Scotto said, he had never attended "any such meeting." Long at odds with the commission, he also said he regretted that its new ruling would deprive two men and their families "of a living wage" for six months.

Mr. Scotto, whose name was mentioned many times in the long hearings, was never called by the commission to testify. Asked why, a commission spokesman said:

"He was not part of the case, and we assumed that because of the nature of the case, he would be a hostile witness, so we didn't call him."

The release of the decisions, along with disclosure of 1,678 pages of closed-door testimony, showed that Ralph Salerno, a former expert on the Mafia for the New York City Police Department, had testified that Gambino led a so-called family that had a "sphere of influence on the Brooklyn waterfront."

Mr. Salerno said Federal authorities estimated the Gambino family had 800 persons in it, and he said members, included labor consultants, labor expeditors and suppliers of service.

The testimony showed David Jaffe, the hearing examiner, had asked Mr. Salerno whether he believed Mr. Scotto was a Gambino family member. Mr. Salerno replied that Joseph Valachi, a Federal informant, "indicated in 1963 he believed him [Mr. Scotto] to be a member," but said he himself would want more than statements by Mr. Valachi

and Mr. Passalacqua "before I would make that my opinion."

In his 16-page separate opinion, Mr. Berck, the New Jersey commissioner, said: "I have carefully examined the testimony of Salvatore Passalacqua and supplementing this with the fact of his firing in September of 1965, which was based on the flimsiest of reasons, I find it to be entirely credible"

Mr. Berck said he considered that Mr. Jaffe, the hearing examiner, "believed Passalacqua," because Mr. Jaffe wrote that "if the commission had corroborated Passalacqua's testimony of the July, 1965, meeting in any manner whatsoever, I would have found that the commission proved the allegations."

However, Mr. Kaitz of New York held this meant Mr. Jaffe had made a determination of Mr. Passalacqua's "credibility" on "testimony standing alone and without corroboration."

DOCK HIRING DESCRIBED

Mr. Passalacqua, who will be 63 years old on Feb. 8, testified in hearings between June and October, 1968, that he had gotten a job as foreman-cooper in April, 1959, on Pier 1, Brooklyn, through the late Anthony Anastasio, then a longshore local president.

He contended he had paid \$30 a month for the job to Mr. Anastasio, making this payment through other individuals, including Mr. Scotto, "when I could not see Anthony Anastasio."

He testified—in Italian through an interpreter—that in July, 1965, Mr. Romano, then his pier superintendent called him and "told me that the next Sunday Mr. Joe Colozzo wanted to see me at the office of the union."

Mr. Colozzo has been president of I.L.A. Ship's Maintenance Workers Local 1277. During the proceeding, Mr. Salerno had characterized him as a Gambino family member.

Mr. Passalacqua, questioned by Anthony Piazza, then assistant counsel for the Waterfront Commission, said he went to the union office that morning, and a Tito Balsamo "came with a key and opened the door."

About 15 persons were upstairs with "all kinds of foods and drinks," he said, adding that among them, were Mr. Scotto and Gambino. The testimony went on:

Q. Now, who spoke to you when you first went into that room?

A. Joe Colozzo.

Q. What did he say to you?

A. He told me that the reason of this meeting—for this meeting was to introduce me to the boss, Joe Gambino—Carlo Gambino, excuse me—because if there was anybody who deserved to become a member of the honorable family, the Costa Nostra, then he should know about it, so that we could, after following the tradition of the laws of the Cosa Nostra, and if I was willing to accept an invitation, they were ready to take me into the family as one of their peers.

I told them that I was not ready to give an answer on the spot because that was not the reason why I had gone in the first place at the meeting. I asked for time to think it over, to think it over, I need some time to think it over.

But Mr. Colozzo asked: "Why do you need to think about it? Why don't you answer me right now?" But I insisted that I needed some time to think it over.

Q. Did Mr. Anthony Scotto say anything to you at that time?

A. He asked me: "Why don't you give an answer? What are you thinking so long about it?"

Q. Did Mr. Scotto participate, in any way, in the introductions, Anthony Scotto, that is?

A. Yes, he took part in it.

Q. What did Mr. Anthony Scotto say to him?

A. Just what I have said.

Q. Would you please state what Mr. Scotto said?

A. He asked me: 'Why don't you accept his invitation? After all, we also belong to the same family?'

Q. Now, did Mr. Carlo Gambino say anything to you?

A. He said: 'Give him time so he can think about it.'

Q. Did Mr. Carlo Gambino say anything about any kind of conditions?

A. . . . He told me: "When you leave this room, don't say anything to anybody, and that, so that what we speak about here is between us."

Q. Did Mr. Gambino say anything about Anthony Scotto and you?

A. Yes, he told me that if I accepted his conditions, then I would have to submit to his orders at the risk of my life.

Q. Whose orders?

A. To Anthony Scotto's orders.

Q. Did you have any conversation with the respondent, Gaspar Romano, at that meeting?

A. Yes. He told me: "What are you waiting to accept? I am a member, too, of this family."

Mr. Passalacqua testified that a week to 12 days afterward, Mr. Romano "asked me: 'What are you waiting to give an answer and to accept? After all, I am also a member of this group. So give an answer.'"

Later, he said, he saw Mr. Colozzo after he had vainly asked a union delegate to give him more coopers to help on the pier.

"And I told him that," Mr. Passalacqua testified, "and I asked whether he could help me somehow, but he answered that he could not do anything for me. He asked me: 'You give the answer that you are expected to give to Mr. Gambino?' And I said no. Then he said: 'I don't have anything to do with you.' And then I left."

Mr. Passalacqua said he was then dismissed on Sept. 23, 1965, by Mr. Romano for having left his post, although he contended he had been given oral permission by timekeepers to sharpen a saw.

Mr. Passalacqua testified he had appealed to Mr. Scotto to get his job back. He said Mr. Scotto replied, "For you, Mr. Gambino will think about it," and told him to come back.

Four or five days later, Mr. Passalacqua went on, he went to Mr. Scotto again. He asserted that Mr. Scotto told him he had gone to Gambino, and had said he had gone down on his left knee with his hands together in front of his face to "pray" to Mr. Gambino to get a job for Mr. Passalacqua.

Mr. Passalacqua said, "I told Mr. Scotto that Mr. Gambino was a scoundrel." He declared Mr. Scotto had put his index finger to his nose and rejoined, "Don't let anybody hear about it" . . . that he was a scoundrel, because I had insulted him.

Mr. Passalacqua testified he then complained to the Mayor's Committee on Exploitation of Workers, and eventually Mr. Scotto sent a letter dated Dec. 30, 1965, which led to his regaining a job at another pier for a year until the company lost a contract. Since then he indicated that he had worked irregularly.

Commissioner Kaitz, in his 33-page opinion, declared that Mr. Passalacqua had told different versions of the story, including initial complaints to the Mayor's committee and an arbitration proceeding.

In these, the commissioner said, Mr. Passalacqua attributed his dismissal to his opposition to the ousting of Mr. Pinto and the hiring of Mr. Crivello's son on June 21, without mentioning "the alleged Cosa Nostra meeting."

After a decision against him by Burton M. Turkus, industry arbitrator, Mr. Passalacqua then gave a statement to the Mayor's committee dated Nov. 19, 1965, charging that he had been "harassed" and that Mr. Pinto had discharged him because he would not accept the Gambino group "criminal offer."

During the testimony, Mr. Passalacqua contended, he first intended not to describe the Gambino incident because he thought the Pinto story would be sufficient to win his reinstatement.

The far-ranging testimony included an account by Anthony Anastasio, secretary-treasurer of I.L.A. Local 1716 and nephew of the late leader of the same name, of a visit in Mr. Scotto's company to Joe Falcone in Utica in 1966. Falcone has been described as a Cosa Nostra associate.

Mr. Anastasio irately protested questioning on this, but said he had sought help in a court fight to get custody of his children. He said Falcone "was not a friend of mine," but "if the devil lived in Utica and he could help, I would go to see him."

SEVENTEEN YEARS AFTER WATCHDOG UNIT BEGAN, PIER CRIME STILL THRIVES

(By Martin Arnold)

The Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor was created in 1953 to combat half a century of crime and corruption on the waterfront, of kickbacks, usury and labor racketeering, of blooded heads and murder.

Now, 17 years later, the commission concedes publicly that there are "still certain Mafia influences on the waterfront" and its members privately believe that every facet of the Brooklyn waterfront is run by organized crime.

"We are powerless to move against these people just because they are alleged members of the Mafia," a spokesman for the commission said yesterday. "It is beyond our jurisdiction. It's not illegal to be a member of the Mafia."

This almost casual attitude can be seen in the case of Salvatore Passalacqua, a Brooklyn dockworker. He has told the New York-New Jersey commission that he was once asked to join the Mafia and lost his job after he refused.

NO PLANS TO FOLLOW UP

After 1,678 pages of testimony—in which the question whether the Mafia operated on the waterfront was raised or at least hinted at or nearly every other page, and in which the names of a few reputed Mafia members were mentioned time after time—the two members of the bi-state commission split yesterday over Mr. Passalacqua's charge.

And the commission said that it had no plans to refer the testimony to the District Attorney's office, the United States Attorney's office or any other investigative agency.

The commission was created by the Legislatures of New York and New Jersey, and has two functions: law enforcement along the harbor's 650 miles of shoreline and the regulation of waterfront labor.

Its jurisdiction is limited to an area called the New York Port District, which covers about 1,500 square miles with 200 municipalities and a population estimated at 18 million people.

The two commissioners are appointed, one each by the Governors of New York and New Jersey, for three-year terms. Those of the current commissioners end June 30, 1971.

The present commissioners are Joseph Kaitz of Cedarhurst, L.I., former director of investigation and enforcement for the agency, who was first appointed a commissioner in 1962 by Governor Rockefeller, and Steven J. Berck of Elizabeth, N.J., first appointed by former Gov. Richard J. Hughes of New Jersey in 1966.

Mr. Kaitz has served as chief investigator for the New York State Crime Commission and was an investigator in the office of Thomas E. Dewey when the former Governor was special rackets prosecutor and District Attorney of New York.

Mr. Berck, a lawyer, served three terms as Mayor of Elizabeth. He was first elected there in 1957 at the age of 35, making him the youngest Mayor in that city's history.

After World War II, various agencies in New York and New Jersey became concerned about the port's loss of prestige and economic influence. Investigations were begun, particularly into criminal control of the port's labor force, and these inquiries culminated in the formation of the current commission.

The dominant union on the waterfront is the International Longshoremen's Association, whose vice president and Brooklyn leader, Anthony M. Scotto, was identified last year by the Justice Department as a captain in the Mafia. Mr. Scotto denied the charge.

CRIME MARCHES ON

Ralph Salerno, a specialist on the Mafia and formerly with the city's Police Department, has said publicly he would want corroboration before accepting it as a fact that Mr. Scotto was a member of the Carlo Gambino Mafia "family," as has been charged.

Despite the bi-state commission's efforts to clean up the waterfront, and despite the efforts of Mr. Scotto's union to give the waterfront a better name, there have been continual eruptions of crime in the jurisdiction.

A year ago, for example, Brooklyn District Attorney Eugene Gold said that a large-scale pilferage ring was operating on that borough's piers, with the complicity of the pier guards.

He said that the \$500,000 in thefts attributed to the ring represented only "an infinitesimal fraction" of the looting on the waterfront—indicating that 17 years of more intensive policing than nearly any other industry ever received had not changed things radically on the piers.

"THE GOVERNOR AND J.J."

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have, from time to time, drawn attention to some of the fine contributions of business and industry in their districts. I would like to take a moment to acknowledge two of the major industries in my district, motion pictures and television.

Every day, on television and in movie theaters across our Nation, millions of Americans are entertained by the products of these industries. These industries include NBC and CBS television, Disney Productions, Warner Brothers-Seven Arts and Universal Studios.

Occasionally their productions concern themselves with our business, politics. I, therefore, respectfully wish to briefly comment on a new CBS television program, "The Governor and J.J." At least a half dozen Governors of various States have journeyed to the CBS Studio Center in my congressional district, which embraces North Hollywood, to appear as themselves on the program.

Dan Dailey, long one of our top motion picture and stage stars who is appearing on television for the first time, portrays Governor William Drinkwater of the 51st State. He is nonpartisan, aware, dedicated. The image he portrays each week is both credible and

credible. Miss Julie Sommars, the Governor's daughter, J.J. is a fine young performer whose character on the air gives young people an image to emulate and to admire.

"The Governor and J.J." is a credit to television, to Leonard Stern, its creator and executive producer, to his company, Talent Associates and last, but not least, to television as a medium. I join the millions of my fellow Americans who each week laugh and sometimes learn with "The Governor and J.J." We wish William B. Drinkwater and his lovely daughter a long residence in the Governor's Mansion of our "51st State."

JOSEPH PICONE—JERSEYAN OF
THE WEEK

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to learn that my good friend, Joseph Picone, chairman of the board of Evan-Picone, has recently been selected Jerseyan of the Week. I want to add my own congratulations, for his contributions have been humanitarian as well as artistic. Mr. Picone is indeed an asset to his industry and a credit to our State. And, I would like to include at this point the following article from the Newark Sunday Star-Ledger:

PICONE FASHIONS IDEAS ON STRICTLY "HIS" AND "HER"

(By Nancy Razen)

When it comes to fashion, Joseph A. Picone's philosophy may sound a little old-fashioned.

"A woman should look like a woman, and a man should look like a man," Picone insists.

But it is this point of view that has kept Evan-Picone Inc. of North Bergen a leader in the field of women's sportswear for years. And the same philosophy put Picone, the firm's Italian-born chairman of the board, on the 10 best-dressed list issued last week by the Custom Tailors Guild of America.

NOT SURPRISED

Picone, a trim, neat figure with youthful blue eyes was cited as best-dressed businessman. Others who won the tailors' approval were New York Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, quarterback Joe Namath, actor Omar Sharif and surgeon R. Denton Cooley.

The nominations may have surprised some of the men on the list, but not Picone.

"I've always been in the fashion business," he said in a voice still accented by his native Italian. "And I started out in men's fashion."

As a little boy in Sicily, Picone was apprenticed to a tailor. When he came to the United States with his parents, he had his first job in a custom tailoring shop at the age of 16.

A LITTLE EXTRA

"It was my background in men's tailoring," he explained, "that enabled me to succeed in ladies' fashion."

Picone left the world of men's custom tailoring to mass produce ladies' sportswear in 1948 when he founded Evan-Picone with Charles Evans.

"By applying the techniques of custom tailoring, we were able to give a little extra," he went on, "to produce a garment at a bet-

ter price and give very good value for that price."

The formula must have been good. Evan-Picone was a success almost from the first.

In 1948 the company's product consisted of slacks, skirts and blouses. The look, throughout the fifties, was separates, Picone pointed out. A woman bought a skirt and then she went out to buy a blouse to wear with it.

"Today everything is coordinates. You have to make skirts, pants, sweaters, blouses, shirts, and they all must be coordinated," he said. "Today women buy the whole outfit together."

For most of the past 20 years Picone has served as president of Evan-Picone, even during the brief period following sale of the firm to Revlon. Picone has since bought it back and moved up to chairman of the board.

"It's important to make room for other people," the dapper executive stressed. "I want to be sure that Evan-Picone will go on even without me, though I have no immediate intention," he smiled, "of retiring."

If anything Picone seems recently to have taken a new lease on life. He married last June for the first time. And he is looking forward to raising a family.

His bride, the former Stefania Careddu di Sambiasi, acted in Italian films and television before their marriage in Vatican City. The couple met at a gala costume ball in Venice two years ago which Picone hosted to aid the human and artistic victims of the disastrous 1967 floods in Venice, which happens to be one of his favorite cities.

LOVES TRAVEL

"I love to travel," Picone noted, "and when I can't, I love to stay home and listen to music from all over the world."

The Picones make their permanent home in Leonia, though they are apt to be found in Italy—where Stefania Picone is at present—or in his luxurious business apartment in Manhattan's Waldorf Towers.

But Picone himself manages to spend at least part of almost every day in the North Bergen plant where 70 per cent of Evan-Picone sportswear is manufactured.

"It may be the biggest plant of its kind under one roof in the country," Picone reflected.

The big plant is part of the Evan-Picone philosophy.

It is fashionable, in the fashion industry, to farm various items out to small shops, Picone explained.

BETTER CONTROL

"But I feel we have better control over quality by keeping everything under one roof," he said. "The designers are there, the pattern makers, the piece goods, the cutters, the production man. It is no less costly. In fact," he mused, "it may be more costly. But I feel you gain in quality."

"I know that Joe is admired and respected in his business," says Picone's long-time friend, Rep. Peter W. Rodino Jr. (D-10th D.). "But he is also admired and respected as an individual. He's a very modest, unpretentious, unassuming man and a credit to every American of Italian origin," Rodino added.

The world-famed tailors of Rome might find reason to disagree with the otherwise general regard in which Picone is held.

BEST IN WORLD

"After only a short time in the United States," Picone has said, "I realized custom tailoring here is the best in the world."

His personal tailors, Gangemi-Balletta, Inc. of Manhattan, he considers, "one of the best in the world."

I choose my own suits," Picone explained, "and my approach is always more to the conservative side. I stay with the basic colors and I watch my waistline. A tailor can't do

anything for a man," Picone smiled, "unless he keeps himself in shape."

"I'd say Mr. Picone is quite particular," noted Fred Balletta, the gentleman's tailor and president of the Custom Tailors Guild. "He knows what he wants and he understands good clothing."

Balletta considers Picone to be "a very well tailored businessman," and even more important, a man who knows just what is right for himself.

SUIT OCCASION

Picone's wardrobe is large, Balletta concedes, extensive enough to permit him to wear coats and suits—in basic colors that match. And his clothes always suit the occasion.

"He knows fashion, but he also realizes that he's not a young boy. He has made some changes in his suits in line with the new look in menswear," Balletta related. "He goes along with the wider lapels, the shaped jacket, the wider shoulder. But he doesn't go in for tricks like eight button, double-breasted suits with a center inverted pleat all the way up the back, or flared trousers."

"I don't like extremes," Picone admitted. "For too many years men's clothing was too basic, like a uniform. But I don't like the extreme where men's clothing begins to look like ladies', either."

"The changes that are taking place in menswear now are good," he concluded. "They are the right thing. But I still feel that a woman should dress like a woman and a man should dress like a man."

HEALTH AND THE CUTBACKS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the President plans to veto the Department of Health, Educational, and Welfare appropriations bill, H.R. 13111. The House of Representatives will then have the opportunity to consider overriding that veto. I will vote to override the veto, not only because the education funds are so badly needed, but also because health funds are critical.

In this connection, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to Sylvia Porter's column, "Health and the Cutbacks," which appeared in the January 12, 1970, issue of the New York Post. The text of the column follows:

HEALTH AND THE CUTBACKS

(By Sylvia Porter)

Surely, you know someone who has cancer or you have known a cancer victim—and surely, you dread the thought of ever having cancer yourself.

We still have not discovered a cure for cancer and it's estimated that in 1970 new cancer cases will reach a peak of 625,000 while deaths will be at an all-time high. Yet, in the face of this and under the superficial excuse of fighting inflation, the Nixon Administration has proposed a budget for the National Cancer Institute nearly \$4.5 million less than the 1969 appropriation. Across the land, major research centers devoted to the study of cancer are slated to close. No funds are available for research on the feasibility of a vaccine for virus-caused cancers, a vitally important field.

Surely, you know someone who has heart disease or have known a heart disease victim and surely you dread becoming another victim of this number one killer in our land.

We still do not know the cause of some of the most prevalent and debilitating forms of heart disease, such as atherosclerosis. Yet, in what seems astounding indifference to the cause for more than half the deaths in the U.S. each year, the Nixon Administration has proposed allocations for the National Heart Institute below even 1969's level.

If Nixon's budget holds, the NHI will have to cut by 40 per cent the number of research projects begun in 1966. An internationally known study of heart attack victims, launched 20 years ago, will have to end in June. Many projects will be axed altogether.

"We shall be courting bankruptcy of America's health if we simply freeze Federal support of health research at current levels," warns Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, world-famed heart surgeon at Houston's Methodist Hospital and Baylor College of Medicine. "Unless the Nixon retrenchment is reversed, the great American investment in medical research since World War II stands the risk of crumbling."

Where and what are our priorities?

Funds allocated by the National Institutes of Health for research and training represent only 1/10th of 1 per cent of our total spending (Gross National Product). Will cutting these funds even more curb inflation? What nonsense!

Our fiscal 1970 budget allocates about \$400 per person for defense and about \$13 per person for all health. Will slashing the paltry \$13 bring us economic balance?

The cutbacks requested by the White House are not only for health research but also for health research training—a "subtle budget policy," says the Senate Committee on Appropriations, which implies that "the cutback in health research is not intended to be temporary." As DeBakey remarks, "the slight allocations for health by this Administration defy understanding." Do you want to wipe out a whole generation of medical researchers, thereby undermine the chance that cures will be found for diseases of which you might die?

You may not give much thought to health care until illness strikes you or a loved one. But then you know and then you are grateful that the health research of which DeBakey speaks has in this century alone lengthened the life span from 50 to 70 years. And if you want dollars-and-cents assurance here's one: in arthritis, studies have shown that for every \$1 invested in improved diagnosis and control, \$38 comes back to our economy—a benefit-cost ratio of 38 to one. But what matter benefit-cost ratio when it's your life?

At the end of December, the Senate added substantially to Nixon's stripped-down budget for health, education and welfare—but then did not send the bill to the White House because of fear of a pocket veto while Congress was out of session.

Thus, the appropriations bill will come up again when Congress returns Jan. 19. Thus, you still have time to make it clear that you will not sit by and be a "silent" citizen while this Administration threatens to paralyze health research in our country.

Your own life well may be riding on this tale—and sooner than you think.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

SPEECH OF

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate in the United States has gone down consistently from 1961—6.7 percent—to 1969—3.5 percent.

WAGES AND PRICES—THERE'S THE CHALLENGE

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, an article this week in the Christian Science Monitor has two telling points to make about the state of the economy. The author, Erwin D. Canham, first observes that all the scrambling of recent weeks within the administration to produce a balanced budget—or even one slightly in surplus—for fiscal 1971 will not insure a beneficial effect on the economy.

The administration's operative psychology is apparently that a balanced budget will impress businessmen and the Nation's money managers with the President's determination to end inflation. The result would be a relaxation of tight monetary policy and a reduction in business capital spending plans.

I am inclined, however, to agree with Canham's conclusion that "there is no certainty that a balanced budget will have more than a marginal influence on the American economy."

Canham's second argument is very important and one that is not receiving serious attention from the administration: Until something is done about wages and prices, we cannot hope to check inflation. Prices rose higher last year than in any year since 1951. There is no sign of abatement. Wage increases, such as the exorbitant 18 percent hike recently awarded to New York City transit workers, continue to inflate the economy.

I believe that the administration can establish tough guidelines for wage and price increases and make them stick by turning the public spotlight on violators. Business and labor must be pressed to lower their sights. Otherwise the administration will have to accept defeat in its war on inflation.

The article follows:

RECESSION AND INFLATION

(By Erwin D. Canham)

President Nixon is fiercely trimming the federal budget. The Commerce Department reports that growth in the economy has drawn to a halt.

But, alas, there is no certainty that a balanced budget will have more than marginal influence on the American economy. There is no evidence that the slow-down now so apparent in many sectors of the economy will really control inflation.

Indeed, there are many signs that the United States is moving into a recessionary period while at the same time most elements in the cost of living continue to mount. In the view of many economists, nothing will really halt the inflationary spiral until something is done to control price and wage increases. Immense labor settlements are being negotiated steadily. Prices, particularly in industries where there is uniformity of price movement, move steadily upward. Some supposedly antiinflationary measures in fact push prices upward: interest costs, taxes, etc.

CONTROLS OPPOSED

It is not easy to suggest remedies. President Nixon is personally very much opposed to price and wage controls. He knows what a vast bureaucratic system would be required

to enforce such controls. The entire economy, in effect, would have to come under some measure of federal restraint. Such a prospect is grim.

Nor has Mr. Nixon been enthusiastic about "jawboning" labor and capital through White House pressures. The guidelines proclaimed and partially carried out by President Kennedy fell apart under President Johnson. Pressures and threats from the executive are of very limited effect when market forces are as powerful as they are today.

The New York Times suggests the President should appoint an executive board on prices, wages, and productivity to develop a program "for arresting the inflation that results from the misuse of market power by business or labor."

PARTIAL MEASURES

Perhaps such a program can be devised. There are certainly many partial measures that could be taken, like withholding price supports from farm products, eliminating quotas on various imports, such as petroleum, removing artificial price floors set up by governmental regulation, and so on.

But the main thrust of any program against wage-price inflation must be directed to the board rooms of industry and the great national unions. There the economic power resides. Within them, the decisions are taken which give the great impetus to the price and wage spiral.

Would Congress give the President power actually to move against these great forces? It is very doubtful. Action merely against labor or against management would be ineffective. Action against both is more than likely to drive them into a formalization of the unnatural alliance by means of which administered prices and wages have risen so inexorably in recent years.

TRAGIC BLOWS

Unless inflation is brought within reasonable bounds, the American economy and society are bound to deteriorate. Already there is great suffering. The rise in prices has dealt tragic blows to all those living on fixed incomes. The real standard of living for many has declined. The housing industry—and all those who badly need better housing—have paid a heavy price.

Soon, it is more than likely that unemployment will mount, with all its social consequences. The Defense Department alone expects to end 1,250,000 jobs in the next year. And the budget cuts the President now is carrying out will have a negative impact on many desirable programs, especially in the cities. The kind of economies now being imposed are not the kind which come out of waste and fat. Quickie cuts are more often than not of visible programs which are badly needed.

The political consequences of a recession and a price-cost inflation at the same time are also bound to be severe. The President is very aware of them; he experienced the mild effects of such a recessionary influence in the 1960 elections.

Once more, most acutely, the "new economics" are being tested. The American economic chariot accelerates beautifully. Much of it is also being slowed. But not wages and prices. There is the challenge.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. JAYCEES

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying honor to the U.S. Jay-

cees in this the organization's 50th anniversary year.

We are most fortunate in having such an outstanding organization, which through the years has attracted young men of action and inspiration to its ranks. They are and have been young men dedicated to service to their fellowmen in helping solve the problems of our Nation and the world and to making this a better planet on which to live.

The work of the Jaycees in so many fields has been outstanding, and I always welcome the constructive suggestions they give to me on Federal legislation.

In the years to come may the Jaycees thrive and prosper and continue in their valuable efforts and work for all mankind.

SAVING FOR CHRISTMAS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, late in the last session of this Congress, I pointed out the practice of banks and other savings institutions which pay no interest on Christmas and vacation club accounts and yet never explain this exception to their banking customers.

I noted that of 10 downtown Washington banks I surveyed, only two paid any interest on such accounts and, in one case, this payment was only conditional.

I have asked the Federal Reserve Board and the other Federal agencies involved in banking matters to look into these practices to see if there were not improvements that could be required of these institutions which would better protect the banking customer's interest.

The Denver Post, in a recent editorial, discussed this subject and my views on it. I include that editorial below:

INTEREST? DON'T BANK ON IT

No one will get too excited if we note that there are only 300-odd shopping days until Christmas, but already 16 million Americans are stashing away pin money in Christmas club accounts. "Members" probably don't know or care that pending federal action may bring them a bonanza.

Rep. Benjamin Rosenthal, D-N.Y., one of the consumer champions in Congress, is disturbed because most banks neither pay interest on Christmas club deposits nor advertise that they don't. So the banks can use that money themselves—some \$2.2 billion nationally last year—without paying their customers for the privilege.

To help alert consumers to what they aren't getting, Rosenthal has sought the aid of the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp., and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. None can force banks to pay interest on club accounts, but Federal Reserve regulations could be amended to require advertising the no-interest angle.

An amendment takes at least 60 days to become effective, and bureaucratic machinery being what it is, the Easter bunny could be on his way before something happened. If Rosenthal decides that agency channels aren't getting anywhere, he plans to hold hearings on the issue.

Such an airing would be fascinating from a psychological as well as fiscal standpoint. Why do millions of us pour our hard-earned,

inflation-depleted cash into accounts that earn us nothing, when we could be getting 4 or 5 per cent in a savings account at the same bank?

The gimmick has been working since 1910, and about the only public protest until now came from New York State Atty. Gen. Louis Lefkowitz. He met with bankers a few years ago hoping to make them change their ways, and he submitted several bills to the state legislature requiring club interest, but neither effort made a dent.

One executive implies that the public is simply paying a bank to "force" them to save. Jack Frenaye is president of the Christmas Club Corp., which handles promotion for 10,000 member banks. He observes that the coupon books representing weekly deposits of a set amount seem to provide more incentive than interest.

Those who miss only one payment, he says, sometimes call the bank and give assurance that their cash is on the way. And when withdrawal time comes, they don't seem to feel as guilty as they would taking cash from a saving account (maybe because they know it wasn't earning them anything in the first place).

Rosenthal feels the clubs are unfortunate because they attract low-income persons who most could use some interest. Frenaye maintains that the average depositor's family income in 1969 was \$12,000, and he only put in \$139.

The bank's answer to the no-interest charge is that running the clubs costs more than savings accounts because of promotion expenses and gifts to attract new members. Rosenthal replies that many banks pay an outfit like Frenaye's to do the work for them—and why not spend the money on interest instead of free ash trays?

The safest course may be to make banks advertise that the clubs don't give interest, and then let customers pay their money and take their choice. If interest is required, some bankers may try the device being used in one Washington institution. It pays interest, all right, but if you miss a single deposit, you forfeit interest for the entire year. It sounds like Scrooge on Dec. 24.

"PUEBLO" CREW—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, it was 2 years ago tomorrow, January 23, 1968, that the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew were captured by the Communist North Koreans. All Americans are most thankful that Commander "Pete" Bucher and his crew have been back in the United States for more than a year.

Yet the *Pueblo* crew once again remains in suspense about possible U.S. Government action. This Congress has had proposed legislation before it for a long time which would exempt the crews' salaries earned while they were in North Korea prison camps from Federal taxation, which is the general rule accorded U.S. military personnel.

Now some 7 months later the relief legislation still languishes. Members of the *Pueblo* crew have contacted me to determine the possible outcome of this legislation. Mind you, the crewmembers are not urging the other body to pass the proposed legislation—rather they only wish the bill would either be approved or disapproved.

Most of the crewmembers are now filling out their 1969 Federal income tax forms and they do not know whether they are entitled to the money withheld from their paychecks or, in some cases, whether they should pay more.

It is tragically ironic that once again the *Pueblo* crew sits and waits for our Government to act. I urge prompt consideration of this legislation.

REPRESENTATIVE PELLY REPORTS TO WASHINGTON'S FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional holiday recess I had the opportunity to speak to numerous clubs and organizations in the district I am honored to represent, and the time away from the Nation's Capital afforded me the occasion to listen to the concerns of my constituents. It was a rewarding time.

In this connection and of special importance was the meeting I arranged with the Seattle school board, and I am scheduling similar meetings with other educational groups in the near future in my district.

Meanwhile, looking ahead, President Nixon's state of the Union message was especially gratifying to me in that it would meet the challenges of the environmental crisis. Of course, in the last session of Congress, I cosponsored legislation which passed and is designed to kick off this attack on pollution by establishing a Council of Environmental Advisers to the President. Rumor has it that Under Secretary Russell Train, a leading conservationist, will resign to head up this Council which augurs well for the President's proposed national growth policy.

Speaking of the President's speech, he pointed up the failure of Congress to deal with his proposals to curb crime and reform our welfare system. I trust Congress will speedily act on these measures.

When I was home, one of my objects was to report to my constituents the results of my recent questionnaire to which I received overwhelming response. Of the 170,000 questionnaires sent to every household in my district, 22,300 responses were received.

For the information of my colleagues, I submit the results of the questionnaire for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Some of the results were most revealing:

[Answers in percent]

- Should President Nixon's family assistance and workfare program be set up in place of the existing welfare system?

Yes	-----	65
No	-----	8
Undecided	-----	26

- Should a percentage of Federal income tax money be shared with the cities and States for use as they see fit?

Yes ----- 66
 No ----- 26
 Undecided ----- 11

3. Should Federal aid be cut off from students disrupting college classes and administration?

Yes ----- 83
 No ----- 13
 Undecided ----- 3

4. Should we elect the President by direct popular vote?

Yes ----- 81
 No ----- 13
 Undecided ----- 5

5. Should we amend the Constitution to give 18-year-olds the vote?

Yes ----- 36
 No ----- 57
 Undecided ----- 6

6. Should we create a self-supporting U.S. postal corporation in place of the present postal system?

Yes ----- 73
 No ----- 15
 Undecided ----- 11

7. Should we pick draftees by random selection (lottery)?

Yes ----- 76
 No ----- 12
 Undecided ----- 11

8. Should we step up space spending to put a man on Mars?

Yes ----- 15
 No ----- 73
 Undecided ----- 10

9. What should we do about Vietnam?

A. Carry on limited military action, pursue the peace talks in Paris—4 percent.

B. Follow the Nixon policy of gradually phasing out of U.S. troops and replacing them with South Vietnamese—63 percent.

C. Resume and expand bombing of North Vietnam—16 percent.

D. Withdraw immediately—16 percent.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of this distinguished body, the 50th anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. Since this week has been set aside as Jaycee Week, I wish to take a moment to praise the fine work of the thousands of young men who belong to the Jaycees throughout our country.

Certainly their work is a tribute to the fine young Americans who endeavor, every day, to make this Nation of ours a better place in which to live. So many times we hear biting comments about young people and I think the Jaycees are a wonderful example of the kind of real devotion young Americans have to the ideals that have made this country great.

I particularly want to thank and commend all of the members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce from my district for their fine work during their past years in Kern and Los Angeles Counties.

I think that all of the citizens of my district should pause for a moment to salute these fine "young men of action," the Jaycees.

In closing, I would like to wish the Junior Chamber of Commerce an even better 50 years to come.

RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE—SAME OLD STORY

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, more than 50 of our colleagues and I introduced last year a bill to give the Interstate Commerce Commission power to regulate the quality and adequacy of railroad passenger service throughout the United States.

We did so because we strongly believe that railroad passenger service must become an integral part of any future system of comprehensive, efficient mass transportation and because we can no longer ignore the obvious decline of such service and the valid complaints of railroad passengers everywhere.

For those who believe we are over-emphasizing the plight of railroad passengers, I wish to include at this point in the Record a perceptive story by Edward Hudson in the New York Times of January 19. This story describes conditions on the Penn Central Railroad's New Haven Division and the difficulties which Penn Central has faced in attempting to improve service:

NEW HAVENS SAME OLD STORY

(By Edward Hudson)

Beleaguered commuters on the New Haven railroad, who have been promised a bright future as a result of a plan to put the railroad under state control, are almost daily struggling to cope with a nightmare of ancient, crowded cars, frequent delays, confusion and breakdowns.

These conditions have not only persisted, but in some ways have also apparently worsened since the Penn Central Company took over the ailing New Haven on Jan. 1, 1969. Under the proposed takeover by Connecticut and New York, to be made final by early summer, the Penn Central will continue to operate the commuter line for a management fee.

Figures made public by the staff of the New York Public Service Commission indicate that on-time performance on the New Haven—at least the intrastate portion—has gone downhill under Penn Central's management, from more than 90 per cent in 1968 under the old New Haven management to about 81 per cent last year.

On Friday, George J. Conkling, Connecticut Commissioner of Transportation, asked Penn Central to take immediate action on a "growing list of complaints," saying that passengers were having difficulty learning of schedule changes, acquiring printed schedules and obtaining train information by telephone.

Officials of the Penn Central, mindful of intense political and passenger criticism, insist that the company has spared no effort to rescue a deteriorating line that has suffered from years of neglect and deferred maintenance. What is needed, they say, is time.

NO MAGIC WAND

"There's just no waving of any magic wand that can turn this railroad around so we can say, 'You're going to have it lovely in 60 days,'" said E. W. Mustard, the New Haven mechanical superintendent, in an interview.

J. M. McGuigan, general manager of the line, estimated that the Penn Central was now spending about \$2-million a month in attempts to upgrade the railroad and its equipment between Boston and New York.

Of this, he said, probably 40 to 50 per cent is going into improvements on the commuter runs between New Haven and Grand Central Terminal, which is the portion that is to be taken over by the two states under a \$56.8 million improvement program.

"I think we've got the patient to the point where it is going to live," Mr. McGuigan said. "Now, the problem is to make it strong."

Penn Central officials dispute the on-time findings of the Public Service Commission, contending that data for 1969 performance include operations in Connecticut while the figures for 1968 do not.

However, commission staff members, who work from daily on-time data supplied by the railroad plus independent investigation, maintain that the inclusion of data from Connecticut makes little difference in the over-all findings.

The staff said that the on-time performance of New Haven trains that travel within New York State dropped to an average 81 per cent for the first nine months of last year compared with 1968's average of more than 90 per cent. This is significant because it indicates that such service is below a 90 per cent standard of reasonable service set by the state's Department of Transportation under a railroad tax relief statute.

In addition, raw data for the last three months of 1969 have shown no improvement in on-time service, according to the commission's staff.

ONE TRAIN 10 PERCENT ON TIME

These figures are over-all averages that some specific trains exceed and others fall far below. The heavily traveled 7:38 out of New Canaan and the 7:55 out of Stamford, for example, were on time last month only 10 per cent of the time.

There are indications, however, that on-time performance is worse than these figures indicate. That is because the data do not include figures for trains arriving within 5 minutes of scheduled time at destinations, delays due to line maintenance and delays for reasons considered beyond the railroad's control—such as time lost caring for ill passengers or contending with snowfalls that exceed 10 inches.

But most New Haven commuters, increasingly disturbed by trains that are crowded, littered and late, do not need statistics to tell them that something is wrong.

On his way home from Manhattan the other evening aboard a dingy old car, a New Rochelle commuter turned to a companion and declared:

"The Long Island at its worst was better than this railroad. They're never on schedule."

A man in front of him turned around to add:

"You can't get rid of a cold, riding these days. You'll find newspaper stuck in the windows to keep out the draft."

The complaints against the New Haven are part of a pattern that covers area commuter lines, including other Penn Central operations in Westchester.

COMPLAINTS CITED

One of the most frequently voiced commuter complaint is the line's unpredictability, with delays on operating trains frequently running half an hour, an hour and even two hours. Another is lack of information on the

reasons for the delays. Still another is last-minute changes on train assignments at Grand Central that require commuters boarding their train to suddenly dash like well-dressed Charlie Chaplins to another track for another train.

Commuter protests were also heard after the railroad announced last June that it was seeking a new fare structure that would net it 3 per cent more revenue. The request is still pending before state and Federal regulatory agencies. The line is seeking to encourage the use of monthly commutation tickets in place of the 10-trip tickets used by most commuters, which would, in many instances, nearly double in price.

For example, the railroad wants to raise the price of a 10-trip ticket from Larchmont to New York City from \$8.95 to \$17. The monthly commutation ticket would go from the present \$33.90 to \$34.

The fare request and subsequent regulatory hearings, since concluded, helped swell the number of complaints about the line received by the Public Service Commission. More than 770 complaints were received about New Haven service in the first 10 months of 1969, as compared with a total of five complaints the previous year, officials reported.

Six weeks ago Connecticut and New York signed a preliminary agreement with the Penn Central providing for the two states to take over the New Haven service and turn it into a commuter's dream by buying new and faster cars, building new stations and installing new power and signal systems.

But government and rail officials have repeatedly stressed that the dream won't begin to materialize for the commuter until the new cars make their appearance—sometime in 1972. Some commuters, embittered by past experience, remain skeptical.

"We'll believe it when it happens," said a midtown executive who has ridden the New Haven from Connecticut for more than 20 years, and who, he says, remembers with sadness that the New Haven was a "cracker-jack" line, with rarely a delay, in the early nineteen-fifties.

"What we really want," he added, "is that the service doesn't get any worse."

Lots of passengers have been unable to find a seat at peak hours and they are unhappy about it.

New Haven officials concede the problem and maintain that it had been aggravated by a shortage of cars. When it took over the line, the Penn Central condemned 26 old cars because of their age and rundown condition. It has since pulled out of service another 20, leaving it with 393 cars, 56 fewer than the year before.

The Penn Central says it can't simply go out and buy new cars "off the shelf" because the New Haven has a "unique" power system. The cars must be equipped with two means of picking up power—from an overhead catenary wire that ends at from a third rail that extends from Woodlawn to Grand Central Terminal.

LINE SAYS IT TRIES

The railroad insists it has been hard at work putting in new rail; replacing catenary wires that have been worn, in some cases, to one-fifth their original size; repairing locomotives (which will eventually all be replaced with self-propelled cars), and cleaning and repairing coaches and replacing broken windows, many shattered by vandals.

"I think we've been given a bad rap," a New Haven official lamented. "The general implication is we've been sitting on our backsides and not doing anything to improve the railroad."

"But I think people did not realize how close the New Haven was to utter collapse. And I don't think the average person understands it takes time to clean out shops, institute modern practices and get programs rolling. I don't think anyone can recover from 10 years of neglect in one year.

"We'd like to have done far more, but, on the other hand, we've certainly been doing twice as much as was done on the old New Haven."

Under the New York-Connecticut take-over, the Penn Central, which absorbed the New Haven in exchange for Federal approval of the Penn Central merger, will operate the New Haven commuter service for a \$100,000 yearly fee, with the states picking up any operating deficits.

The Federal Government and the states will share the \$56.8-million cost of modernizing the line. The Federal share has still to be approved by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, but this is expected. Several state agencies must also approve the terms.

Only after the final documents are signed can contracts be let for the purchase of 144 new cars, the construction of new stations and other improvements. This is not expected until early summer.

About the only consolation railroad officials hold out to the 24,000 Westchester and Connecticut residents who ride the railroad regularly is that we will be able to watch some of the rehabilitation in progress as they ride by in their old cars.

But this, in fact, is a mixed blessing because conditions could worsen as work gets underway.

"I'm afraid that the commuter, initially, is going to see some more dislocations," Mr. McGuigan warns. "But this is not going to be just work to keep the railroad alive. From here on, they're going to see work that will result in great improvement."

Although the rehabilitation will not begin in earnest until the final take-over contract is signed, the state agencies responsible—the Metropolitan Transportation Authority of New York and the Connecticut Transportation Authority—say they are proceeding with preliminary planning.

Harold Wanaselja, chief of project management of the M.T.A., said that his agency hoped to begin soliciting bids on the new cars in February or March—well in advance of the take-over.

The new cars will be nearly identical to the new coaches on the Long Island, with contoured, high-backed seats. Each car will seat 130 passengers, with seats arranged in rows of three on one side of the aisle and two on the other. This is 10 more than existing New Haven cars. The major difference will be external—the addition of overhead pantographs atop the train to pick up power from the catenary wires between New Haven and Woodlawn.

Plans call for the new New Haven cars to be delivered starting 18 months after a contract is let. All are to be delivered in a year's time.

Probably the first visible evidence of the modernization will be work on new stations. The two agencies plan to raise the railroad's station platforms to the level of the car floors.

Except for Grand Central Terminal, platforms are now all at ground level, which means that commuters must struggle up the car steps—no easy thing for the heavy-set, the elderly or the handicapped.

The line's 9 stations in New York and 18 in Connecticut will be reconstructed.

The M.T.A. plans, in the near future, to approach local communities along the New Haven's right-of-way to stimulate interest in joint state-community efforts to rebuild the stations.

Some communities already have been mapping their own plans. In others, private developers have acquired title. In Greenwich, for example, a developer is building a commercial project of offices and stores.

AUTOMATIC CONTROLS

Among other improvements new signals will be added and the New Haven trains will

be equipped with new automatic train controls.

Recently Mr. Mustard, the line's mechanical superintendent, showed a visitor through a large building in New Haven that contains the facilities for overhauling the New Haven's cars and locomotives. Repeatedly, he complained that the old management had left the repair shops in deplorable condition.

"They never threw anything away," he declared. He said there was grease on the shop floor "an inch thick."

As a result of changes in the shops, the line says it is now turning out six refurbished cars a month, at a cost of \$6,500 to \$10,000 a car. Under the old system less extensive refurbishing—about \$2,500 a car—produced four improved cars a month.

When asked if the car rehabilitation could be speeded up, Mr. Mustard replied:

"Assuming I was able to find shop space, which would be difficult, and assuming I was able to find the skilled manpower, which I know is impossible, and that we overhauled all the cars on a one-year crash basis, what in the world would I do with the manpower and the additional shop space after the year is over?"

PROPOSAL TO HONOR THE LATE DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of suggestions for honoring the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y.

Dr. King's birthday, January 15, was marked appropriately in our community and the local organization BUILD proposed the renaming of one of our day's main arteries, Jefferson Avenue, in Dr. King's honor.

As an alternate to the renaming of Jefferson Avenue, one of our major television stations, WGR-TV, has proposed instead that Dr. King be honored by changing the name of Kensington Expressway to Martin Luther King Expressway.

The movement in our city to honor the late Dr. King is sincere and has my full support. I am impressed with the suggestion of WGR-TV and the logic for the alternate.

I do not believe that Dr. King would have wanted our city to replace its existing memorial to Thomas Jefferson, one of the founders of our country. Thomas Jefferson was the Nation's second Vice President and its third President.

WGR-TV broadcast an editorial on January 12 in support of its alternate. The text follows:

MARTIN LUTHER KING MEMORIAL EXPRESSWAY

The local organization BUILD has asked that Jefferson Avenue in Buffalo be renamed to honor Doctor Martin Luther King Junior. We think the suggestion to memorialize Doctor King has merit and should be considered.

Our suggestion is to rename the Kensington Expressway. This would enable Buffalo and the Niagara Frontier to honor the late black leader and still maintain the memorial to one of our country's founders, Thomas Jefferson.

Creating the Martin Luther King Expressway has some symbolism in that it can be

considered a road out of the ghetto and one which connects with a continuing series of highways.

The purely practical aspect of the idea is the elimination of confusion and expense in changing local addresses, letterheads, signs and other items associated with such changes.

It is our feeling that the Martin Luther King Memorial Expressway would be a fitting tribute to a great American.

THE 1879 TEXAS ALMANAC
DISCUSSES DALLAS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent holiday season I was given a reprint of the Texas Almanac for the year 1879. My friend, Jack C. Vaughn, chairman of the board of the Steck-Warlick Co., was thoughtful enough to reprint this most interesting historical document. At this time, the Dallas Morning News continues the tradition of publishing our Texas Almanac annually.

Back 90 years ago, Dallas was a young city with 16,000 population, whereas, today, we have grown into a metropolis of 1,300,000 people. But, what impresses one most about this summary of Dallas in 1879 was the type of dynamic leadership that pioneered our community. They were described as "businessmen who discerned the future; men who worked together for the general good of the city, displayed a degree of enterprise, combined with a concert of action, and mutual regard of the prosperity and growth equaled by no other city in Texas. Such men as flocked to Dallas are deterred by no obstacles." And, as we start into our clean 1970's, the greatest asset in Dallas is still the manpower leadership—men looking to the future.

One interesting remark was the last comment where Dallas had "minerals the value of which cannot now be conjectured." Our city never expanded because of its minerals. We have no oil, no gold, and no minerals. It is no longer a matter of conjecture—we have no minerals—but Dallas still has the dynamic leadership and that is the greatest asset any community can have.

Mr. Speaker, the summary of Dallas from the 1879 Texas Almanac follows:

THE CITY OF DALLAS

Is the metropolis of north Texas. It is the most wealthy and populous portion of the State, and by reason of the vigorous enterprise of her citizens, and rapid growth has sometimes been designated the "Chicago" of Texas. Dallas is the center of the great wheat belt of the State, and is in the midst of a tier of counties, the productiveness of which are unsurpassed, if equaled in the broad world. Until a very few years ago Dallas was merely a respectable local country town. With the advent of the Houston & Texas Central road, connecting her intimately by great trunk lines with the West, and the Gulf of Mexico, commenced a tide of emigration rarely witnessed, even in the rapid growth of American cities. These newcomers were shrewd businessmen, who discerned the future that awaited the city. Then came the Texas Pacific, affording her additional facilities, and

a through competing line of railway. It may, without prejudice to other points, be said that the businessmen of this city have displayed a degree of enterprise, combined with a concert of action, and mutual regard of the prosperity and growth of the place equaled by no other city in Texas. With the disadvantages of limited capital, no enterprise was omitted which could contribute to the growth and prosperity of the young city. Such men as flocked to Dallas are deterred by no obstacle. Capacious stores and warehouses were erected, and the ambition of these men probed for the trade of far distant points. Soon Dallas was the busiest mart in Texas. Why should she, the center of the richest lands and most populous section, not become the metropolis of the State? Such it is quite within the bounds of probability, she is yet destined to become.

There is certainly concentrated here an amount of pluck, vigor, and enterprise which, considering age and capital, is exhibited nowhere else in Texas. Men, too, work together for the general good of the city, and concert is nine points in the battle for success. But not alone has Dallas been alive in commercial enterprise. Within a period so brief, she has made rapid strides in industrial enterprises. She has in operation two cotton compresses, two grain elevators, a mammoth cotton seed oil factory, a number of capacious planning mills, a woolen factory, six flouring mills, supplied with all modern machinery, several foundries and machine shops, some of them capable of turning out any description of work; a cement factory, an artificial stone factory, quite a number of brick kilns, a large broom factory, carriage and wagon manufactories, and is the headquarters for Texas for farm and mill machinery—perhaps doing more business in that line than all other towns combined, the business in this branch alone aggregating \$2,500,000. One of the grandest enterprises inaugurated by the people was the building of the Dallas & Wichita Railway, stretching in a northwesterly direction through a region abounding both in minerals and rich productive lands, and the completion of which will open to Dallas a grand future.

Dallas has perhaps a greater number of elegant and substantial churches than any city in the State, of which there are 21, representing most of the leading denominations of religion, all presided over by able divines. No city is better supplied with schools and colleges—a magnificent female college recently completed being one of the notable features of the city.

It may be readily assumed that a people so enterprising and ambitious as those of Dallas, would not be slow in the inauguration of modern improvements. No city is better lighted with gas. Here are waterworks bringing fine water into almost every house. Some 7 miles of street railway, and other improvements too innumerable to mention in these pages. The extent of hotel accommodations at Dallas are unequalled in the State, a number of them being commanding buildings, perhaps equal to any in the Southwest. A stranger visiting Dallas from most any of the other towns of the State, is at once impressed with the evidences of life to be observed on all sides. Wagons from remote counties, loaded with cotton, wheat, and other produce, blockade the streets. He is not less impressed with the intelligence and bearing of those men from the country, who come here to dispose of their produce and furnish their supplies. They are in fact composed of thrifty farmers from the Northwestern, Western, and Southwestern States, who came to Texas to better their fortunes, and are succeeding. No better society is to be found in the world than the population of western and northwestern Texas.

The number of cotton buyers in this market during the season of 1878-9 have been numerous, and the means at command

abundantly ample to move the crop. In fine, it clearly lies within the power of the people of Dallas to maintain for her the position which she enjoys at this writing as one of the leading commercial and manufacturing cities in Texas, and the day is probably not far distant when her present 16,000 or 20,000 inhabitants will swell into 50,000—for not alone is Dallas the metropolis of the great wheat belt, but of a country alike adapted to cotton and all the cereals—of a region vast in area, and yet comparatively undeveloped, abounding not alone in rich cheap lands, but in minerals the value of which cannot now be conjectured.

STATE DEPARTMENT VIEWS ON
HICKENLOOPER AMENDMENT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I thought it would be of interest to my colleagues to read some recent correspondence between the State Department and myself, on the issue of the Hickenlooper amendment. The letters follow:

DECEMBER 8, 1969.

HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I would like to know what your views are regarding the Hickenlooper amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Do you recommend its repeal or its continuance? Has it been an asset or a liability in our negotiations with Peru, and in our relations with other South American nations?

I look forward to receiving your reply.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 22, 1969.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of December 8 concerning the Hickenlooper Amendment.

In the wake of our recent crisis with Peru the question of whether this amendment serves the national interest has become increasingly debated within the Executive Branch. It is the view of the Department that the Hickenlooper Amendment does not add to the President's authority to protect American business abroad, and in fact introduces certain elements of inflexibility that can make it difficult for the Executive Branch to shape a response that is appropriate to and likely to be effective in a particular case. For instance, the six-month time limit prescribed by the amendment leads to public, time-specific confrontations that make it more difficult to carry out the delicate negotiations that are necessary to resolve these difficult problems. In this sense at least the amendment is a liability in our negotiations with Peru over the expropriation of the properties of the International Petroleum Corporation. In effect, the amendment tends to put all U.S. interests in a country at risk on a single issue, admittedly a very important issue.

On the other hand, this provision of law was intended to act as a deterrent to uncompensated expropriations and other actions against U.S. investors in violation of international law. This is an important purpose and a legitimate concern of the Congress.

While questions can be raised as to whether the amendment in its present form is an effective instrument for that purpose, there are different opinions on this matter that deserve careful consideration. In addition, we are faced with some current and potential expropriation situations which would affect both the substance and timing of any position the Department might take on possible adjustments in the amendment.

At the present moment, we are *not prepared to make any definite recommendations* on the future status of the amendment, but we will be considering this issue as events develop in the next few weeks.

We continue to believe in the importance of the role private investment can play in the development process. As the President noted in his address before the Inter-American Press Association on October 31, "constructive foreign investment has the special advantage of being a prime vehicle for the transfer of technology" to developing countries. Whether private investment is attracted to a particular country depends on many factors, particularly business confidence in the foreign government and its readiness to abide by rules of international law. As the President states, "a capital importing country (must) expect a serious impairment of its ability to attract investment funds when it acts against existing investments in a way which runs counter to commonly accepted norms of international law and behavior." We believe this is an important thought we should keep in mind in reviewing the Hickenlooper Amendment.

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

Sincerely yours,

H. C. TORBERT, Jr.,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

JUST A COINCIDENCE?

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, an article in the *Nelpa News*, published by the Northwest Electric Light & Power Association, has passed over my desk. It may be of interest to my colleagues and I submit it for the RECORD:

JUST A COINCIDENCE?

In May of 1919 at Dusseldorf, Germany, the Allied Forces obtained a copy of the "Communist Rules for Revolution." Nearly fifty years later, the Reds are still "following the rule." As you read the list, stop after each item and think about the present-day situation and where you live, and all around the nation. We quote from the Red Rules:

A. Corrupt the young, get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex. Make them superficial; destroy their ruggedness.

B. Get control of all means of publicity thereby:

1. Get people's minds off their government by focusing their attention on athletics, sexy books and plays and other trivialities.

2. Divide the people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters of no importance.

3. Destroy the people's faith in their natural leaders by holding the latter up to contempt, ridicule and obloquy.

4. Always preach true democracy, but seize power as fast and as ruthlessly as possible.

5. By encouraging government extravagance, destroy its credit, produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent.

6. Foment unnecessary strikes in vital industries, encourage civil disorders and foster a lenient and soft attitude on the part of government toward such disorders.

7. By specious argument cause the breakdown of the old moral virtues, honesty, sobriety, continued faith in the pledged word, ruggedness.

C. Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext, with a view of confiscating them and leaving the population helpless.

That was quite a list, wasn't it? Now stop and think, how many of those rules are being carried out in this nation today? I don't see how any thinking person can truthfully say that the Communists do not have any part in the chaos that is upsetting our nation. Or it is just one big coincidence? I doubt it.

BRIGHTER PROSPECTS FOR U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Propeller Club, Port of Washington, honored the Maritime Administrator, Andrew Gibson, and the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, at a luncheon in the Rayburn House Office Building. It was a pleasure to be among the guests on that occasion because the spirit which pervaded the gathering was one of excitement, occasioned by the expectation of early action to review our merchant marine.

It is a pleasure to include in the RECORD the remarks of Mrs. Bentley, which indicate a uniting of all groups in support of a new program:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HELEN DELICH BENTLEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION, BEFORE THE LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES, PORT OF WASHINGTON, D.C., RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING, JANUARY 21, 1970

It is an honor today to be addressing the Polar Bear Port of the Propeller Club of the United States. As an early explorer in the Northwest Passage, one whose four letter word made history from the North Pole, I hereby grant to everyone here today charter membership in the Polar Explorers Club. We will make Chairman Edward A. Garmatz president of the club since he limped here today in pain and under strain—an infected leg and in this bitter cold weather.

Our next meeting will be one year from today in Helen's Haven, a recently-chartered cove off the Prince of Wales Strait on Victoria II Island. Transportation will be furnished by the Coast Guard if our good friends here on the Hill insist that some money be spent on new ice breakers.

What a heart-breaking sight that was to see the American-flag icebreaker sadly limping away trying to hold her own through the thick Arctic ice while the modern Canadian vessel stood valiantly by. So for our next meeting, we want new ice breakers for transportation, Chairman Garmatz, and, moneyholder, the Honorable Frank Bow.

I was somewhat dismayed in looking around this room that there wasn't any American flag in view. Jack Drewry said that there was one flying over the Building (the Rayburn Building), so we will forgive this oversight this time, but not again.

This is good today to be here in the company of so many friends and acquaintances

of long standing here at the Propeller Club of the Port of Washington.

Nor can I forget the fact that it was this Propeller Club of the Port of Washington that initiated the progressive step of opening its membership rolls to women some four and a half years ago. It was at such a luncheon as this that six women were first presented with their Certificates of Membership in the Propeller Club of the United States.

By so doing, you acknowledged that women were no mere passing fancy, but were here to stay as part of the body politic, constituting forceful allies in the Propeller Club's efforts to obtain a merchant marine equal to the Nation's needs.

True, they were all women who had long worked, each in her own way, for the best interests of our Nation's shipping because of strong, personal convictions in the matter—and I believe you will all agree that there is no stronger, more persistent, more persuasive advocate than a woman fighting for her convictions.

If memory serves me—and I am certain it does—those six women were the Honorable Leonor K. Sullivan, long-time member and ranking Democrat House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; Barbara Boardman, of the Maritime Administration; Marguerite Bryan, of the Labor-Management Committee; Madeline Carrol, the screen star; Kathryn O'Marr of Grace Line and myself, as the then Maritime Editor of the *Baltimore Sun*.

Others have since joined us as members of the Propeller Club. But as for the first six, I leave it to your judgment as to whether we have been working partners with you during the intervening years in the unending labor to achieve a strong, well-rounded American Merchant Marine, opposing its detractors and assiduously working for its advancement.

One thing is certain, the interests of the American Merchant Marine have advanced, whether it is measured against one year, five or ten years ago. That is why we can at long last say the future holds great promise—a promise based not on promises, but on actions.

That is another basic reason why I take such personal pleasure in being present today, in company with Maritime Administrator Andy Gibson, as a member of President Nixon's team concerned with American shipping and the shipping policies of this Nation having a bearing upon United States trade and commerce.

Some of the hardest—and, when my side won, happiest—battles on behalf of the American Merchant Marine have been fought up here on Capitol Hill during my years with the "Sun". I think it would be in order for me to say here that I believe it has been the liberal support over the years of the management of The Sun Papers to the maritime industry that had a great deal to do towards laying the foundation for educating both the present Administration and the members on Capitol Hill on the importance of seapower and why the United States had to halt its downward trend in this area. But both you and I know there are new battles ahead. Because of this, it is good to have in the same corner a hard-hitting Maritime Administrator like Andy Gibson—one who knows the shipping business and respects the promotional ideals and ambitions which the Propeller Club espouses.

With the Propeller Club backing the Nixon program, and the legislative package seeking to bring the program into reality, I am positive that better days are ahead for American shipping and I stand before you today ready to pledge that the Federal Maritime Commission's role to achieve this will *not* be found wanting!

In 1903, at the dawning of the Twentieth Century, President Theodore Roosevelt de-

livered a message to Capitol Hill. At that time this great Republican president declared that: "A majority of our people desire that steps be taken in the interest of American shipping, so that we may once more resume our former position in the ocean-carrying trade."

President Roosevelt told the Congress: "The differences of opinion as to the proper method of reaching this end have been so wide that it has been impossible to secure the adoption of any scheme."

Since the differences within the industry were so wide that nothing concrete could be accomplished, Teddy Roosevelt suggested the creation of a Maritime Commission to study the problem and to recommend a course of action.

The Congress agreed.

That study was made and the majority of the Commission accepted the views of ship owners and ship builders and asserted that: "Thoughtful men throughout the entire country have now come to see that the question is not merely one of building ships or manning ships, important as that may be to large seaboard communities. Nor is the question further, one solely of the national defense, though that of itself would abundantly justify Congressional action. A third imperative motive for the creation of an adequate merchant marine is the need for new and wider markets. Without these there is such a thing as smothering at home in our own prosperity."

Official U.S. figures show that from 1902-1906 we had a Gross National Product of \$24.2 billion. Today our Gross National Product tops \$980 billion and is soon expected to pass the trillion-dollar mark.

Now, I am sure that everyone within the sound of my voice knows, at least as well as I do, the tortuous course of the American Merchant Marine since the dawning of this century.

It is our good fortune that the Maritime Administrator in this critical time, both by training and profession, is well aware of the shoals, the rocks, and the barrier reefs that lie ahead—as well as the friends in Congress who will join in upgrading the Merchant Marine by enabling legislation now before the Congress.

On my part, let me assure the Maritime Administrator before this auspicious gathering that he will have my fullest support, first, as an American and, second, as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission. Not only will he have my support in his endeavors to advance legislation acceptance by the Congress, but also in the important project of American Merchant Marine promotion for which he is the designated responsible official.

In this regard, let me say that I find a too-widespread philosophy held to the effect that the Federal Maritime Commission should tend to its regulatory knitting and let the American Merchant Marine sink or float on its own.

As an American, I do not share that philosophy.

I firmly believe that the Commission can and does provide assistance to the American Merchant Marine, that at the Federal Maritime Commission our regulation can and does remove artificial impediments to trade and commerce.

Regulation, properly applied, can ensure fair competition. Fair competition stimulates trade and more cargoes move. We know, that if cargo is available, the American Merchant Marine can do well under conditions of fair competition. I might add that as the cargoes to and from the United States flow in abundance our foreign ship-owning friends also benefit.

I am fully aware that Americans in general and American businessmen in particular do not like Government regulation.

That is a healthy sign in keeping with our independence as a people. As a result, for the Federal Maritime Commission this means that we, who are regulators, must dedicate ourselves to convincing the business community—by actions more than by words—that fair regulation is indeed helpful.

That is the type of regulation that I am determined and will insist be practiced at the Federal Maritime Commission. I am certain that Commissioners Fansen, Day, Barrett, and Hearn join me in this determination.

We at the Commission can help American trade and commerce, and the American Merchant Marine, as well as the merchant marines of those free nations that trade with us. We can do so by concerning ourselves with the public welfare and with the welfare of the carriers, the terminals, the freight forwarders, and shippers.

We know that the regulation of conferences is an extremely delicate task. Some steamship men think it is an impossible one.

Nevertheless, we intend pursuing our responsibilities. We will encourage self-policing. We will declare war on illicit rebating and other malpractices which foster and breed unfair competition.

It is stimulating to me to know that despite some very basic different views, many of the foreign maritime nations are beginning to respect our battle to achieve fair competition.

We are convincing the shipping conferences that just and reasonable procedures for handling complaints; fair and reasonable rules concerning admission and expulsion; and equitable arrangements for conference membership, foster and promote confidence in world trade and that confidence makes commerce flourish.

In our off-shore trades between the Continental United States and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam and Samoa, the Commission is being carefully considerate of the needs of the islands and, at the same time, of the rights of the carriers to serve and to earn a fair and adequate profit by American standards.

History refuses to stand still. At the Federal Maritime Commission, as elsewhere in the field of national maritime policy, the Nixon Administration is meeting its responsibility to recognize and to deal with new problems as they develop.

Fortunately, in our American form of government, such responsibilities do not set up the Maritime Administration nor the Federal Maritime Commission as dictators. Far from it. You know that we have many "bosses," many helpers, and constructive critics whose services are invaluable. You also know that we have a number of plain and fancy kitbitzers—plus those who strive, at any cost, for special privileges regardless of the public welfare.

Apart from this, however, the Maritime Administration, the Federal Maritime Commission, and the responsible and patriotic maritime industry—both labor and management—now is on a course to weld a program which will meet the "plans and specs" laid down by President Nixon for the consideration of the Congress of the United States to vastly improve the status of the American Merchant Marine.

This country deserves and must have a sound program to revitalize the Nation's shipping. Such a program will be achieved through the legislation submitted to the Congress by the Nixon Administration.

If we back the President, America will get the revitalized Merchant Marine essential to its future economic well-being and security.

The time is past for the wringing of hands. The time is here to join hands, and to join with President Nixon in achieving America's place in the future on the trade lanes of the world!

THE JAYCEES CELEBRATE THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the United States Jaycees are celebrating their 50th anniversary this week. Since their founding in St. Louis in 1920, the Jaycees have dedicated themselves to local community service projects. They have been instrumental in building the leadership qualities a dynamic society needs to continue to grow and prosper.

In the midst of an atmosphere increasingly critical of American ideals, the Jaycees stand foursquare for the principles upon which America became great: faith in God, human brotherhood, social and economic justice, the rule of law, the dignity of the individual, and service to humanity.

While surrounded by a burgeoning bureaucracy in which an official's discretion plays an ever-larger role in the execution and enforcement of regulations, the Jaycees proclaim the forgotten truth "that government should be of laws rather than of men."

The growth of the Jaycees over the years is very encouraging and has been much deserved. They have grown from 12 chapters and 4,000 members in 1920 to a network of over 6,000 chapters with more than 300,000 members.

Among their civic programs are annual recognition of outstanding young men, the granting of scholarships, and sponsorship of community development and mental health and retardation seminars and various junior sports events.

The activities of Jaycee chapters in my district have always been a source of civic pride. In recent years the Jaycees have become involved in the real pressing needs of the community in addition to sponsoring their popular traditional activities.

As long as the spirit embodied by the United States Jaycees continues to prevail, America will emerge from the crisis psychology of the 1960's fully prepared to renew its commitment to the cause of freedom and to the swift and humane solution of our social problems.

An excellent letter from the president of the Springfield, Ohio, Jaycees appeared recently in the Springfield Sun. To give it the wider circulation it deserves, I am herewith inserting the text of the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Springfield (Ohio) Sun, Jan. 19, 1970]

JAYCEES—50 YEARS OF PROGRESS

EDITOR, THE SUN:

The week of Jan. 18-Jan. 24 will celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the United States Jaycees during their annual Jaycee Week. It is noteworthy that the Springfield Jaycees were organized that same year and therefore celebrate this 50th anniversary with an added pleasure.

As we look forward to the next 50 years, we must reflect our belief that every American citizen can and must play a role in creating an environment for change in this country, even if it sometimes means that rigid

structures must be broken. That is our responsibility—it must be our goal.

During the past 50 years, the Jaycees have provided an untold number of qualified public servants. The fact that President Nixon and former Vice President Hubert Humphrey are both past local Jaycee presidents is a good example of this. Today, past Jaycees are prominent in the House and the Senate as well as in other top leadership positions in federal, state, and local governments. It is a tribute to the Jaycees, but it is also a challenge; and that is that we continue to provide the quality of leadership in this vital position that has made this country great.

In our beginning as an organization, we were and still are, to some extent, involved in programming that is not meeting the needs of today's society. But during the past few years we have grown up, realizing that just providing Christmas shopping tours and running beauty pageants isn't the answer. We must continue our trend toward getting involved in the real needs that face our communities today. We all know what the priorities in our communities and states should be, and it only remains for us to forge ahead in this, our 50th year, into areas that are not always pleasant or rewarding but which are vital to our well-being as Americans and as a truly United States.

We think that it is particularly significant that in this point in our organization's history we can look back on 50 years of excellent growth, and in so doing we can see that we have indeed genuinely contributed to the well-being of our communities, states, and nation. But we must not be so caught up in considering our past that we let the future slip by unnoticed, failing to take the initiative in helping to provide the solutions so urgently needed in light of the problems we as a nation face today.

In reflecting on the growth of The United States Jaycees' early beginnings as the Herculanean Dancing Society and comparing that to where we stand today, we have a right to be proud of our progress. Right now, we are increasingly looked upon as the number one volunteer organization that is genuinely concerned about poverty, health, employment, safety and several other vital areas that relate to people in the United States. What this in fact does is to place on our shoulders the greatest responsibility we as an organization and as individuals have ever had. In this, our 50th year, we must re-evaluate our dedication, our goals, and purpose in order to channel the greatest amount of effort and manpower to the most effective use. If we can indeed do this, there is nothing that we cannot do.

HARVEY M. RICHISON,
President, Springfield Jaycees.

SALUTE TO A DEDICATED MAN

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the town of Glen Ridge, N.J., has been ably served during the last 4 years by Mayor Herbert H. Johnson. He has now retired only to assume the duties of organizing Glen Ridge's 75th anniversary celebration.

A recent article from the Glen Ridge paper follows:

SALUTE TO A DEDICATED MAN

On New Year's Day Mayor Herbert H. Johnson stepped down from his desk in the Council Chamber after many years of service to the borough.

For the last four years Johnson had been

Mayor of Glen Ridge and had devoted many long hours to resolving the borough's problems. Prior to holding this post he served the borough as Councilman.

Just to show his dedication and devotion to duty Johnson took over the chairmanship of the 75th anniversary committee. This group is planning celebration activities for this summer when commemoration rites will be held recalling Glen Ridge's breaking away from Bloomfield in 1895.

OUR NATION IN THE DECADE AHEAD

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess, Empire magazine, a supplement to the Sunday Denver Post, published a most astute appraisal of where our Nation stands in the milestone year of 1970.

The article, which was written by Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher of the Denver Post, may be considered both a footnote to the 1960's and a prolog to the 1970's.

I commend "Our Nation in the Decade Ahead" for your reading:

OUR NATION IN THE DECADE AHEAD

(By Palmer Hoyt)

Anyone who attempts to forecast what the world in the 1970s will be like finds himself in somewhat the same position as the airline captain in the old joke who reported to his passengers that he had "both good and bad news" for them.

"First, the bad news," said the captain. "It appears that we are lost. However, on the brighter side, we are making good speed."

Of course, humanity's prospects in the decade ahead are not that grim. In many ways, the prospects are downright exciting. But there are also some very dark clouds over the horizon, and these should be faced realistically.

Humanity is likely to continue to live in the 1970s in the shadow of the hydrogen bomb and other superweapons of frightening potency. It will also face the prospect that the human environment will become less and less compatible because of pollution, diminishing supply of food and other resources plus the psychological pressures of increased crowding.

All of these problems are rather direct "fall-out" from the non-nuclear weapon which some people have referred to as the Population Bomb. And this weapon could be just as decisive, if less dramatic, in setting the fate of mankind as all the nuclear-tipped missiles in the world.

The mechanics of the problem are deceptively simple. The planet Earth has only some 200 million square miles of surface, and a mere one-fourth of that is land area. Continuing population growth will in the long run produce saturation. And the world's population has been growing in geometric progression—that is, even the rate of growth continues to increase.

Population growth means the number of births exceeds the number of deaths. Throughout most of man's stay on Earth, the two have been almost in equilibrium. During the 600,000 years of the Paleolithic period of pre-history, the population of man's ancestors could not have increased faster than 2 per cent per thousand years.

By the Neolithic period, some 10,000 years ago, the human population had probably

reached 10 million. At the time of Christ, it was an estimated 250 million. It took some 1,800 years more to reach 1 billion. In another 100 years, the 2 billion level was reached. And in the 30 years from 1930 to 1960, the total rose to 3 billion. We are now at 3.5 billion and will reach 4 billion about the middle of the 1970s.

In an earlier era, when the human population in any place threatened to get too large, Nature (or human nature) seemed to step in to equalize things. There might be starvation, epidemics or plagues, wars, increases in the infant mortality rate or simply a decline in births and somehow or other an increase in deaths. In this day and age we have succeeded in reducing the infant death rate and prolonging the adult life span—but we are not yet free of the scourges of Nature, in the form of hunger, or of human nature, in the form of war. In fact, we have become so much more efficient in our war-making potential that total obliteration of the human race is a distinct possibility.

At the present rate of increase—2 percent a year, compared to 2 percent a millennium for our Paleolithic predecessors—the inhabitants of Earth would number over 7 billion by the end of the century, a scant 30 years from now. Robert McNamara, president of the World Bank, has remarked that a child born today, and living a normal life span, would experience a world of 15 billion population, and his grandson would share the planet with 60 billion.

"In six and a half centuries from now—the same insignificant period of time separating us from the poet Dante—there would be one human being standing on every square foot of land on Earth: a fantasy of horror that even the Inferno could not match," said McNamara, who added this sobering footnote:

"Such projections are, of course, unreal. They will not come to pass because events will not permit them to come to pass. . . . What is not so certain is precisely what those events will be. They can only be: mass starvation, political chaos, or population planning."

Still, the problem of population pressure may not appear as clearcut as all this, particularly to Americans living through the next decade. Population growth likely will appear in this country—where it will be increasing at a slower rate than in the underdeveloped areas of the world—as much as boom as a burden.

More people will mean more customers (and more income, or buying power) in our high-consumption economy. But for Americans, there will be another side of this. For America, with only 6 to 8 per cent of the world's population, even now consumes more than 50 per cent of the world's resources. By the end of the coming decade, we will be consuming 83 per cent of those resources.

This supply of resources is not inexhaustible. Take food, for example. McNamara estimated that there is less food per person on the planet today than there was 30 years ago during a worldwide economic depression.

Even in the affluent United States there is a relationship between population and poverty. Many of the children born in poverty are trapped in poverty. They cannot manage to get the education or technical skill which would enable them to get the kind of jobs which are coming—and will come even more in the '70s—to dominate the employment market.

By and large, however, population growth and technological change should be the keys to greater prosperity in America in the coming decade. At present there are about 203 million people in this country. By the end of the decade, there will be at least 225 million. (The figure should reach 300 million by the year 2000.) The greater population of Americans will be buying and demanding more of the sort of things available in the 1960s, as well as the goods and serv-

ices arising out of the space-age research or tailored to fit the greater amounts of leisure time that should be available to the average person in the 1970s.

An economic panel assembled by *U.S. News & World Report* estimated last summer that the nation's Gross National Product, the total production of goods and services, would climb to a startling \$2 trillion by 1980. That's *trillion!*—a word we will have to get used to dealing with in the next decade. The *U.S. News* panel felt this growth would come through a new industrial revolution arising out of applications of nuclear energy, advances in electronics and continued development of automatic control systems and computers.

Over the next decade, typical family income should rise from the present \$9,000 a year to more than \$15,000. The number of two-car households is expected to go from the present 17 million to 26 million. Homes with color television sets would rise from the present 19 million to over 50 million.

During the decade, an estimated 20 million new living units would be built, with the annual rate of new housing starts by 1979 coming close to doubling the present 1.6 million.

New car sales would rise from the 1969 figure of 9.3 million to a level of close to 14 million 10 years later. And the number of vehicles on the road is expected to increase 35 per cent, from a base of approximately 84 million today, that would mean a vehicle total approaching 120 million by the end of the decade.

Obviously, these manifestations of greater wealth will also intensify some of the problems of human life which I referred to earlier: problems of traffic, transportation in general, urban congestion, pollution and the like.

Americans in the 1970s are going to have to make a massive attack on the problem of saving the cities—modernizing them, breathing new life into them, wiping out the slums. I believe this effort will be made, if for no other reason than that it will no longer be possible to avoid doing so. In fact, the starting steps have already been taken in many places—in the urban renewal projects like Denver's and those of other cities. The downtown centers of the cities—again, like Denver's—will in the 1970s be transformed into much more attractive places to work, shop and play, places with malls and plazas and parks.

There will have to be major advances in mass transit. Already we are facing what Sen. Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island has called a "crisis in passenger transportation." He has warned that the problem won't be solved by building bigger and faster jets and more freeways. If anything, these just add to the strains. Traffic in the air, like traffic on the ground, is already congested beyond belief and undoubtedly will get worse before it gets better. For example, during rush hours it can take as long (50 minutes) to get to National Airport in Washington, and from LaGuardia airport to New York City, as it does to fly between these two airports.

One attractive-looking possible solution to the problem of interurban transit in densely populated corridors such as the Boston-New York-Washington, Cleveland-Chicago-Detroit, and Los Angeles-San Francisco areas, would be the use of clean, efficient, high-speed electric trains such as those that work so successfully in Japan.

Within the cities, the glut of traffic has been getting more and more unmanageable. With the addition of perhaps as many as 30 to 35 million more vehicles in the next decade, the situation should become a matter of life-or-death priority for any city. It is hard to imagine a large, thriving metropolis of the 1970s without a good rapid transit system.

Not long ago, experts in the Department

of Transportation figured it would take at least \$37 billion over the next five years to make a start on cleaning up the domestic transportation situation: \$5 billion for the corridor trains, \$5 billion for airports, \$5 billion for automated flight control (for greater air safety), \$8 billion for mass transit, and the rest for bus transit, fringe parking and related needs.

But if urban blight and transit problems are cause for concern, they are also challenges and opportunities, too. For in the process of solving them, we will not only be providing essential jobs for a labor force which is expected to grow to nearly 100 million by the end of the decade (from the present 84 million) but we will be helping to build a new life for millions of our fellow citizens as well.

Much the same could be said about the problems and challenges of education. Education is vital to a well-functioning society. As H. G. Wells once remarked, civilization is "a race between education and disaster." America is in such a race, and unfortunately, as Secretary Robert Finch of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has acknowledged, American education has fallen 50 years out of date. Gov. James Rhodes of Ohio says education is 100 years out of date. This certainly has been one of the contributing factors to the student unrest of the 1960s.

In the processing of updating our educational system in the 1970s, Americans will find the problem complicated by the growing demand for facilities. Whereas 30 years ago only 12 per cent of our high school graduates went to college, and today 70 per cent go, by the middle of the coming decade the figure will reach 80 per cent. For many of those who go, a great need will be professional and technical training. This is increasingly the demand of the labor market. Thanks to better education and training all along the line, American workers in the 1970s will be better skilled and more adaptive to change—and many people who are now classified as poor will be stepping up to share in the more bountiful mass market.

As we use our resources to make life more pleasant we do, as part of the same process, manage to foul our streams, poison our air and threaten the very balance of nature. We could, in effect, be burying ourselves in our own gunk and junk.

We are building mountains of trash and garbage. An average family accumulates a ton and a half of garbage and rubbish a year. Per capita garbage production is growing enormously. It has doubled since 1920; increased 60 per cent just since 1950. Dr. Melvin First of the Harvard School of Public Health estimates that the national production of solid waste in urban areas alone amounts to over 800 million pounds daily. And, he says, this will probably rise to three times that figure by the end of the decade.

The growth of garbage and litter in America has brought forth some graphic comparisons. *Nation's Business* estimated that a one-year accumulation of garbage, rubbish and scrap in the United States would "fill the Panama Canal four times." The total from California alone, more than 71 million tons a year, would according to *Solid Wastes Management*, make a mass of "100 feet wide and 30 feet high from Oregon to the Mexican border." Another source estimated that America's annual litter itself would make a five-foot drift extending from New York to Seattle.

Disposal of solid wastes costs our cities some \$4.5 billion a year, and the task is growing costlier as ground available for disposal becomes scarce. In the decade ahead, one of the truly urgent tasks will be to find ways to re-cycle solid waste. That is, everything possible would be reused in some way. One authority has estimated that in 10 years

all but 5 to 10 per cent of household garbage could be reclaimed in one way or another.

Pollution of the air has contributed to widespread illness. Today the death rates from certain lung ailments are nine times what they were 20 years ago. Dr. John T. Middleton, commissioner of the National Air Pollution Control Administration, says the air pollution threat to health is "daily, insidious, usually unnoticed in the early stages, and it affects millions."

Studies in recent years indicate that sources in the United States expel some 190 million tons of pollutants into the air in a year.

Half of the total comes from mobile sources, mainly autos. They give off the most prevalent pollutant, carbon monoxide—which is colorless, odorless, tasteless and deadly. Vehicles also give off substantial amounts of hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides which are key ingredients in the production of smog.

With the expected 35 per cent increase of vehicles of all sorts, experts have estimated that in the next six years the United States alone could throw more than a billion tons of such pollutants into the air.

I should emphasize that the United States, while a major polluter of the air, is far from the only one on Earth. Every important industrial nation (and that includes the Soviet Union, Japan and Germany) and a good many lesser ones add significantly to the problem. That fact was brought home to me very graphically recently when I was flying over the Turkish mountains and saw in the sky below the plane the same familiar brown streak of smog and pollution I had noticed many times in flights across the United States.

But it is not just the industrial nations that are threatened. Meteorologists have discovered evidence that pollution particles of the sort found over urban and industrial centers are spreading across the continents and slowly encircling the Earth.

So serious is the potential danger that some scientists fear we may be changing the very nature of the air, that the atmosphere of the Earth may be undergoing changes which could have irreversible catastrophic effects.

Some believe the changing composition of the atmosphere could prevent the Earth's heat from escaping into space, causing more melting of the polar ice caps and raise oceans as much as 400 feet—drowning many cities. Others predict the Earth will cool as sunlight is blocked by the increased concentration of particulates, bringing on more rain and hail and possibly leading to a decrease in the food supply.

At any rate, it is safe to predict that Americans will be showing a greater concern in the decade ahead for the protection and preservation of the human environment, for they will be seeing more clearly than ever before the evidence of the harmful effects of misuse of man's natural surroundings.

The American people in the 1970s will be better educated, earn more income and have more leisure time. Consequently, they can certainly be expected to do more foreign travel. Travel specialists estimate that spending by Americans for trips abroad will more than double in the decade ahead, from the present \$5 billion a year to upwards of \$11 billion. The additional millions of Americans who travel overseas will be riding in the new jumbo jetliners which will carry from 250 to 500 passengers. The larger passenger loads should make lower fares possible—which in turn would encourage more people who have never traveled abroad to do so.

Later on in the decade the supersonic jets will come along. Chances are the British-French and Russian models will precede the American entry, which could be in service by 1978. We can also look for the adoption of short takeoff and landing and vertical takeoff

and landing craft for use on short passenger and freight hauls and from smaller fields.

In order, however, for this air travel boom of the 1970s to come to pass, considerable progress will have to be made in relieving the congestion of air space and airports. Like many another traveler, I have had the experience of circling Chicago's O'Hare field or New York J.F.K. for hours waiting for clearance to land, or waiting so long to take off that the pilot felt compelled to give the passengers periodic "progress" reports as to how close the plane was to the head of the line on the runway.

With the bigger planes bringing in bigger loads of passengers in the 1970s there will have to be great improvements in airport procedures. More efficient ticketing and baggage handling, for example—perhaps through the use of computers and more automation—is a must if customers are not to be subjected to unacceptable delays.

The decade of the 1970s will bring us closer to, if not actually take us to the point of, actual space journeying. I know this sounds fantastic to us now, but here is what Dr. George E. Mueller, associate administrator of NASA, has said about it:

"Within the next decade, I would believe . . . that a low cost transportation system will be in operation between the planet Earth and Moon. It should take no more than a second generation of the space shuttle to bring any point on Earth to within an hour's travel to any other point on Earth. By the end of this decade, the Moon could be, and I believe will be, regularly visited."

Forecasts of the progress man will make in space are, in a way, easier than predictions about what he will do on Earth—in part because predictions about scientific advancements of this sort characteristically err on the conservative side, and in part because we do know a good deal about plans that are already on the boards.

For example, it is evident that both the United States and the Soviet Union will be operating Earth-orbiting workshops and laboratories in the next decade. The Russians have already conducted experiments on orbital assembly work, and NASA hopes to launch the first of our Earth-circling labs in 1972. These space stations will contain crews of six to 12 men, who will live and conduct experiments aboard over considerable periods of time.

Chances are there will be orbiting space stations around the Moon, too, and that men will make frequent trips in reusable, nuclear-powered vehicles from Earth to Earth-orbit station, from Earth-orbit station to Moon-orbit station, and back and forth between the Moon and the Moon-orbit station.

The Moon itself in the 1970s will be an important base for study of the Earth, for study of the mysteries of the universe, and for launching further exploration of the solar system. Such a launching pad is of tremendous value since most of the fuel used in probing space has to be expended in getting beyond the gravitational pull of the Earth itself.

Early in the decade we will be sending unmanned craft to the surface of Mars on information-gathering missions. And by the end of the decade, or shortly thereafter, may come the first manned landing on the red planet.

Unmanned spacecraft will be sent on probes past Mars, to Jupiter, Saturn—and beyond. It is very likely, for examples, that men will take advantage of a rare alignment of planets in 1978 which will enable us to send spacecraft skimming from gravitational field to gravitational field past Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus and Neptune while transmitting priceless pictures and other data about these distant planets.

The fantastic developments in space will—as they have in the recent past—continue to produce research spinoffs applicable to life on Earth. Among the most obvious will be the applications to communication technology. The live television transmissions from Apollo 11 on the Moon, 250,000 miles from Earth, were only the beginning of fabulous things to come.

These transmissions, you recall, were sent from outer space to a communications satellite which then relayed them around the world. An estimated 600 million men, women and children were thus enabled to witness man's first step on the Moon.

In 1970 a potential worldwide television audience of 1 billion persons in 40 countries will be available through intercontinental network links, according to a recent report done for the Department of State. And not long thereafter, said the report, new communications systems—and a worldwide hookup by satellite—will make possible instant contact with every quarter of the globe.

Instant worldwide contact is something awesome to contemplate. Its effects are difficult, almost impossible, to predict—except that they will be profound. It would truly bring the world to the point where it would be, in Marshall McLuhan's term, a "global village." It could, at long last, serve to knit the human race together. Or it could trigger the most violent reactions. Indeed, both kinds of results are possible.

In the past decade in America we have seen some of the turmoil and trauma that has resulted—at least in part—from the exposure of masses of people to the emotional experience of comparing the reality of their lives to life as it is portrayed on television.

Before we have had the chance to measure, with anything like scientific reliability, the full effects of this sort of exposure in our own country we may be experiencing similar results on a world scale.

In the days when Rome dominated the known world, it took a month for the news of the assassination of Julius Caesar to reach the outlying areas of the empire. Even when John Kennedy was killed in 1963, it was several hours before the whole world knew about it. But things that happen now are known within a matter of minutes and seconds.

Already, the "have-not" people everywhere grow more and more restless as they learn what the people in the "have" nations possess. How much more explosive, then, will their comparisons become when the disparities between the haves and have-nots—which are infinitely greater on a world scale than they are between richest and poorest in America—are beamed to them regularly and explicitly in living telecolor in the decade of the '70s.

Someone has speculated that the next world war will not be fought between Communists and non-Communists, or between races, but between the rich and the poor of the world, the haves and the have-nots. Whether such speculation comes true may depend a great deal on how we conduct ourselves as the world's leading nation.

I have purposely not referred to the problems of international relations in the decade ahead, mainly because of the immense complexity of the subject and the difficulties of predicting what may happen when there are so many unknowns. However, I do not wish to give the impression that foreign affairs are not relevant to our problems of survival and the quality of life in the 1970s.

Indeed, events abroad are not only relevant to Americans, but urgently so. I say this in the hope of discouraging a trend I detect among some Americans at least to turn away from the world's problems and concentrate instead on the domestic scene. This "neo-isolationism" may capture the fancy or suit the

mood of some people who have become discouraged with our often unsuccessful attempts to help set things right in the world (by our lights). To them I say that there is no more chance of Americans withdrawing in safety and security to our own national borders than there is of any one of us returning to the womb.

The world has become too small and too interlocked for us to run away from it. In fact, it is hard to imagine any international problem that is not also in some ways "domestic," or any American domestic problem that does not have international ramifications. Vietnam is almost too obvious an example of one that is both an international and domestic problem for us. How about our economic problems? Does anyone still believe they do not affect the economic well-being of people all over the globe? And are we not likely to feel the effect of what happens to Middle Eastern oil, Cuban sugar, East German industrial equipment and production or Chinese H-bombs?

Certainly we would feel the effect. I have been saying for years to my journalistic colleagues that all news is local. But it is only in recent years that I have really realized how disturbingly true that is. We have now reached the point where almost anything that happens overseas is immediately reflected at home. Therefore, before I bring this lengthy article to a close, I do want to make the point that what happens to America in the 1970s and all the decades ahead more and more depends on what happened to the world. Thus the critical importance to our future of our approach to foreign policy.

Our behavior in foreign affairs in the '70s will of course be affected by events which we cannot now foresee. But it will also be influenced strongly by the tone being set by the administration now in power in Washington. More and more it becomes evident that an important tenet of the Nixon administration is to avoid the avoidable conflicts, to keep from being boxed in or forced unnecessarily to the brink of disaster—without at the same time withdrawing into a position of isolation.

Flexibility appears to be the key. The United States would deal with its friends, or anyone else—where the others showed a willingness to cooperate toward solving mutual problems. Such an approach would seem—in theory at least—to make possible an era of lessening tensions. It would be compatible with the reduction, and even elimination, of America's role as a combatant in Vietnam even as our nation tried to maintain some other kind of "presence" in Asia. It would be compatible with Big Power resolution of the conflict in the Middle East.

It could, if successful, tend to promote domestic tranquility in the United States and permit America to devote its energies to the solution of such urgent problems of the '70s as I have tried to outline in this article.

My deep hope is that it will.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED STATES JAYCEES

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join in the nationwide tribute to the United States Jaycees who are observing their 50th anniversary in meetings all across the Nation this week.

Many pages of the RECORD could be filled with the accomplishments of these

young men of action. They have been an effective third force in American life, organizing the energy and ability of individual citizens to give leadership in community and nationwide activities outside the scope of Government agencies.

I can testify personally to their many fine activities in my own county and State, and I take this occasion to say thank you to the Jaycees, both past and present, for their dedication to the welfare of the national community.

MANHATTAN BOROUGH PRESIDENT PLEADS CASE FOR ISRAEL

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the unrest in the Middle East, particularly as it applies to Israel, is of concern to all of us.

The story of the struggle of Israel over the years is well known. There is a solution to this problem, but it is not going to be brought about by outsiders alone. It cannot be prearranged. Israel must be a party to any lasting agreement that is worked out.

The American Jewish Congress held a "Rally for the Security of Israel" in New York City on Jan. 11. The main speaker was Manhattan Borough President Percy E. Sutton, who made an excellent presentation of the case for the support of Israel. Following is the text of Mr. Sutton's address:

ADDRESS BY MANHATTAN BOROUGH PRESIDENT
PERCY E. SUTTON

It is with great concern but also great hope that I speak to you today.

I am filled with concern because I see the military forays by the Arab governments and their guerilla fighter and the military raids by Israel as posing a terrible threat to the existence of both the Arab and Israeli peoples.

I see the protracted war in the Middle East costing lives, money, resources and energy.

I know that the war cannot continue, for the nations of the Middle East cannot live in the insecurity and fear and destruction of war without causing serious damage to the well-being of their inhabitants and creating permanent and indelible animosities.

I come here this afternoon filled with hope because I believe firmly in the possibility of a peaceful settlement of the war in the Middle East, the possibility of a just solution to the problem of the Palestinian refugees, the possibility of establishing secure, permanent and definite guarantees of the sovereignty of the nation of Israel.

IMPRESSED ON HIS VISIT

When I visited Israel two years ago, I was greatly impressed by her vigor, her strength, her achievements and her spirit. Israel is a nation of greatness, for she has combined the ancient and rich traditions of the Jewish people with unremitting toil and advanced technology and a zeal for experimentation. She has built herself up out of the barren lands into a giant of progress and humanity.

There is much that we can learn from Israel, much that she can teach us. Her strides in educating and training her citizens before they are released from military service is an example that we would do well to follow here

in the United States with regard to our own GIs.

The prime task that we must face in order to guarantee the preservation and indeed expansion of Israel's greatness is to convince the Arab nations that it is a dangerous and self-destructive delusion to think that Israel can ever be eliminated.

ONLY ONE WAY TO PEACE

Peace can only come to the Middle East when the Arab nations accept unequivocally the reality that Israel is a nation and that her rights as a sovereign state cannot be abridged.

This peace that we so urgently seek can only come about if the United States maintains a stance of full commitment to the survival of Israel, and does not let "oil diplomacy" sway its policy.

After all of the sufferings of the Second World War; after the struggle for independence; after more than twenty years of crisis and threat; and after the third war in a generation—after all this, the United States cannot abandon Israel.

The United States cannot let the influence of the banking interests and the oil interests change its long-standing pledge to back Israel in her struggle for final peace settlement with security.

OTHERS CANNOT SHAPE SETTLEMENT

A final settlement to the decades of hostility and war between Israel and the Arab nations can only be achieved if the parties involved follow the time-honored and time-tested tradition of settling disputes—sitting down at the bargaining table and hammering out an agreement.

A settlement pre-arranged by the Big Four Powers and agreed to through a complicated method of intermediaries cannot be a lasting settlement—it can only serve as a temporary military armistice, which in the long run will guarantee further misunderstanding and further bloodshed.

Secretary of State Rogers must recognize the unworkability of his 12-point proposal. It cannot work because it is a scheme conceived by a third party which would be negotiated through third-party mechanisms.

Israel is rightly refusing to accept this fairy-tale of a proposal, for Israel knows from bitter experience that the harsh reality of the Middle East crisis can only be resolved if it is faced directly by the nations involved.

Secretary Rogers must recognize the arrogance of his proposal, for it is nothing but arrogance to assume that Israel will give up its trump card, its occupation of Arab territories, before the Arab nations have demonstrated their willingness to recognize Israel by agreeing to direct negotiations.

JUST MORE PAPER ASSURANCES

Secretary Roger's proposal offers only paper assurances that Israel will never again face a challenge to her very existence.

Israel has had enough of paper assurances—for all the paper assurances of the past which were supposedly signed in "good faith" have brought Israel only more fighting and more war.

Israel is a gallant democracy and a shining light of progress. She has worked miracles: she has made the deserts bloom; she has established herself as a homeland for the Jews of the world; she has made the world admire her for her courage and determination.

Israel cannot be sold out to the Wall Street interests—and we must not let the U.S. make the mistake of thinking that it can ever sell out Israel.

We must make our voices heard, loud and unmistakably clear.

We must urge the State Department to reverse its recent decision and continue its previous policy of unflinching support for Israel and her demands to be recognized as a sovereign nation.

BUSINESS IS RESPONSIBLE, TOO

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, today's Wall Street Journal includes an article well worth noting authored by chairman of the First National Bank of Chicago, Gaylord A. Freeman, Jr. In his article, part of a speech to the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce, Freeman recognizes an economic fact of life that his colleagues in business sometimes appear to overlook: Government alone cannot keep the economy on a stable course. When talk turns to the economy in Washington these days, there is much discussion about the need for the Federal Government to set national priorities, to restrain spending, to use its economic powers more effectively.

But Government can only provide part of the answer. Certainly, business activity is a major influence on the course of the economy, and business policies are central to economic solutions. As Freeman describes it to his business colleagues:

The fact is, "we cats do have clout."

Freeman goes on to exhort businessmen to accept the responsibility that goes with the "clout," to exercise restraint in their capital expenditures, and to justify the investment that is made on the basis of the economic and social needs of the Nation.

His concluding remarks to the business community are especially significant:

Thus the message is "Let's get committed. This is our country. This is our society. Let's improve it and, by improving it for all of the people, we can preserve it not only for ourselves but for all citizens. The job is expected of us, and its accomplishment will be deeply rewarding."

Mr. Speaker, this is an important article and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

FOR BUSINESS, A CALL TO COMMITMENT

(By Gaylord A. Freeman Jr.)

If we were to step back from the immediate and consuming interest in our business and look at the conditions necessary for our success, we would realize that in order to make a profit—which is the basis of our present economy—we need a political system in which private property is respected and private profits are legally permitted, and economic conditions sufficiently stable that profits are possible and have continuing value.

We take these two conditions for granted and just assume their continuation—but we should not do so.

There is nothing in either the Ten Commandments or the United States Constitution that guarantees private property. There is nothing in the history, or present condition, of man that assures stability in the value of our currency or a continuation of our economic assumptions. If at any time the majority of our citizens—including our sons and daughters—should conclude that they would be better off under some other economic system, then our system will be changed.

If the majority of our people place full employment and rapid national growth ahead of monetary stability and, later,

ahead of economic stability, then profits will no longer be economically possible or of continuing value.

Any fundamental change in our society seems so improbable that it may appear foolish to worry about the possibility. Perhaps so. But I do have some concern about the attitude of many honest, conscientious citizens—and not just those who are young or black—who see in the war in Vietnam, the continuing poverty of millions in this most affluent of societies, the pollution of our air and water, evidence of failure of our entire system and a reason for fundamental change.

I think our people are capable of understanding the merits of freedom, which is the basis of our system, if someone reminds them of its values, and someone improves the existing conditions (of inequality, poverty, and pollution).

That "someone" has to be us—or it is no one. Who else has an equivalent motivation of self-interest to try to accomplish this?

JUSTIFYING CORPORATE SPENDING

The question is properly asked: "What right does a corporate executive have to spend his corporation's funds (or the time of his executives, who are paid by the stockholders) to achieve a cause which he thinks is appropriate?" My point is that the use of stockholders' assets to improve the society can be justified if the societal improvement redounds to the benefit of the corporation and redounds in some reasonable relationship to the expenditure—hopefully, at least, dollar for dollar. If by an expenditure of \$25,000 or \$2,500,000 or \$25,000,000 (depending on its size) a corporation could substantially contribute to the continuation of the opportunity to conduct a profitable business for the next 100 years, the investment clearly would be justified.

If, on the other hand, the cause is just "a good cause," with no prospect of enhancing future earnings, then (unless it causes others to bring you additional profitable business—or it induces others to make social contributions which do enhance your earnings—or it can be supported as a form of compensation to your employees), it is an unjustified gift of funds belonging to the stockholders.

Much of the student criticism, the black criticism, the academic criticism of business is not a criticism of our business or our profit motivation, but, on the contrary, a criticism of our failure to utilize our magnificent business organizations to achieve ever-widening public purposes.

Whether or not we want to improve the society, whether or not we are motivated by self-interest in doing so, it is now expected of us. And if we fail to accept this responsibility, we will lose much of the public's confidence in the value of our private enterprise system.

The entrepreneurs who built the railroads were the giants of a century. They may not have observed all of the niceties of our current mores but they bulldozed through their lines; they built cities; they set the tax rates; they chose the Senators; and they built a nation. Magnificent! But they didn't care about the customer. Their social attitude was reflected by Vanderbilt when he exploded—"The public be damned!" That was a mistake. The individually insignificant farmers banded together and founded the Grange movement. One of their first purposes was to get the power of the railroads curtailed and their rates regulated. The railroads have suffered ever since. Caught between rising labor costs and government regulated rates, they are being squeezed to death.

Let's not let that happen to the rest of us.

We businessmen are so completely absorbed by our businesses that we don't take time to think much about the non-business problems facing our society. "Why study these prob-

lems when we don't have the time? Besides, in the last analysis, they are pretty simple."

There is a great temptation for us over-committed businessmen to accept the ready-made convictions of our friends in the company or at the country club and, consequently, to avoid the necessity for the hard analytical thought which we reserve for our business problems.

This isn't a new phenomenon. As James Harvey Robinson pointed out many years ago: "Few of us take the pains to study the origin of our cherished convictions; indeed, we have a natural repugnance to so doing. We like to continue to believe what we have been accustomed to accept as true, and the resentment aroused when doubt is cast upon any of our assumptions leads us to seek every manner of excuse for clinging to them. The result is that most of our so-called reasoning consists in finding arguments for going on believing as we already do."

A Secretary of the Treasury once said to me that he thought that we should terminate the tax exemption of all universities because they were all full of liberals ("Pinkos" I think he called them). Think just a minute. If all the university people had to follow one line of thought, who would suffer the most? We would. We, the less than one per cent who have the greatest benefits in this society. All that is required is to destroy freedom of thought, and we go down the drain with it. I don't know the solution to campus demonstration or the indefensible destruction of property or the disruption of teaching of those who want to learn, but I do know that the universities are our greatest defense—not because professors or students like us (generally they don't), but because they preserve the anarchy of freedom of thought and expression without which we could never demonstrate the importance of the freedom of individual initiative and the resulting social benefits.

THE FREEDOM TO DIFFER

And I suspect that related to our tendency to accept standardized, simplistic attitudes is a similar tendency to lump many quite heterogeneous groups into one mold. At the same moment that we cheer for individual freedom, we may criticize the boy who grows a beard or the girl who demonstrates for peace. We must be careful to preserve the freedom to differ as well as the freedom to conform.

Many of us lived through the depression. Those of us older ones who had to walk the streets looking for a job will never forget the experience. Perhaps that makes security, hence job tenure, hence conformity, too important. The young people today want "to do their own thing." They want to dress and live their own way, at least, for a while. They don't have our fear of losing a job—they can get another one without missing a day's pay. Some of these attitudes will change as they grow older, but some will not.

We are, undoubtedly, entering a period with less emphasis on production of goods and with greater emphasis on culture, leisure, individual self-expression—on the quality of life. Even our labor negotiations will have to offer individual employees more individual options at the expense of our paternal security. This rattles us. But it shouldn't. It is merely an expression of the wider affluence—a recognition by a larger number of our people of the very values which we have always defended for ourselves—individual freedom.

We have all read of "powerful business interests" and figured it referred to some people we didn't know. We have had acquaintances refer to our positions as positions of power and influence and we have tried to look a little important while secretly we thought the remarks greatly exaggerated.

But the fact was brought home to me a little while ago when, with a few other business leaders, I was negotiating with a group of blacks. One of them said:

"I don't like you honkies, but we have to deal with you. City Hall has got it made, and they don't want to change nuthin'. The guys in the churches are soft-hearted, but they are also soft-headed and have no power. The professors study everything but never follow through with any conclusion. The Federal Government guys are interested, but when it comes right down to the punch, they're afraid to take action for political reasons. So there's nobody else left to talk to but you guys who represent the Establishment that we're supposed to be fighting. The fact it, you cats got the clout."

I have thought about that a good deal since. We do have some clout, some power. We have the economic power to hire, to invest, to locate a plant, etc., which decisions are invariably made on such a strict dollar and cents basis that we don't think of it as power. We never think of using this for our personal benefit so we never think of it as personal power.

BUSINESS PREROGATIVES

As the head of a business, you can ask other leaders to lunch (at company expense), and if they are free, they will come. If it is inconvenient for them, you can send a car (with a company driver) to get them. If you want to urge the Mayor or the Governor to take a certain action, you can call him on the phone and he will at least listen to you. Or you can get the chamber of commerce or your trade association to mobilize other opinions and communicate with the official.

The fact is, "we cats do have clout." We don't have as much as outsiders may think and we don't use it indiscriminately, but we do have it.

But we have it only when we feel committed. We influence others only if we are willing to put up the first \$25,000 or give the time of two vice presidents or otherwise indicate that this project is of great importance to us.

Thus, the message is: "Let's get committed. This is our country. This is our society. Let's improve it and, by improving it for all of the people, we can preserve it not only for ourselves but for all citizens. The job is expected of us, and its accomplishment will be deeply rewarding."

PRYING FOR A PURPOSE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that we have reconvened, a matter which should have attention is the House-approved census bill which has not yet been acted upon by the Senate.

A most objective commentary on the House-passed bill was carried in the Monday, January 12 edition of the Chicago Daily News. As one of the cosponsors of the bill, I was pleased to note such powerful and effective editorial commentary. The editorial follows:

PRYING FOR A PURPOSE

Americans cherish their privacy, and this year when the census takers begin asking whether the family bathroom is shared with another household, or how many babies the lady of the house has had, a certain amount of fur is bound to fly.

The questions are not mischievous; the picture gained by the census is invaluable as a guide to governmental policies and planning. But the Senate could take much of the heat off the process by completing action on a bill tightening security precautions and

easing penalties against uncooperative citizens. Such a measure, aimed at bolstering the individual's right of privacy, passed the House in September but remained bottled up in the upper chamber.

To safeguard the confidential nature of the count, the bill would toughen the criminal penalties against any census employees who wrongfully disclose information about individuals. The long-standing maximum penalties of a \$1,000 fine and/or two years of imprisonment would be boosted to \$5,000 and five years. The \$100 fine for persons refusing to answer questions would be retained in some instances, but the provision for a jail sentence of up to 60 days would be eliminated. The fine has been imposed only twice in this century, the jail penalty never.

The House bill makes sense. The jail penalty for individuals is supposed to act as a "psychological deterrent" against the withholding of pertinent data. The record of prosecutions would seem to indicate clearly that the \$100 fine is deterrent enough.

Charges of unwarranted snooping into financial affairs were originally raised in 1940, when the census for the first time asked questions about income and property of a small sampling of Americans—as is planned in 1970. Complaints about the length of census questionnaires are as old as the census itself.

Sec. of Commerce Maurice H. Stans has pointed out that the number of questions to be asked of the average family is about the same as in 1960 and, in fact, there will be far fewer questions than in any other count in the past 100 years. Four out of five households will be asked only 23 questions, confined to name, address, age, race, sex and data on housing conditions. One family out of four will be asked additional information—adding up to 66 questions—on income, employment and standard of living. One household out of 20 will be asked to answer 73 questions—and a selected few will have a maximum of 89.

In a computerized age when gigantic data banks on individuals are being maintained by credit and insurance agencies there is an understandable public fear of Big Brother. But it shouldn't be misdirected against the Census Bureau, which is closely circumscribed by law. The information it gathers is an indispensable tool in resolving the nation's complex social, economic and political problems.

To set the public minds at ease, and maintain the integrity of the census, President Nixon should push the House-approved bill, or some equivalent measure, in the Senate.

IT IS TIME FOR ACTION

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the Washington News of January 20 carried an editorial on crime which I consider so important I feel it is must reading for all who are concerned with this vital problem. The editorial follows:

THE WAR ON CRIME: 1 YEAR LATER—IT IS TIME FOR ACTION

President Nixon was inaugurated one year ago today. He had been elected two months earlier on a platform which featured his declaration of a War on Crime. In a front page editorial we welcomed the new President's return to the city he knew so well, and his selection of it as a principal battlefield in the War on Crime he had led us to expect.

It is time now, one year later, to take an accounting.

It is time for the rhetoric to end.

It is time for partisan fingerpointing to end.

It is time for some action.

During this interval, crime rates in the nation and in the Federal City have soared to unprecedented heights. In 1969, in Washington, one murder was committed every 30 hours, an armed robbery took place 20 times a day, a woman was raped each day.

In 1969, the Nixon Administration submitted to Congress, after some six months' preparation, an inventory of legislative weapons it said it needed to prosecute the War on Crime.

On Oct. 9, in response to mounting public outrage and to his own often-repeated concerns, Mr. Nixon summoned the leaders of Congress and officials of Washington to a White House strategy session. Its purpose was to get bipartisan momentum rolling for the stalled anti-crime bills.

Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson, as we noted daily on Page One in our ensuing "Crime Crisis Countdown," told this prestigious gathering: "The total system of justice must be treated. . . . My greatest fear is that Congress may go home without this being done."

His fear was realized on Christmas Eve, 76 days after that emergency meeting. The Senate had acted. But the House of Representatives had not.

The second session of the 91st Congress opened yesterday. There has been speculation, based on the solemn promises of leaders on both sides of the aisle, that Congress will complete action on the War on Crime legislation this year. Our hope that this will come to pass is mixed with skepticism because the same promises, made one year ago today, did not come to pass.

The victimized public can be reassured only by action.

We recognize that parts of the anti-crime package have raised some constitutional doubts. . . . the provisions for greater license for wire-tapping and for pre-trial detention, for example. But much of the package is not controversial, or should not be. . . . more police, more courts, a variety of attacks against syndicate crime, easing the lot of prosecutors, tougher penalties for the habitual criminal and for crimes of violence (particularly when guns are involved), and tougher measures against hard dope traffic.

There is no reason—no acceptable excuse—why the non-controversial bills should not be passed within the opening days of this session. In the past 365 days, ample attention has been paid to the problems of drafting this legislation by the Republican-controlled Department of Justice, and to its examination by the Democratic-controlled Congress. We'll buy the need to delay for those reasons—up to this point. But we will not buy any further delay. Congressmen reading the polls and weighing the outcome of recent off-year elections must realize that they may engage in further partisan bickering and legislative delay at their peril in the November general elections.

If further study is needed for those few controversial aspects of the proposed legislation. . . well, all right. . . but let's get on with committee study as the first order of business, and clear the way for prompt action on the floor.

It is time, too, to go beyond the cops-and-courts aspects of the War on Crime. We insist, as we did in that Open Letter to Mr. Nixon one year ago today, that the criminal be caught and prosecuted. We also want him, whenever possible, to be rehabilitated so that he will not return to the streets a more embittered and expert criminal.

In the heat of partisanship, the cause of law and order has suffered. Motives of both the "hardliners" and the "do-gooders" have

been challenged. Justice, we repeat ourselves, means two things: it means that the innocent shall go free and that the guilty shall pay the price of their guilt.

No issue on the Hill has higher priority. No positive response will gain greater favor with the public.

To get very, very elementary, the physical well-being, the lives, even, of many Americans are at stake. So, of course, is the vitality of Our Town of Washington, and every other core of the great metropolitan areas of our nation. So, too, is the future of our democratic society.

A COMMUNITY'S GENEROSITY ATTRACTS INDUSTRY

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, while the "people helping people" aspect of a United Fund Campaign is familiar to all, I believe few of us stop to think what a successful campaign can mean for the economic growth of a community. It can be an important consideration in attracting new industry to an area.

This point is emphasized by the Fall River Herald News in an editorial which proudly hails the success of the recent United Fund Campaign for the Greater Fall River area.

It was a success which "will not go unnoticed beyond the confines of Greater Fall River," the newspaper observes.

As the editorial points out, the success of a United Fund drive is something that is well noted by industrialists seeking areas in which to locate. Increasingly, it explains, industries are inquiring about local support for United Fund efforts as an indicator of a community's health and the attitude of citizens toward their responsibilities to their fellow men.

Greater Fall River outdid itself this year. For the first time in local history, the United Fund Campaign passed the half million dollar mark. The total surpassed the \$525,770 goal.

The contributions by residents of Fall River, Assonet, Somerset, Swansea, and Westport support 28 United Fund agencies.

Obviously, I share the hope of the Fall River Herald News that this outstanding achievement will have additional benefits in terms of attracting new industry to this area. The editorial of January 16, 1970, reads as follows:

FOR FALL RIVER AREA—A DAY TO BE PROUD

Greater Fall Riverites can be proud today. The announcement that the United Fund quota—the largest ever—has been attained and exceeded is one that must gratify every person in the area.

The success of the United Fund campaign is attributable to the leaders whose planning and direction were superb, the workers whose diligence and devotion never lagged, and most of all the people in all walks of life who gave through the payroll deduction plan or in direct contributions.

It was an area wide effort that will not go unnoticed beyond the confines of Greater Fall River.

Many people have the impression that the success of a United Fund drive is something of newsworthy note for a day—something to be filed and forgotten.

This is not true. The success of the United Fund campaign has greater meaning.

It assures the many organizations comprising the fund that there will be sufficient money for their continued operation.

It guarantees those served by the United Fund agencies that their needs will continue to get required attention.

It is people helping people. And more, it is people helping themselves. For the success of a United Fund drive is something that is well noted by industrialists seeking areas in which to locate.

Industrial development authorities have come to expect a prospect to inquire what the people of an area have done in support of their United Fund campaign. And when the campaign succeeds as has the 1969 one in Greater Fall River, industrialists are made aware that the area's residents recognize and accept their responsibilities toward their fellow men.

It is indeed a definite plus in the unrelenting effort to attract industry.

We repeat Greater Fall Riverites indeed can stand proud today of the Page One news that the 1969 United Fund campaign soared beyond its goal.

It is a most encouraging and heart-warming story with which to usher in the new decade, a period which will become for this area the Successful Seventies.

PASSENGER BUSINESS BOOMING, BUT NOT FOR U.S. SHIPS

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, recently several additional U.S. passenger ships were laid up because owners had sustained great losses in their operations. The Miami News on January 9 carried an article on the booming cruise business which is going to foreign lines, out of Miami, who apparently find it quite lucrative.

This is a matter which our Merchant Marine Committee plans to look into in connection with a series of hearings scheduled on our maritime program and one which should be of concern to all of our Members.

For this reason I am including in the RECORD the article in the Miami News on this foreign cruise business:

[From the Miami News, Jan. 9, 1970]

NORWEGIANS STARTED THE BOOM AT PORT OF MIAMI: A TOAST TO THE CRUISE SHIPS—SKOAL

(By Larry Birger)

Miami is a long way from Oslo—and the climate's not exactly the same—yet a tiny but growing nucleus of Norwegian cruise ship owners is rapidly turning Florida's vacation capital into a financial happy sailing ground for their modern fleets as 1970 begins.

They, with the help of some good old Yankee promotional know-how, have made the new Port of Miami the home base for a burgeoning flotilla of "floating hotels" which in 1970 will carry as many as 575,000 holiday passengers on a schedule of 3- to 14-day cruises to the Bahamas and the Caribbean.

In fact, the Norwegians—through their success—have just about written an end to cruising from northern ports in winter by

persuading vacationers to fly instead to Miami to board ship rather than brave at least two cold and blustery days at sea—the time it takes to sail from New York to Nassau, calmer waters and warmer weather.

At the helm in spawning what probably is the fastest growing segment of the total travel industry in Klosters-Rederi, an Oslo-based company which has one ship, the 11,000-ton Sunward, making twice-weekly cruises to Nassau.

A second ship, the 15,000-ton Starward, makes a weekly voyage between Miami and Kingston, Jamaica; a third, the spanking-new 15,000-ton Skyward has just arrived for a weekly Miami-San Juan-St. Thomas cruise, and two more ships of similar size are to follow to cruise to as yet undecided ports in late 1970 and 1971.

Better known as Norwegian-Caribbean Lines, the 66-year-old firm is headed by Mogens Kloster and his nephew, Knut Klosters, and has invested upwards of \$100 million in the five-ship fleet.

Right behind them is another Oslo syndicate—I. M. Skaugens & Co.; Anders, Wilhelmssen & Co., and Gotaas-Larsen, a wholly-owned subsidiary of International Utilities, Inc., a Canadian conglomerate—which is plowing about \$50 million in a three-ship fleet under the colors of Royal Caribbean Cruise Line.

The 18,000-ton Song of Norway, launched two weeks ago in Helsinki, is scheduled to enter service in November, offering seven-day cruises to San Juan and St. Thomas. A sister ship, Nordic Prince, is due to follow in the summer of 1971 on a nine-island cruise of the Caribbean spanning 14 days. And a third of similar size, Sun Viking, will enter service in the fall of 1972, also on a two-week schedule out of Miami.

Gotaas-Larsen also owns Eastern Steamship Co., a Miami firm which has one ship, the 12,000-ton New Bahama Star, sailing twice weekly to Nassau, and the 7,500-ton Ariadne making twice-weekly sailing to Nassau out of Port Everglades, just north of Miami near Fort Lauderdale. In April, it will switch to alternate weekly cruises to Mexico and the Caribbean.

The Norwegians, though, are by no means the only operators in the race for the growing cruise ship traffic.

Commodore Cruise Line Ltd., a Bahamian firm headed up by Miami Beach hotelman Sanford Chobol, has the Boheme, an 11,000-ton ship built in West Germany for Swedish ship owner Olaf Wallenius, and is sailing her on a weekly schedule that takes in Freeport on Grand Bahama Island, San Juan, St. Thomas and back to Miami.

Chobel, too, is actively negotiating to charter two more vessels of similar size. One he would run on a 14-day cruise to Vera Cruz, with a seven-day stopover in Mexico, the second on seven-day sailings out of San Juan rather than Miami.

And Costa Line, of Genoa, Italy, has two ships in operation—the 16,000-ton Flavia, operating between Miami and Nassau, and the 20,000-ton Federico C, sailing a 14-day circuit out of Port Everglades through the Caribbean to as far south as the Panama Canal. Later this month, Costa will put a third ship, the 17,000-ton Fulvia, formerly the Oslo Fjord, on seven-day voyages out of San Juan.

But the catalyst for all the action that followed was the Klosters, who in early 1967 gambled that Miami—with a new port under construction—was ripe for a revival of the cruise ship trade that had just about succumbed three years earlier with the sinking of the ancient Yarmouth Castle and a fire aboard a just-as-elderly Viking Princess, causing the deaths of more than 100 passengers.

What happened was this: the Klosters had just come off a very successful summer with their first cruise ship, Sunward, hauling holiday passengers between England and Gibralt-

ar, when the British government instituted an austerity program to save the pound, in effect throttling any chance of a repeat the following year.

Meanwhile, in Miami, shipping agent Ted Arison was in search of a vessel to replace the MV Nili which through no fault of his was confiscated by its owner, the Israel government, because the owner was in default.

Arison, spotting an item in a travel magazine that Klosters-Rederi was having difficulty finding a port from which to cruise, convinced Knut during the course of a one-hour phone conversation to come to Miami. That weekend, they made a deal to bring the Sunward on a four-month trial over the winter season of 1966-67.

"Our first cruise was 75 per cent occupied (65 per cent is break-even) and the next was a sellout," Knut Klosters recalls. "We decided then to extend to a full year and within six months we signed a contract to build the Starward and bring her into the Miami market."

The decision to build three more ships was made in 1968, on the strength of traffic forecasts by Arison that proved amazingly accurate. Sunward ran with an 80 per cent occupancy in 1967, a startlingly 95 per cent in 1968 and, combined with Starward, 90 per cent through the first 11 months of 1969.

They weren't, however, to enter service under the original scheme until 1971-72-73. "But business proved to be so good (revenues of \$4.5 million in 1967, \$5 million in 1968 and \$12 million with two ships last year, and profits to match) that we decided to move the timetable up by two years," says Klosters.

Aside from convincing the public to alter its cruising habits by sailing out of Miami rather than New York, Klosters and Arison believe the construction of the modern-day cruise ship, operated as a floating hotel with the middle-class traveler in mind, has been the key to their success.

They cite, for example, that Sunward was the first to offer a private shower and toilet in every cabin, portholes on every outside stateroom, well-decorated public rooms, free nightclub shows, sauna baths, a swimming pool, a cocktail party, slot machines and a host of other extras—and all at reasonable prices (generally, about \$40 a day per person).

But they also feel they are doing well for a number of other reasons:

The Bahamas and Caribbean offer a year-round travel market, vs. a four- to five-month season in Europe, even in the Mediterranean.

The ships fly the Norwegian flag, which from the standpoint of safety on the high seas gives the public a feeling of confidence.

Travel agents are closely cultivated, and they in turn sell 95 per cent of the out-of-state business (tourists who come to Florida with plans to spend at least part of their vacation on a cruise) and 50 per cent in-state.

The market for conventions and incentive sales meetings is proving to be extremely lucrative and only now is beginning to be tapped.

Obviously, success breeds copiers, which has certainly been the case in the cruise ship industry. Klosters likes to say there is a "peculiar similarity" between the Starward and all of the ships now proposed or being built.

Since Norwegian-Caribbean has set its sights on 20-25 per cent of what eventually is expected to be a \$200 million market (a million passengers by 1975 at \$200 a throw), it looks for revenues by that time of \$40-\$50 million annually.

On the other hand, in entering the market somewhat tardily, Royal Caribbean hopes to make it up by selling potential passengers—and conventioners—on the fact that its ships will be newer, somewhat larger (18,000 tons vs. 15,000 tons for Norwegian-Caribbean) and thus more roomy and luxurious.

As Edwin W. Stephens, exec. vice pres. of Royal Caribbean, points out: "We believe our size is the most economical in which to operate while still giving our passengers the proper atmosphere and comfort in sailing to the islands."

During the upcoming season and through 1970, it's not anticipated that any of the operators will have difficulty in making money since the number of ships won't be anywhere near enough to meet the demand for berths based on forecasts by Irvin Stephens, director of the Port of Miami, that traffic, which rose 45 per cent in the fiscal year ended last Sept. 30, will be up another 25 per cent in 1970.

There are those operators, in fact, that don't see supply catching up with demand anytime soon, based on the premise that the cruise ship market is only now beginning to be tapped.

Chobol, operator of the Boheme, is one. "I think we'll see a market for all of these ships," he insists. "More and more people (who stay in apartments) are coming down here for three to five months and they want something to do. Cruising offers them a secondary vacation."

Yet, warning is sounded by Leo Robins, vice president for Costa Line, particularly after the Song of Norway arrives on the scene late next year.

"When that happens," he says, "things could get sticky. We'll have 3,000 berths to fill each week on cruises to the islands. With four ships this winter on the Nassau run, that market is starting to be diluted. And the same thing could happen on the longer cruises. I'm not that certain that the market is unlimited."

Sums up Klosterg, who started it all: "It's too early to tell where the saturation point is. But I know this. We haven't reached it yet, or come anywhere close."

THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to hear many state of the Union addresses. Some have been memorable; a few even eloquent. One or two have been historic in their implication for this Nation.

But never in my memory has one message more dramatically combined the qualities of eloquence and substance, style and matter, than this one.

This message was clear as it spoke of the need for clearness in our air and our water and our thinking.

It was direct as it spoke of new directions for our Nation and the world.

It was simple—as it spoke of simple things, the basic things, a clean environment and peace.

It was economical in phrasing—as it spoke of the need for a sane economy.

It was infused throughout with a spirit of good will and hope and tolerance—as it spoke of the need for a renewal of the spirit.

It was, as they say, all of a piece; each section was combined with all the other sections in a harmonious whole—just as the President's vision of the future in one in which our Nation, its people, the environment and the rest of the world

will be able to live with each other in harmony.

There is an old saying that the style is the man—that the way a man acts and speaks is essentially a reflection of who he is. I believe that. And after listening to this state of the Union message, I am convinced more than ever that in Richard Nixon the United States is fortunate in having a man whose clarity, directness, and inspirational vision will lead this Nation to our greatest decade.

OUR ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS—A WORLD IN DANGER

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, can we save our environment? The answer to this question will depend to a great degree on our actions in Congress as we consider the priorities of the 1970's.

President Nixon devoted a large portion of his state of the Union message to the problems of environmental pollution. By doing so, he reiterated what has been obvious to some of us for a long time, the fact that only with a total commitment by the President, Congress, and the American people can we hope to turn the tide and prevent environmental catastrophe.

In an outstanding example of interpretive reporting, Roberta Hornig and James Welsh of the Washington Evening Star have written an excellent series of articles on environmental pollution. Published in last week's editions of the Star, this series graphically describes every aspect of the pollution crisis.

In light of the need for prompt action and the apparent willingness of Congress and the President to take such action, I wish to include these seven articles at this point in the RECORD as a reminder of the monumental challenge we must face:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Jan. 11, 1970]

THE ENVIRONMENT: IS IT PROBLEM NO. 1?

(By Roberta Hornig and James Welsh)

John Heritage's job begins to close in on him long before he gets to the office.

As a 31-year-old staff aide to Wisconsin's Sen. Gaylord Nelson, Heritage specializes in the environment. On a typical workday, he hasn't driven far from his home in Alexandria when these troubles begin coming at him, one after another.

His car inches through a crowded interchange onto Shirley Highway. It is a gray, heavy day. The cars stop, inch forward, stop. The fumes hang over the highway.

The cars, thousands of them, sputter through Arlington's apartment wonderland, past the Pentagon and toward the 14th Street Bridge.

As he approaches the bridge, a jet swings into its landing approach to National Airport. It approaches from upriver.

Heritage knows that as he crosses the bridge, the plane—perhaps even two—will pass not far overhead, engines screaming and dumping oily black grit on top of the exhaust-laden air he is breathing.

The Washington skyline should be clearly in view now. Some days it is, but today it is not. The accumulation of smoke from cars,

buses, trucks, planes and smokestacks is too heavy; the skyline is blurred in a pastel haze.

Beneath the bridge, the Potomac flows dirty and sluggish, logs and dead fish floating in the murky brown.

Heritage crosses the bridge and the traffic passes a densely built-up urban area. There is construction nearly everywhere—buildings and highways.

The noise and confusion reach a peak as he nears the Rayburn House Office Building. There, a pile driver is banging away at full steam.

John Heritage has driven from a famous suburb to the Capitol of the United States. The trip is past, but not forgotten. He has to drive home tonight, and back to work tomorrow morning, and he wonders what Washington will do to right man's wrongs against nature.

"You have to wonder what's happening to people," he observes. "Call it irritation if you want, but anyone can sense on a trip like this what is meant by the contention that our quality of life is going down."

"The environmental problem is no longer an issue of saving trees, of conserving natural resources. It's part of daily life. To go from one place to another in our cities is to pass through an unhealthy cross-section of pollution."

Heritage and his fellow Washingtonians are far from alone. Countless thousands across the country are wondering and worrying about their own communities—not just the big towns of New York and Los Angeles, but also the middle-sized cities of Oakland, Salt Lake City, Denver, Wilmington, Providence, Buffalo, Chattanooga, plus smaller towns and even rural areas.

And if other Americans remain relatively unconcerned, the sweep of current developments and trends may be giving them second thoughts.

People in Cleveland apparently had decided they could live with the Cuyahoga River. But one day last June the river caught fire. The blaze from an ignited oil slick soared five stories high and caused \$50,000 damage to two railroad trestles. Clevelanders are more "aware" now.

Around San Francisco, a city justifiably proud of its good looks, it has been fashionable to look down on Los Angeles as a monument to tastelessness. Northern Californians like to think of LA's air pollution, which has set off 71 emergency alerts since 1955, as typical of the kind of mess Southern Californians are capable of making. But now in the San Francisco Bay area, the smog is so thick that the Northern Californians can't see across the bay.

Lake Erie was murdered, the victim of industrial and municipal waste disposal. It now harbors new life—a mutant of carp which lives off poisons.

Death is also coming to more of the nation's once clear waters.

So much sewage from upstream communities is coming down the Eagle River in the Colorado Rockies that trout fishermen, if they still go there, catch toilet paper, not fish.

In Northeastern Pennsylvania not too long ago, acid drainage from a mining operation leaked into some abandoned, uncapped gas wells, eventually polluting the underground water serving seven counties. In some parts of the area, the only way to get water was to truck it in.

Incidents and problems like this are piling one atop the other.

The days are gone when concern for the land, the air, the water was the sole province of the conservationists, the wilderness enthusiasts, the bird watchers and a few far-seeing scientists, authors and public officials.

Last spring the National Wildlife Federation arranged for a public opinion poll, on the subject of conservation. It showed 85 percent of the American people worried about the state of the environment.

The problems they worry about, of course, vary in severity from place to place.

Washington, for instance, is about average for a city of 800,000 and a metropolitan area of nearly 3 million. Like similar areas, it suffers from air pollution caused chiefly by auto exhausts and burning fuels.

But Washington is not too typical because as a government town, it has little industry to add to air and water wastes.

A good question then is why the Nation's Capital stands in the middle rather than the low end of the pollution index.

But solutions are as elusive as the air, and relatively little has been done.

As an issue, the environment began gathering true momentum in 1969. This year, it could well elbow its way to the top of the list of issues of major national concern, perhaps overshadowing the war in Vietnam. Students are planning protests; President Nixon is planning new programs.

There are reasons. Everyday pollution is becoming more evident to the senses. As Heritage puts it: "It's real because you can smell it, touch it, see it, hear it."

Beer cans and other debris float by boaters far down the Chesapeake Bay. Signs warning "No Swimming—Polluted Water Not Recommended for Bathing" crop up in more and more places.

Airline passengers can spot metropolitan areas ahead by the banks of smog enveloping them. If they don't notice, their pilots who are increasingly hampered by lowered visibility, are likely to tell them about it.

Besides commonplace pollution, dramatic "accidents" and attention-getting examples of pollution dangers are occurring more frequently.

The Cuyahoga River fire is just one example. Its effect was small in comparison to the breakup of the American tanker Torrey Canyon off the coast of England, leaving oil smeared across miles of British and French coasts, and killing tens of thousands of birds and fish.

More recent environmental "happenings" range from oil spills from a drilling platform off the Santa Barbara coast, to scientists' reports that human mothers' milk contains more DDT than the federal government permits in cow's milk sold for human consumption, to the death of 6,400 sheep on isolated Utah rangelands from nerve gas the Army was testing.

Evidence has piled up that no corner of the world is safe from pollution.

Poisonous pesticide residues have been found in penguins in the Antarctic.

Thor Heyerdahl, who sailed across the Atlantic last year, said the ocean "looked like a sewer."

In Greenland, traces of lead from industry and gasoline have been found in cores taken from the ice.

In Europe, acid rain frequently falls as far north as Sweden.

The Rhine is a contender for the world's most polluted river. Athenians called their air "Marshall Plan smog" for the fumes pouring from industry. In Venice, it's a tossup whether air pollutants or the flooding caused by excessive landfill operations will destroy a good part of the city's art treasures.

And as the pollution mounts, journalism is putting a higher news value on the environment.

Bigger headlines are going on stories like oil spills and smog alerts. Scientists' reports get into print and over the airwaves. There is a new breed of reporter's "beat"—the environment.

Newspapers are devoting long stories and series to the over-all problem. Time magazine now runs an environment section. Last year Look magazine devoted much of a whole issue to the environment. Newsweek has something similar in the works. So does Fortune.

Partly because of this kind of coverage, and partly because they are better organized, scientists are getting the message across as never before. And it is a sober message.

Increasing credibility is going to people once regarded as extremists for warning that the human species could become extinct unless it learns to live in harmony with nature.

Dr. Barry Commoner of Washington University in St. Louis is now considered a prophet for the doom-crying he has done for years—that "it's a matter of survival to be scared."

And ecologist LaMont Cole of Cornell University is now getting audiences besides other ecologists when he warns that pollution, because it kills forest and water plants supplying the world its oxygen supply, amounts to a time-bomb that may be impossible to defuse.

In a curious way, the Apollo space flights have helped galvanize public opinion. Mail to the White House on the environment doubled after last year's first moon landing.

To many, the flights raised the question of where technological priorities should be directed—into space or back on the earth?

The critics weren't alone. Astronauts joined them, some of them saying that from space, air pollution was so visible it cut into the joy of seeing Mother Earth from hundreds or thousands of miles away.

And the warnings are coming across. In New York, mini-skirted women are picketing shops that sell coats made from the skins of leopards, a diminishing species.

In Minnesota, a Mothers' Day protest march descended on the site of a planned nuclear-powered generating plant on the Mississippi.

In fairly conservative Santa Barbara, residents led by a former state senator formed GOO (Get Oil Out), and with power and sailboats moved to block an oil company from setting up an oil-drilling platform like the one that earlier had blackened their beaches.

Students are forming environmental "action groups" on campuses across the country.

At Berkeley and Minneapolis, they held mock funerals for internal-combustion engines to protest auto air pollution.

At Richmond two weeks ago, students from Maryland to North Carolina met to protest the pollution of Virginia's rivers. The federal government sponsored their meeting.

None of this has been lost on the politicians.

It's a far different climate than a few years ago when Maine's Sen. Edmund S. Muskie was quietly cranking out landmark air and water pollution legislation or when Wisconsin's Gaylord Nelson was practically alone in talking of alternatives to the gasoline-powered internal combustion engine.

Now, Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel put it, the environment has joined motherhood and the flag as good politics. In legislation passed last year—and more legislation now in the works—various members of Congress are outdoing themselves over who becomes identified with the push to save the environment.

President Nixon was slow off the mark on this issue but he is trying to catch up.

"There are more people in the White House now working on the environment than on any single issue, and that includes Vietnam," says one of the President's staffers.

The President will devote a major part of his State-of-the-Union message Jan. 22 to the environment. He has said it will be among top-priority items in his 1970 programs.

In the broadest sense, the problems of pollution tie directly to the march of civilization, to the many forces at work in industrial society, each heightening the effects of the others, all of them accelerating in intensity.

The first force is people—the sheer numbers of them.

As long as man's numbers were few, and his way of life simple, he could live compatibly with the world around him.

But the world's 3 billion people, which took millennia to produce, will double by the end of the century. The U.S. may add its third 100 million people by that time. As a result, the relationship between men and nature will change radically.

It wouldn't be too bad if the population were distributed more evenly across the land. But the economics of industrialized society doesn't work that way. Industry congregates in urban areas where it can draw upon a wide range of resources, knowledge and skills. People migrate to the cities for more money and a wide choice in the employment market. Service industries follow the people. The urban areas grow bigger.

But as industry and people become more concentrated, so do their wastes—to the point that it becomes extremely difficult and expensive to keep the air and water clean, to dispose of the trash, to preserve any open space.

Prosperity only aggravates the problem. On the one hand, it provides increased leisure time and the mobility to get away from it all.

But the more people try to get away from it all, the more they run into each other. Today, in what were once remote vacation spots, it is often tent-pole to tent-pole, boat to boat, bumper to bumper. And because of so much use, some vacation areas themselves have become pollution trouble spots.

More important, western civilization's unprecedented prosperity is dependent on an increasingly high order of technology. Man has become the super consumer, demanding more resources, more products. Some of these products, autos especially, add to pollution. And the technology that underpins our prosperity cannot continue to grow in quality and quantity without giving off larger amounts of waste products.

Today's technology is turning out new orders of pollutants—plastics that don't corrode but continue to pile up, and synthetic chemicals that are what the scientists call "non-biodegradable" in that they do not break down easily.

The advance of knowledge and techniques has led to the 100,000-ton tanker and the giant pipelines that can be, and probably will be laid across the fragile tundra of northern Alaska.

New knowledge and technology have enabled the exploiters to become more efficient.

As just one example, European fishing fleets, after discovering the major migratory route of the Atlantic salmon off Greenland, have so depleted this great sport fish that spawning grounds in Canada, Maine, Norway, Scotland and Ireland are now almost empty.

Even with the best of intentions, the application of technology often is preceded by little or no calculation of its environmental consequences. And so what Dr. Commoner calls "ecological backlash" is a growing phenomenon.

Perhaps the most vivid example of this backlash can be found in Egypt, where the giant Aswan Dam controls the Nile River, holding back a reservoir of water some 300 miles long.

Because the Nile's downstream flow has been slowed, waters of the Mediterranean Sea are now flooding the Nile Delta 600 miles below the dam, covering thousands of acres of fertile farmland. Because rich nutrients no longer flow below the dam, Egypt's fishing industry is collapsing. On mammoth Lake Nasser behind the dam, evaporation may claim as much water as the Nile was supposed to send downstream for irrigation. And medical specialists fear that snails that carry schistosomiasis will invade the lake and irrigation canals, eventually infecting

thousands of peasants with that painful and crippling disease.

In its conception and construction, the Aswan Dam was seen as providing enormous benefits to the Egyptian people and economy. It may become a monument to environmental disaster.

If technologists have been short-sighted, so has government at every level.

In this country, for instance, two decades of housing and transportation policy led to the suburban sprawl evident now in every metropolitan area, to dependence on the auto, to the great amount of smog that autos produce.

On other fronts, while the Interior Department was trying to save northern wetland breeding grounds for waterfowl, the Agriculture Department was subsidizing their drainage for farming.

Over the years the federal, state and local governments have spent a lot of money in pollution abatement. But in the prevention of pollution, the record is a dismal one. In one area after another, where the pressures for "progress" have confronted concern for environment, the environment has lost.

To put it another way, one agency after another created to help protect the environment gets caught up in a bureaucratic conflict of interest. As Muskie put in it a recent speech:

"The Congress has assigned responsibilities for pesticide control to the Department of Agriculture, which also promotes the use of pesticides for increased agricultural production.

"The Atomic Energy Commission supervises radiological protection from the uses of nuclear energy, which the commission promotes.

"The Corps of Engineers is responsible for some pollution control on navigable rivers, which the Corps dredges and into which it authorizes the dumping of spoil."

But now the situation has become so serious that such practices and policies—a whole way of life—are being questioned sharply. People are beginning to care, and beginning to hope it's not too late.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 12, 1970]

A WORLD IN DANGER—2: POLLUTION TOTALS TON A YEAR FOR EACH OF US

(By Roberta Hornig and James Welsh)

While in orbit during the Apollo 7 flight, astronaut Walter Schirra should have been able to see Southern California 124 miles beneath him.

He could see a portion of its coastline. But then California disappeared in a shroud of smog that extended for about 100 miles eastward.

As soon as he got back, Schirra sent pictures he had taken to the National Air Pollution Control Administration—and to Gov. Ronald Reagan.

Schirra's three space voyages have made him militant on pollution control: "The moon is not hospitable. Venus is not hospitable. Mars is not hospitable. We'd better do what we can to clean up Earth, because this is where we're going to be."

Astronaut Donn Eisele was on Apollo 7 flight with Schirra. His reaction: "Earth generally is very pretty, but you can see smog in the clouds. It was pretty evident that there is considerable air pollution. It's most discouraging."

Col. Frank Borman's Apollo 8 orbit of the moon at Christmas 1968 had a similar effect on him: "There is no question in my mind that regardless of the economic considerations, we must take immediate steps to preserve our atmosphere."

The astronauts had a special view of planet Earth. But people back on the ground are getting worried, too.

A Gallup poll conducted a year ago for the National Wildlife Federation showed

that of all forms of pollution, air is the one people care about most.

And for good reason. Man must have decent air in order to live. But he is mistreating his air—as he can tell just by looking at it, or smelling it in many areas—and science doesn't know just what that mistreatment is going to do to man.

Air is made up roughly of one-fifth oxygen, four-fifths nitrogen, a bit of argon, minute traces of other gases and water vapor in varying amounts. It is a delicate mixture.

Each year, in the United States alone, 173 million tons of man-made waste products are released into the air. That's close to a ton for each man, woman and child. Worldwide, the estimated figure is 800 million tons.

The National Air Pollution Control Administration officially recognizes nine pollutants in the air: Sulphur, dust particles, carbon monoxide, "photochemical oxidant" (the gases loosely called smog), hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxides, lead and pesticides. It has also let out a contract to study 30 other air pollutants, including asbestos and cadmium.

Scientists know only some of the things these pollutants do.

They corrode metals; they soil clothing and curtains; they make stockings run; they injure and kill crops and flowers, they reduce visibility, endangering air and highway transportation, and they blight man's surroundings, making life less enjoyable.

But more importantly, air pollution affects health. At its worst, it can kill.

Its potential became apparent in London in 1952. Four thousand more persons than the normal died that year because of a three-day blanket of killer fog.

The comparable American pollution horror tale came in 1948 in Donora, Pa., a small steel and chemical plant town. A four-day "fog" killed 19 and sickened almost half of the 1,400 townspeople.

The same thing happened in each case: Normal fog, heavy with moisture, trapped poisonous chemicals—pollutants which normally drift off into the atmosphere. In London, fog trapped sulphur caused by coal-burning; in Donora, it blanketed the town with a chemical mixture from the industrial smokestacks.

In normal conditions, air pollution's effects on health are less easy to document. But more and more, scientists are warning that there is a relationship between dirty air and what happens to people.

As Dr. Jesse L. Steinfeld, deputy assistant secretary of the health, education and welfare, put it:

"It's full impact on our health is not known, but there is abundant scientific evidence that exposure to polluted air is associated with the occurrence and worsening of chronic respiratory diseases, such as emphysema, bronchitis, asthma, and even lung cancer."

While not so dramatic as the London and Donora episodes, air pollution reached such high levels in the New York area three Thanksgivings ago that it was later found to have at least shortened, if not claimed, the lives of 168 persons, mostly old people or those prone to respiratory illnesses.

There were no "body counts," but last August in the St. Louis area and in November in the Chicago area, air pollution reached seriously high levels.

The increasing concern over air pollution as a health hazard last year led the Los Angeles County Medical Association to recommend that "students through high school . . . should be excused from strenuous indoor and outdoor activity" when smog concentrations rise above certain levels.

And in the same county, the smog capital of the nation, physicians are estimated to have told some 10,000 persons suffering from respiratory ailments to move elsewhere last year.

What makes air pollution even more insid-

ious, though, are the things scientists don't know about it.

No one knows what will happen if man continues to haphazardly pour compounds into the atmospheric test tube, permitting them to accumulate. Many results are feared.

The weather is affected, studies show. Tulsa, Okla., has grown from a town to a city since 1900. With its growth has come a steady increase of dust particles in the air. And with that growth, there has been an increase in the annual rainfall.

In Louisville, Pittsburgh and Buffalo, it doesn't rain as often when industries are shut down. The snow pattern in Toronto is similar.

In LaPorte, Ind., 30 miles downwind from the heavy industrial complex around Chicago, precipitation has increased significantly since 1925. And the precipitation peaks have coincided with peaks in steel production in the Chicago area.

In America alone, about 12 million tons of simple dust are put into the sky every year. And scientists are concluding that it amounts to a virtual and involuntary cloud-seeding.

But air pollution also can have an opposite effect.

In some cases, the dirtier the air gets, the less rain falls. Clouds get so overseeded that moisture can't grow to raindrop size.

This weather-backlash in scattered locations has led meteorologists to wonder what dirty air is doing to our global climate.

Some say it's cooling the Earth's temperatures—a process that could lead to a new ice age. Others argue that it has a "greenhouse effect," raising the world's temperature at a rate fast enough to melt the polar ice caps and flood the coasts of the continents.

But all this seems rather academic to the busy urban dweller who notices air pollution only casually.

He more likely thinks about the way the air smells and looks. He may notice that when he's in a traffic jam he gets a headache, that his responses aren't as good as they might be, and that when there's smog, his eyes smart.

He is becoming more aware of air pollution, past the point where he cracks jokes about Los Angeles' smog.

Federal air pollution officials have even gotten up a dubiously distinctive "Top 10" list, headed by New York, then followed by Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Boston, Newark, Detroit and St. Louis.

Washington made the second "Big 10" out of the list of 65, falling just behind Jersey City.

But dirty air seems to be everywhere. Even in New Mexico the Weather Bureau is issuing air pollution forecasts.

As a consequence, people are asking hard, central questions: What and who is responsible for air pollution and what's being done about it?

Almost all dirty air comes from some kind of burning or combustion—from gasoline in auto engines; from coal, oil and other fuels in industrial, generating and trash incineration and from jet airplane exhausts.

The "what" and "who" of it depends on where you live.

In Bishop, Md., population 500, for example, the offender was a single rendering plant. In the New York-Newark area, the polluters are a mixture of industrial plants, utilities, oil refineries, municipal incinerators and the fuels used to heat homes and apartment buildings.

Way out in front, though, is "transportation." It accounts for 94.6 percent of the country's bad air.

This is pollution caused by cars, planes, buses, trucks and other vehicles. Its effect varies according to location.

The automobile, for example, accounts for an average of 60 percent of the air pollution

nationwide, but its effect goes as high as 90 percent in Southern California, and as low as 25 percent in Buffalo, where industries do the job.

And the automobile is now the No. 1 target of the scientists, technicians and politicians who are fighting air pollution.

Cars dump 90 million tons of pollutants into the air each year, double the amount of any other single contributor.

The 4 million motor vehicles in Los Angeles basically cause that city's smog. And the 1.1 million vehicle trips here in Washington daily don't do much for the air in the Nation's Capital. And unlike other cities of its size, Washington doesn't have heavy industry to blame.

It was not Washington but Los Angeles that fingered the car as the chief culprit.

After several air pollution scares in the early 1940s—including a day in September 1943, cited by the Los Angeles Times as a "daylight dimout"—Los Angeles clamped down on just about every air pollution source it could control. It went after domestic, commercial, industrial and municipal incinerators, and all open burning.

Afterward, there was little left to account for the growing smog except the growing number of cars and other motor vehicles.

California has, in fact, always been ahead of the nation in trying to cope with auto air pollution. By the early to mid-60's, however, other states were in the act, and so was the federal government.

Out of all this came federal requirements that Detroit beginning with '69 models build in devices to limit hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide emitted by new cars sold across the country. California went further, insisting that the devices should also control nitrogen emissions.

Yet in its war on cars, California has met with just about the same kind of success as the rest of the nation: Not much.

One of the reasons is that the 1965 law regulating automobile emissions only applies to about a fifth of the cars being driven on the nation's roadways now—the 1969 and '70 models.

Another reason is the testing procedure on the control devices set up by the National Air Pollution Control Administration. At its Ypsilanti, Mich., lab, prototype automobiles undergo tests under very favorable circumstances. They "move" standing still, and the assumption is that the prototypes are like all the cars Detroit is producing. Critics say this test has little relation to actual driving conditions.

More importantly, the law controlling the car devices has no provision for testing after the cars are sold and on the road.

The New York Scientists' Committee for Public Information states flatly that the control devices are not reliable.

The committee, set up to inform the public on the conditions of the environment in general says that 63 percent of a sample of cars equipped with pollution control devices in California in 1966 "failed to meet . . . the standards . . . after only 2000 miles of driving." They're supposed to work for 50,000 miles.

Many say the solution is to find an alternative to the internal combustion engine.

This seems to be the route the Nixon administration is taking. The President's Council on Environment Quality last month announced it will spend \$45 million to look into a different kind of car. New York City and California already are.

Plenty of publicity has gone to some of these alternatives—the steam engine car, the electric car, the car powered by natural gas, or cleaner gasoline.

But none yet provides the answer. Meanwhile, Detroit is sticking with the internal combustion engine. It would take untold millions for the auto makers to tool up for any other kind of propulsion unit.

A spokesman for Ford said his company

thinks the internal combustion engine is still the best bet. Ford, he said, has 24 virtually "smog-free" cars "in the concept stage on the test tracks," and that's the route Ford will take.

Critics, led by Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Maine, contend that Detroit is interested in keeping a "status quo (that) may run counter to the public interest."

The struggle to find a non-polluting car is shaping up as one of the big research races in the 70s—Detroit versus outsiders, with government incentives probably going to both.

Another big industry, the airlines and manufacturers, has committed itself to the best pollution control devices on the market so far—after the state of New Jersey took seven airlines to court last fall.

Until then, the airplane industry had denied it was an important polluter. Its argument was that, nationwide, airplanes' particulate emissions account for only 1 percent, or 78 million tons, of the nation's air pollution by weight.

But these figures don't impress people living near airports in New York, for example, planes pump 1½ tons of pollutants a day and in Washington, the filthy particles come to 1,200 pounds a day, or 602,000 a year.

The new devices should cut some of this down. But it's only part of the solution.

Considering that it was pretty apparent the air was dirty, and getting more so in more places, the federal government was late getting into the air pollution field.

The landmark law, the Air Quality Act devised by Muskie, didn't come until 1967. It's a combined federal, state and local approach setting up air quality regions nationwide—the first one was the Washington metropolitan area—on the grounds that air doesn't neatly confine itself to political boundaries.

The law also for the first time hit at "stationary" sources, such as industry and power plants, that belch black smoke into the sky.

On the books the law looks good. It gives the federal government a handle in getting after states that aren't policing the air.

But the legislation also has serious drawbacks. The most important one is that it has built-in time-lags. For all practical purposes, it gives polluters, and the states going after them, as well as federal institutions, a five-year break.

It will be two years yet before its results can be seen.

And, at this point, with environment so spotlighted, it's questionable whether the results will be sufficient.

To make the air fit to breathe, it's going to take money, for research and new technology, tighter laws and enforcement.

Ironically, as forms of pollution go, and particularly compared with the costs of clean water, it will not take all that much money to restore our air, the experts say.

Federal air pollution officials estimate they could get it back in shape within the next five years for less than \$5 billion.

But, they point out, even with all the attention being paid to air pollution these days, Congress in the last session appropriated only \$88 million for air pollution. About the same time, it authorized \$85 million for the supersonic transport plane—which conceivably could have some insidious side effects on the atmosphere.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 13, 1970]

A WORLD IN DANGER—3: OUR RIVERS ARE GOING DOWN THE DRAIN

(By Roberta Hornig and James Welsh)

The nation's waterways run in not-so-glorious color. Name your color; it's there.

On the Potomac, beginning not far below Washington and extending for miles, the surface can turn a thick blue-green, the color

of the algae that thrive on nutrient chemicals rushing from the metro area's big Blue Plains treatment plant.

Out on the Chesapeake Bay and in some of its small tributaries, the same concentrates of nutrients feed plants called dinoflagellates. In this case the color spreading across the water is bright red.

For white, try some of the Southern rivers where textile and carpet mills pour milky wastes that float lazily downstream.

For black, try the goo that spills from oil companies on the Delaware.

Yellow is the color of mine acid. You can see it on the headwaters of the Monongahela and some of the streams that feed into the Potomac and Susquehanna. Rusty red also is the color of mine acid. In the Ohio-pyle section of southwestern Pennsylvania not long ago, mine acid got into a stream, and a place called Cucumber Falls ran red for a year and a half.

Blue? Sure. In Clarion County, Pa., a printing plant reprocesses used paper. As a result, the Clarion River runs inky blue.

Where industry pours a variety of wastes into the water—the Buffalo on its way to Lake Erie, the Calumet near Chicago, the Ohio at Memphis, Tenn.—the colors run the spectrum.

Then, too, a river can look perfectly clear, but be filled with a pollutant such as oil-well brine, which is so strong it can corrode ship bottoms.

Are there no clean rivers?

Asked to name one relatively clean major river system in the United States, federal officials just shake their heads. There is none.

American rivers generally fall into three categories—dirty, very dirty and dirtiest.

Staffers at the Federal Water Pollution Control Agency (FWPCA) prepared this list of the nation's 10 dirtiest rivers: The Ohio; the Houston Ship Canal; the Cuyahoga in Ohio; the River Rouge in Michigan; the Buffalo; the Passaic in New Jersey; the Arthur Kill near New York City; the Merrimack in New Hampshire and Massachusetts; the Androscoggin in Maine, and the Escambia in Alabama and Florida.

A runner-up list of 10 very dirty rivers also is available. The Potomac made this list. So did the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Hudson and the Connecticut.

All this is not to say that every American river is getting progressively more polluted, or that nothing is being done about cleaning up the rivers and lakes.

Water pollution is an old story in this country, and so is the fight to stem it. Over the last dozen years, governments at all levels have spent \$5.4 billion to attack water pollution, and industry has spent billions more. And the effort has achieved a measure of success.

The Potomac is one example of a river that is cleaner than it used to be. At the turn of the century, the Potomac was the source of typhoid infection. Just a few years ago the Blue Plains treatment plant, which serves the District and suburban Maryland, was removing only 40 percent of organic pollutants. Now it's removing 60 percent.

But this kind of progress brings little comfort to the nation's water-pollution specialists. They look instead at the mountains of waste still pouring into U.S. waterways, at the backlog of treatment-plant construction, at new breeds and sources of pollutants, and at the increased amounts and concentration of pollution that will accompany future growth.

The complexity of the task facing the experts can be illustrated in this oversimplified example:

Putting up a better sewage treatment plant in a city might cut the amount of pollutants going into the river by half. But if, after a number of years the increase of municipal and industrial wastes doubles, that city's river is just about as polluted as it was before.

Then, too, water pollution is spreading to new and dangerous battlefronts.

A river might very well be more free than in decades of such traditional pollutants as sewage.

But American industry, it has been estimated, turns out a new chemical compound every 20 minutes. Some of these substances are highly toxic and difficult to treat.

Industry also turns out that modern wash-day miracle, the detergent, which depends on the nutrient chemicals phosphate and nitrogen. In the water, they serve as food for plant life—and eventually can choke waterways. Scientists call this eutrophication.

On top of this comes the threat of pesticides in the water—and radiological emissions from atomic-generated plants.

A further threat to water quality comes not from a waste but from heat, or what is known as thermal pollution. Heated water used for industrial cooling is returned to the nearest waterway, often disrupting the balance of aquatic life.

Pollution is no longer limited to surface waters. Only in the last year have the scare stories begun to spread of what's happening to the underground water supply. Deep disposal wells leaked, or "blew out," sending their contents—brine in Texas and Kansas, cyanide near Buffalo, a variety of chemicals near Denver—into the water supply.

And pollution is no longer limited to inland waterways. Oil spills, offshore dumping, and pesticides carried by winds have raised a new spectre—pollution of the world's oceans.

David Dominick, the young chief of the FWPCA, is alternately gloomy and optimistic over the water-pollution problem.

He sees little or no progress having been made in the last decade, but with a greater commitment by all concerned, believes the nation's waters could be significantly improved in the '70s.

But with no greater commitment than the nation is now making, he believes the most serious consequences would follow.

"We would get to the point where water no longer would be an economic resource," said Dominick. "Our industry would be crippled, our municipalities would be crippled."

In terms of what worries scientists, public officials and the public, water and air pollution are the big two of the environmental problems. But the two cannot be equated.

In one sense, polluted air is more insidious because it is impossible to contain. The reverse of that proposition is that water, since it is more contained, can get incredibly dirty. No given volume of air is poisoned to the extent that Lake Erie is poisoned.

Then, too, the sources of water pollution are numerous, disparate and frequently indirect in nature as to defy coordinated attack.

For example, a chemical firm might install waste-treatment devices at its plant along a California river, and the river would not be polluted. But that company's products are sold across the country and, after used, may end up being discarded in thousands of rivers and lakes.

Pesticides and detergents are the most obvious examples of this form of indirect pollution.

A final distinction between air and water pollution boils down to one word: Money.

Up to now, government and industry have spent far more money on water pollution than on all other forms of pollution combined. And if the nation makes a commitment to clean up the environment, by far the greatest part of the money involved will have to go to the water program.

Two years ago the FWPCA, which is part of the Interior Department, put out a document saying that to bring our waterways up to federal standards by 1973, it would cost some \$20 billion. This estimate, now perhaps too low, included only municipal and industrial waste treatment. It excluded the costs

of controlling a wide range of other contaminants such as sediment, animal feedlot runoff and acid mine drainage. (Just to halt mine acid runoff, other studies have shown, might cost \$6 billion.)

And the report ignored the cost of separating sewage lines from storm drainage lines in the many cities where they are combined. This cost never has been calculated, but its enormity is indicated by one estimate for Washington alone—\$1 billion.

Whatever the grand total, it is formidable. Certainly, the nation has not shown it has been willing to spend anything close to that amount.

Partly because of that, partly because the environment has become such a visible issue, and partly because of sheer political antagonisms, water pollution promises to shape up next year as one long fight over money.

Congress passed the landmark Water Quality Act in 1965. It directed the states to draw up water quality standards for their municipalities and industries, and promised these states steadily increasing amounts of money to help finance waste treatment plants.

Some of the states—Maryland, New York and Michigan among others—took Uncle Sam at full faith and charged ahead with ambitious anti-pollution programs.

But the promised federal money failed to come along.

For fiscal 1968, Congress had authorized a prior authorization of \$450 million, three times what had been spent the year before. But with the Vietnam war and other budgetary strictures, the Johnson administration asked for, and Congress appropriated, only \$200 million.

The advance authorization for fiscal 1969 was \$750 million. All that came along was \$214 million. For this fiscal year, the advance authorization was \$1 billion. But both the outgoing Johnson administration and the new Nixon administration chose to hold the line. They asked for only \$214 million.

But this year, with the White House and congressional leadership split along party lines, the revolt came.

Congress appropriated \$800 million for water pollution grants, far more than the President wanted to spend. A question now is how much of this money the administration will release, or how much it will seek to hold back in the campaign against inflation.

If Congress' actions were in part motivated by politics, they also came in response to growing pressures back home. The failure of federal funding promises in the last several years had triggered bitter reactions at the state level, particularly in those states that had jumped out ahead in water-pollution programs.

Maryland, for instance, had launched a 4-year, \$150 million program making one guarantee after another to local communities for the construction of treatment plants. Under the federal legislation, it had counted on up to 55 percent federal matching grants. But the federal subsidies so far have run about 10 percent.

Not yet through its third year, the program is just about out of money.

There's little secret about what the President wants to do for his 1971 program. With no elbow room in the budget, with inflation yet unconquered, the war not yet ended, he wants to replace direct cash grants with the promise to help pay off bonds for sewage treatment works over a long period of time.

Under this plan, municipalities would float some \$10 billion in bonds, with Washington paying off all the principal but none of the interest, over 20 years.

The argument for it is that communities throughout the nation could begin work now on the facilities they need. Moreover, by spreading out its obligation, the federal

government would spend at most \$500 million a year, far less than that in the first year or two.

But even before the plan is announced, arguments are building up against it. A number of congressmen, including Maine's Sen. Edmond Muskie, chief architect of the Water Quality Act, are poised to fight it, and to go for big cash-grant appropriations.

From the states, the reaction to the tentative federal plan is far from enthusiastic.

"It's unrealistic to expect the locals to play banker for the federal government," said James Coulter, deputy chief of Maryland's Department of Natural Resources.

The smaller and poorer the community, the more trouble it will have trying to enter today's tight bond market, argued Coulter. He further said such a plan would about cut in half the 55 percent federal subsidies promised under the Water Quality Act.

Meanwhile, until more money comes along, and as the bond market tightens, the backlog is growing.

Two years ago, according to FWPCA, 44 percent of the nation's urban population was served by less than adequate treatment facilities, or no facilities at all. For many states, the figure was far higher—New Jersey, at 75 percent, Michigan at 79 percent, Maine at 93 percent.

"I think we're even worse off now," said Dominick.

The FWPCA chief is pinning some hope on new technology—notably a method of treating municipal wastes through activated carbon and other chemicals. It will be given a try at Washington's Blue Plains plant.

Said Dominick: "If it works, it should be much simpler and cheaper than the usual secondary treatment process. It should do for waste treatment plants what transistors did for radios."

But it will be 18 months before results can be properly assessed. Meanwhile, Dominick reports running into resistance, in Washington and elsewhere, from the waste-treatment industry.

"I think what we've got on our hands is a sewage-industrial complex," he said.

But for all the debate to come over big sums of money, many of the people directly concerned, from top federal officials to men like Coulter and a growing number of local officials, realize that money alone won't eradicate water pollution.

First, there is good reason to believe that money now going into waste treatment plants across the country could be spent far more efficiently.

Two months ago, in a tough report, the General Accounting Office told Congress that the benefits from billions of dollars of spending on some 9,400 treatment plants in the past 12 years "have not been as great as they could have been."

GAO's reasoning gets to the heart of the traditional grant-in-aid process.

Consider a river lined by two dozen communities and a lot of industry. Administrators in possibly five of those communities know the bureaucratic application route well enough to get money for treatment works. But the river remains dirty because all the other communities and the industry continue to pour untreated waste into the river.

Said the GAO report: "The program to date has been administered for the most part using a shotgun approach—awarding construction grants on a first-come, first-served or readiness-to-proceed basis. Little consideration has been given to the immediate benefits to be attained by the construction of individual treatment plants."

Ralph Widner is director of the Appalachian Regional Commission, serving an area sorely beset by both water and air pollution. He puts it this way: "What we have is the accidental consequences of the grant-in-aid approach. There has been no systematic attack."

If Congress listens to GAO and other critics, it may insist on the application of systems techniques, leading to treatment systems serving large areas.

Said Maryland's Coulter: "It has to come. Just as we have state highways and interstate highways, we'll have the state-run sewage system and regional purification works."

"But none of this will come cheaply. It will cost enormous amounts of money.

The GAO report didn't say so, but there are other reasons why money for cleaner water can go down the drain.

One is that the agencies of government often work at cross purposes.

What happened on the Ohio River is a case in point. With a population of 24 million and some 38,000 industrial plants in its 10-state drainage area, the Ohio has been the target of the biggest cleanup effort ever directed at a major American river. Nearly \$1 billion has been spent in the last 20 years.

But over the years, too, the Army Corps of Engineers has been busy improving the river for navigation. In effect, the Ohio has been turned into a series of reservoirs.

These reservoirs were given little flushing capacity. Waste, along with heat from thermal pollution, builds up. Aeration is low.

Over-all, these projects have offset a good part of what the clean-water program promised to accomplish.

Water pollution specialists also agree that beyond money, enforcement of tough standards is the key to cleaning up the waters.

In the past, the federal government has for the most part relied upon the states to "get tough" with local governments and industry.

One federal official describes why this so often hasn't worked:

"At the state government level, industry can be politically potent. Often the biggest firms, maybe the biggest polluters, are the biggest contributors. What's more, the states traditionally have competed for new industry. They're more scared of driving industry away than they are of water pollution."

Lately, on interstate waterways, the federal government has shown a willingness to bear down. After extensive hearings last year, it threatened to sue the city of Toledo and four industries in Toledo and Cleveland for not taking steps to end the pollution of Lake Erie. It remains to be seen whether Toledo and the four firms comply with clean-water standard—and if not, whether the FWPCA refers the matter to the Justice Department.

Dominick and his aides say that among each of the major industrial groupings—steel, chemicals, oil, forest products—there are good guys and bad guys, firms that get plus ratings and firms that act with what one official calls "19th Century abandon."

In the steel industry, for example, U.S. Steel gets good marks. It's not perfect, but it spends money and tries hard. Republic Steel is on the other end of the FWPCA scorecard. One of the four Ohio firms the agency threatened to sue last year, Republic refused to testify at the hearings on grounds the issue was strictly a state matter. (Interestingly, the state of Ohio refused to testify on the same grounds.)

Dominick is seeking legislation that will make it simpler to crack down on violators. But even if that comes, the question is how much farther Washington will go to crack down, to play the heavy. Said Dominick:

"If we get the type of national priority commitment that cleaning up the water deserves, it will be clear mandate to go after the offenders."

As a whole, industry is spending just about the amount called for in the Water Quality Act goals. At last count, it was on the order of \$600 million a year.

Industry no doubt will be called on to spend more in one way or another. Public pressure is growing. Congressional pressure is growing. Wisconsin's Sen. William Proxmire, for example, following on the heels of the GAO report, introduced legislation that would place a user tax on industry, depending on the amount of waste it dumped in the water.

Higher product prices? We're already paying them—not only for what industry invests to treat its own wastes but also what some firms, notably in the medical and food fields, must invest to treat dirty water even before they use it.

As the nation's water pollution fighters go about their business, they face the prevailing problem of setting priorities. What should come first?

Widner, thinking of Appalachia with its strip-mine runoff and acid-laden abandoned deep mines, its old industry and impoverished towns still pouring untreated wastes into the river, talks of the issue in these terms:

"We have this tremendous legacy of neglect, all the problems from the past, that are still with us. It would take more resources than we have to eliminate them. And even if we tried, there are all the new problems coming along."

For Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel, Dominick and their aides, many of these problems are pressing in more swiftly than anyone could anticipate even a year or two ago.

Consider the eutrophication menace, only recently recognized by scientists.

Last month, Rep. Henry Reuss, D-Wisc., held a series of hearings that wound up with a scolding of scientists, both in government and industry, for failure to find a pollution-free detergent. Now FWPCA is stepping up its research efforts in that field.

The pollution of underground waters is something else. It will not be solved by research. It will be solved by regulation.

"It's a treacherous problem—out of sight, out of mind," says Dominick.

Now this form of pollution is growing more visible—and so are demands to do something about it.

Until now, the federal government has largely ignored it, permitting industry and the military to multiply the number of deep wells for disposing of poisonous wastes.

Dominick now promises that a strong federal policy will be coming along soon.

Ocean pollution is something else again. No one nation can deal with it. It's a problem with scientific, diplomatic and legal implications that environment specialists and public officials are only beginning to grips with.

A WORLD IN DANGER—4: GARBAGE PILES UP, UP, AND UP, AND . . .

(By Roberta Hornig and James Welsh)

Before affluence, people did not have much to throw away. Last year, Americans threw away 7.6 million television sets.

Housewives used to find a use for coffee cans, jelly jars, and other containers. Last year, with so many containers on store shelves that even the most economy-minded were overwhelmed, Americans threw away 50 billion cans, 30 billion bottles and jars and about 4 million tons of plastics.

During World War II days, old cars went to the scrap yards and the metal was salvaged. Last year, Americans junked 7 million cars and trucks. In New York City alone, about 1,000 vehicles a day were simply abandoned.

America is not just a consumer economy. It is a throw-away economy, which by its very nature is creating problems of avalanche proportions.

It was officially recognized by Congress in 1965 as the "third pollution," following water and air pollution. And because no one can

think of a better name for it, it is called "solid wastes."

These are the solid discards of society—any of the discards that are neither liquid nor gas. Besides everyday garbage and trash, these range from old refrigerators to dead animals, to the immense amount of scrap and wastes that industry and farmers no longer want.

What happens to them? After they're thrown away, left for the municipalities to pick up, the municipalities usually throw them away too—into dumps.

It is old fashioned, but open dumping still accounts for 85 percent of the way this country is "disposing" of its wastes.

People do not think about garbage very much. They don't want to; they don't like to see it around.

But, dumping uses up a lot of land. Experts say garbage has damaged about 7,000 square miles of the country—a country in which land is becoming scarcer, particularly in the metropolitan areas.

And as metropolitan areas grow, dumping grounds get farther away—making trash transportation cost more than it does already.

What are the alternatives?

Burning is the most common one.

Some communities still permit "open burning" at dump sites, but there is increasing pressure to stop it because it contributes to air pollution.

Incineration appears a more logical step, but even incinerators are undergoing a rash of criticism. Between 8 and 10 percent of the nation's garbage is burned in incinerators. A study by the Public Health Service in 1967 revealed that 75 percent of these are unsatisfactory because they dirty the air.

Many of them don't do a very good job, either. Gerald F. O'Leary, president of Boston's City Council, told a Senate committee recently that in his city "You can put a telephone book in the incinerator and come out and read it."

Larger metropolitan areas are turning to burying garbage. It is called "sanitary landfill," which is a refinement of the open dump. In some places, including Washington, these are fairly sophisticated.

Properly planned, landfills cover each day's garbage load with six inches or more of compacted earth and in such a way as to prevent ground and water pollution.

Washington went this way, and now it has one of the model landfills in the nation.

Just two years ago, the Kenilworth Dump, located about four miles from the Capitol, was rated by the Public Health Service as the worst air-polluting, open-burning dump in the nation.

Today, after being filled in with a half million tons of trash and with the help of a federal grant, Kenilworth is about to become converted into a 300-acre park.

Washington is already on its second landfill, at Oxon Hill. In about two years, it will become a golf course.

But landfills, which handle about 5 percent of the nation's garbage, cannot be considered a final solution. Besides posing a possible water pollution threat, they are a land-gobbler.

New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco and Boston will be running out of garbage burial grounds within the next five to 10 years.

Washington is going to have to turn to Prince William County, at least 20 miles down the Potomac River, for its next landfill operation. This one will be the most up-to-date of its kind, with garbage baled, then barged, to burial.

Some garbage already is barged for burial at sea. A recent study by an oceanographer at the Stony Brook Marine Resources Center on Long Island says that 8.6 million tons of material are thrown annually into the Atlantic Ocean, up to five miles out to sea from the New York area. The effects of this practice

are as yet unknown, but frowned on by federal officials.

At the present rate, this country is throwing out 3.6 billion tons of solid wastes a year.

On the average, every man, woman and child in America generates 5.3 pounds of garbage a day. The rate in the 1920s was 2.75 pounds per person, and experts predict that in 10 years, the figure will leap to 8 pounds each.

This is a faster growth rate than our population. In fact, the U.S. garbage growth is double its population growth.

Much of the reason for the garbage heap is the nation's new affluence: More money equals more goods equals more trash—and more complicated trash at that.

Some of the goods and gadgets finding themselves on supermarket shelves are not for burning. They won't burn.

And some of what people buy won't deteriorate under any normal circumstances. Throwing a cardboard carton away and it eventually disappears through natural biological processes. Try the same thing with some of the plastics and they will be there almost forever.

Garbage is a problem everywhere in the country.

Where people are poorer, and the communities poorer, different orders of garbage problems appear.

The report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders to President Johnson in 1968 pointed to the effects of garbage—which mostly amounts to food wastes—on the inner cities.

"It must be concluded that slum sanitation is a serious problem in the minds of the urban poor," the report states, pointing to the "peculiarly intense needs of ghetto areas for sanitation services."

But country areas have their garbage problems as well.

In Kentucky, for example, the local municipal units are so small that there is no standard trash collection. So people dump anywhere.

A few years ago, following the lead of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's beautification program, Kentucky started a "beauty program" of its own, and created roadside rests with litter barrels.

The public's assumption was that litter barrels were placed for trash. Soon after the program began, so much trash accumulated that the litter barrels were hidden.

Nationwide, trash collection is an extremely expensive proposition.

John F. Collins, former president of the National League of Cities and one time mayor of Boston, puts municipal waste disposal costs at \$3.5 billion annually.

This would make solid wastes the third largest municipal expenditure, behind education and highway construction.

It took a long time for Congress to become concerned with it because, like other people, garbage was not uppermost in the mind.

Garbage caught the attention of Sen. Edmund Muskie's air and water pollution subcommittee when it was discovered that garbage burning in open dumps and incinerators was causing much of the nation's air pollution.

Almost as an afterthought, prodded by Muskie, Congress added the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965 to the Clean Air Act.

It called for finding and developing better ways of handling garbage and for grants to states through 1970. The authorization was for \$100 million. But the Vietnam war costs got in the way and less than \$20 million was actually appropriated.

Muskie's subcommittee has drafted a much more sophisticated law—the Resource Recovery Act—which will come up this new session of Congress.

If passed, this legislation would earmark \$800 million over five years for research and construction grants to come up with new

technology to recover, reuse and recycle what now is just thrown away.

The general theory behind the proposed law is that in its inefficient methods of disposing of wastes, the country is wasting valuable national resources.

Richard D. Vaughan, director of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Bureau of Solid Waste Management, goes along with the general philosophy behind the new Muskie proposal.

For the last few years, waste-equipment manufacturers have been rushing into production with garbage shredders, pulverizers, grinders, compressors, compactors, balers and collection trucks with new gadgets.

The Reynolds Metals Co. has a highly successful project going on in Los Angeles and Miami, and is paying ½ cent a can for the return of beverage cans. These cans, which cause problems when dumped because they don't "degrade," are then "recycled" by the company and converted into a new use as secondary aluminum products. The project will be expanded soon.

Paper companies are trying to recycle their wastes. The Crown-Zellerbach Corp. reports that about 20 percent of corrugated boards are returned to the manufacturing process.

Glass technologists have also been experimenting with several ideas for using scrap glass.

One of the problems facing industry is that there are not many secondary industries around to buy, and reuse, products.

The Solid Waste Management Bureau has recently let out a contract to the Midwest Research Institute in Kansas City to look at available and potential markets.

In New York, the bureau is testing a "vacuum collection system" in an apartment house. This device picks up garbage like a vacuum cleaner, eliminating the need for collection.

Other research involves a super-incinerator that could produce electricity while it burns garbage at even, high temperatures. The most modern incinerator in the world—in Dusseldorf, Germany—generates electricity.

At Clemson University, work is underway on a new kind of bottle that dissolves in water.

The bureau also is trying to come up with ways to use wastes. For example, it is throwing old tires into the Atlantic for fish breeding beds.

The Interior Department's Bureau of Mines also is in the solid wastes research business.

Among its projects is making building blocks out of garbage, a scheme similar to one in Japan. Under the Japanese method, raw garbage is compressed into a block under pressure.

Some experts are dubious about this scheme, however, and are warning that it is possible the garbage-blocks could build up methane gas and explode.

Thus far, though, Vaughan's answers to the nation's junkpiles boil down to the necessity for moving on many fronts at once.

An obvious one is an attempt to improve trash collection methods to get away from the trash-and-carry method. Research contracts are being let to this end.

Another is better incineration. Incinerators will probably be around for a long time. Sanitary engineers are working toward getting ones that burn trash better and that have a secondary use, reclaiming some of the energy the burning gives off.

Another answer, Vaughan believes, is recycling products—that is, getting trash, such as metals and paper, back to a base state and finding a new, secondary use for them.

Alternatives to the "nonbiodegradables," like plastics, that don't break down naturally also should be found, he says.

Ultimately, Vaughan says, the housewife may have to change her habits and learn to separate trash, keeping bottles and papers, say, separate from food wastes.

But most important of all, Vaughan says, is to cut down the sheer volume of wastes.

The war on garbage may also ultimately require reusing everything from milk bottles to equipment on old cars, or even a tax on the amount of wastes the consumer generates.

All the answers add up to greater costs—to someone. The question is: will the consumer get caught in the middle?

A WORLD IN DANGER—5: THE DAY LBJ WAS ALMOST SPEECHLESS

(By Roberta Hornig and James Welsh)

Not long after he died in 1967, poet Carl Sandburg was honored in a ceremony at the Lincoln Memorial.

President Johnson sat there while one dignitary after another rose to speak. Johnson couldn't hear much of what they said. Almost all he could hear was the jets overhead, coming down the Potomac on their landing run to National Airport.

As his own turn to speak approached, Johnson turned to Interior Secretary Stewart Udall.

"Get rid of those jets," he ordered.

A startled Udall spoke to the nearest Secret Service man, who quickly telephoned the presidential command to the airport. By the time Johnson rose to speak, the noise had stopped. And throughout his address, the jets remained miles upriver, circling.

As the story goes, this is a big reason Washington became as involved as it now is in trying to curb excessive noise. It wasn't long after the Sandburg ceremony that federal officials began speaking out much more strongly about "noise pollution" than they had in the past.

More substantial reasons aren't difficult to find. Largely they stem from the widespread introduction of jet aircraft to places like National Airport, and the fact that if a citizen is bothered by the sound, he can't order the jets turned around like Johnson did.

Protests and lawsuits over noise have been on the rise. Major lawsuits are under way contesting airport noise in New York, Chicago and Atlanta.

And so noise has become the latest environmental hazard to get the federal government's seal of disapproval. Springing from 1968 legislation, a new noise-abatement office is operating from the Department of Transportation. And a few of the states have similar offices.

But should noise, which is usually defined as unwanted sound, be equated with the widely prevalent and publicized forms of pollution?

Yes, say some specialists. They cite the warning of Nobel Laureate Robert Koch some 60 years ago: "The day will come when man will have to fight merciless noise as the worst enemy of his health." They warn that if noise levels continue to rise as they have in the recent past, what is now a threat could be lethal.

No, say others. In order of magnitude and concern, noise is not in the same class as what's happening to the air and water, they say. And it is not, in a technical sense, a pollutant, since to pollute means to soil or dirty. Noise does not soil or dirty, nor does it accumulate as waste accumulates.

Yet, there is general agreement that excessive noise, if not pollution, nevertheless can be a menace to health and well-being.

Moreover, if it does not threaten the environment, it lowers the quality of the environment.

The same thing is often said of other by-products of modern life, especially urban life. The billboards protrude; the power lines and freeways cut across the land; roadside commercial blight spreads; open land diminishes; ugliness prevails.

All of these things relate to the question of what can be done to make urban living more pleasant. It's a question that can lead to endless debate.

The answers are not easy. For example, if highway construction is halted, it creates greater traffic congestion. Or if housing development is blocked over a huge area, it drives prices up and contributes to the density of other areas.

One thing is certain: Concern for the amenities is assuming greater importance. It is inseparable from the over-all environmental issue.

Noise, unlike ugliness and blight, can be measured with great precision. For purposes, it is measured in decibels (db), which are units of acoustic pressure levels.

The numbers can be deceptive. The sounds inside a quiet residential home might average 40 db, the sounds of a busy downtown street 80 db, the sound of a pneumatic air hammer 120 db.

But this doesn't mean the street is twice as noisy or the air hammer three times as noisy as the home.

Decibels rise by logarithmic ratios, so that a 50 db noise is 10 times as intense as a 40 db noise. For each additional 10 db, multiply by 10. The busy street, then, is 10,000 times as loud, the air hammer 100 million times as loud as the quiet living room.

Not long ago, Malcolm C. Hope, the District's associate director for environmental health, and Harry Gilbert, his specialist for noise problems, took a ride through the Washington area.

Inside the car on upper Connecticut Avenue, the needle of Gilbert's audiometer flickered in the 50 db range. Quiet enough. A window was opened; the needle went past 60 db, and when a truck passed, it went to the mid 70s.

"This is nuisance level, nothing dangerous," said Gilbert.

On to Washington Cathedral. Very quiet. Inside, the audiometer measured the hushed sounds at about 40 db, until the organ began playing. At the cathedral's great crossing, the organ measured 72 db.

Back downtown, the window open at Connecticut and K Street, the needle pointed up toward 80 db, higher when horns were sounded. It hit 95 when a bus revved up.

Hope noted that tribes in Africa living in a quiet isolated environment were found to have near-perfect hearing.

"Our 'normal' is really abnormal," he said. Around to other parts of town:

From nearly 100 yards away, a pile driver in the Southeast measured about 100 db. On the Southwest Expressway, sounds ranged in the 80s. And at the 14th Street Bridge, it went into the 90s as a plane passed overhead.

Finally, to Gravelly Point in Alexandria on the direct landing pattern to National Airport. As a jet came over, the audiometer needle swung to 114. Afterward, the needle dipped, but not too much, for the airport itself is a noisy place. The meter registered 108, 102, 105, then back to 115 as another jet swung overhead.

"Let's face it, the jet is a noisy engine," said Hope. "Exposure to that kind of noise for any period of time is dangerous."

The effects of noise generally fall into four categories.

Noise annoys. A dog barking, a siren screaming, a motorcycle tearing around a corner—any or all can be an irritant. This is not a danger, but it helps degrade the quality of urban life.

Noise disrupts. Above 50 db, it can interrupt sleep. And it can make studying difficult. Above 80 db telephoning can be next to impossible.

Noise can cause loss of hearing. Federally adopted standards say a steady 85 db is about all anyone should be asked to absorb over the length of a workday. At 95 db, the listening limit should be four hours, according to Gilbert. At 115 db, it is more like 15 minutes.

Dr. Hayes Newby, head of the Maryland University speech and hearing clinic, says

"There is no doubt of the damage that can be done. What is deceptive is that the noise levels that can cause damage are well below what is painful or uncomfortable."

Dr. Lloyd Bolling, of the George Washington University speech and hearing clinic, says an increasing number of people are reporting trouble hearing, many of them older persons. "Medical science is prolonging life," he said, "but the hearing mechanism deteriorates at the same rate. And we know that exposure to high levels of noise can help speed that deterioration."

Noise may be injurious to physical and mental health. But on this point, the specialists are in sharp disagreement.

The moderately alarmist side begins from this premise:

Man evolved in a relatively quiet world. When noise did occur, it could produce a healthy response. It was both signal and warning.

Now noise abounds, with the abnormal, as Hope suggested, the normal.

Britain's Dr. John Anthony Parr, asked if man has become used to higher noise levels and whether he can get used to more, replied: "Yes, that is true, but only at a price. One cannot ignore a noise, only put oneself in a condition in which we do not make any obvious reaction. It means keeping all the muscles tense so that we are not jumping up and down like a human yo-yo, and keeping ourselves in this state of permanent tension leads on to mental stress."

But some specialists go farther.

At the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science recently, a panel of scientists presented papers suggesting that sonic booms threaten the health of unborn babies and that noise may contribute to heart trouble and blood cholesterol. In other studies, noise has been blamed for a wide range of problems—from indigestion to an increase in the divorce rate.

But there is a conservative view, too, and it's widespread.

Drs. Newby and Bolling, for instance, say many of the claims that noise produces various ailments are highly speculative. Many scientists, too, question the validity of the research that led to these claims.

Dr. Leo J. Beranek of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has long been one of the nation's leading acoustic experts. He believes that many people are unusually susceptible to noise, but many of the reports of the effects of noise are overplayed.

After talking with a reporter for some time, Beranek said:

"Maybe you've found I'm disappointing to interview. The stories that people might wind up dying in the streets with blood running out of their ears might be more exciting."

Beranek believes that 10 to 15 percent of any group of people are highly sensitive to noise. If they are unable to adapt, they should not live near sources of loud noise, he said.

All the experts agree that the world is getting noisier. Jets fly to once-quiet islands. Urban life and noise chase the suburbanite. The farmer uses loud new machinery.

Yet Beranek is one specialist who believes the noise levels in some cities—notably New York and Chicago—are leveling off.

"Transportation is the biggest source of rising noise levels—the planes and the road traffic," he said. "If some cities are getting no noisier, it's because they've absorbed all the traffic they can."

What angers the specialists in this field is that except for the sonic boom, excessive noise produced by technology can be suppressed by technology, and by regulation. The noise problem can't be completely solved, but it can be ameliorated.

A number of European nations are ahead of this country in reducing urban noise levels. (Not all of them, to be sure; Rome,

for instance, is regarded as noisier than any American city.)

But the Swedes and the Danes, the British and the Swiss have set limits for such noise producers as motorbikes and machinery used outdoors. Moreover, while it's still a joke in this country to talk of paper-thin apartment house construction, much of the European housing industry is doing a good job with noise-cutting components.

Quieter jack hammers, air compressors and pile drivers are available. Blasting can be muffled. So can much of American industrial machinery. And the cost frequently is low.

Beranek estimates it would cost no more than \$25 a car, in mass production, to turn out quieter mufflers, better enclosed engines and quieter tires to cut down on road noise.

Col. Charles Foster, chief of the federal Noise Abatement Office, believes the cost would be somewhat higher—but not by much.

Why not require such sound-softeners? "It's a subject of debate at present," said Foster, "and it isn't that simple."

"Setting federal standards for cars would mean getting into all manner of maintenance problems—the question of how a muffler, for example, performs after the car is older."

Foster's office now is discussing the problem with the auto industry. It hopes to produce noise-muffling recommendations upon which the government could, at the least, specify that when it purchases new vehicles for its own use they have the sound-softening devices.

Working with the National Bureau of Standards, the Noise Abatement Office also hopes to turn out recommendations and ratings for tires, which account for a big part of road noise at high speeds.

But that won't be easy either. A total of 654 tire-tread patterns are on the market today. Some are noticeably quieter than others. Foster fears that the quietest treads, avoiding horizontal indentations, will not be the safest treads.

For regulatory purposes, Foster's office currently is in business for only one reason: to cut down aircraft noise. With its authority spelled out in the 1968 legislation, it requires all new planes to be equipped with quieter engines.

Will noise around airports go down? No. For the foreseeable future, it will go up. Foster is the first to concede that.

All but the newest planes are as noisy as ever. To refit America's jet fleet with quieter engines—up to \$5 million a plane for a 15db noise reduction is one estimate—would be economically prohibitive.

Beyond that one factor, the number of planes in the air will increase. To accommodate them, smaller airports will grow bigger and new airports will crop up.

"We're not going to improve this part of the environment fast enough to please the public," Foster said. "Someday, we may have planes making little noise at all. But right now it's tough. I think we'll see more complaints, more lawsuits."

Militancy is rising on other fronts where urban amenities are threatened. Local conservation groups are battling what use to be considered inevitable forces of development.

As often as not, open land is the focus of conflict.

In Montgomery County, Washington's wealthiest suburb, highway planners couldn't figure a better route for the new Northern Parkway than to run it through a lovely stream-valley park and Wheaton Regional Park. Public hearings in the last few days indicate a massive amount of citizen resistance.

This kind of save-the-land militancy goes beyond the crowded urban areas.

The Potomac Edison Co. wanted to build a 500 kilovolt transmission line across the Potomac about an hour and a half's drive

from Washington. Citizen protests—contending the line would have ruined the scenic view of the Antietam battlefield—stopped it.

Now the power company, with the permission of the Interior Department, wants the power lines, with towers more than 100 feet high, to run adjacent to the proposed Potomac National Park. The public outcry continues, reaching a peak this week at congressional hearings.

Nationally, much of the concern for what's happening to the land focuses on parks and recreation holdings—preserving them and adding to them. This is a situation with bleak prospects.

The problem could be called simple—too many people, too few parks. And there isn't enough money to buy new parks.

This is another of the environmental issues that boils down to a question of what the government is willing to spend.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has estimated it would cost most than \$300 million to acquire national parks, including Point Reyes near San Francisco and Cape Cod National Seashore, that already have been authorized. This is to say nothing of the money required for such proposed new parks as the Potomac National River and Connecticut River National Recreation Areas.

This year the Nixon administration asked for \$124 million—half of it to go to the states—and that's what Congress appropriated, despite congressional guarantees of last year earmarking \$200 million a year for parkland purchases.

From what Budget Director Robert P. Mayo told congress, the administration apparently intends to ask no more than the \$124 million in the next fiscal year. And he told Congress in effect: Don't bother authorizing any new parks since it will take years to buy the land for those already authorized.

It's uncertain whether President Nixon, now increasingly aware of public concern for the environment, will raise the ante for buying parklands.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 16, 1970]

A WORLD IN DANGER—6; DOOMSDAY—IS IT JUST AROUND THE CORNER?

(By Roberta Hornig and James Welsh)

As the environment has come on strong as an issue, so have the Jeremiahs, the prophets of doom.

From all over come the warnings of catastrophe, of man "on a suicidal course," of man "choking on his wastes," of man on his way to "destroying himself and his world."

The time-scale of this doom-crying is not on the order of a thousand or a few hundred years. It is more on the order of a generation or two, or of the 30 years left until the end of the century.

Dr. Barry Commoner, director of the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems at Washington University in St. Louis and a prolific writer, is in demand at environmental conferences across the country. He says:

"My own estimate is that we are unlikely to avoid environmental catastrophe by the 1980s unless we are able by that time to correct the fundamental incompatibilities of major technologies with the demands of the ecosystem."

The urge to warn of disaster is spreading. As likely as not, scientists and public officials discussing environmental problems will lead off their papers or speeches as one did recently:

"Man, in the way he is abusing his environment, is in danger of becoming a vanishing species."

From other quarters, both within and out of the scientific communities, come reservations, somewhat more conservative views and expressions of skepticism.

"The ecologist," said one top federal official,

"must maintain a professional posture: It is to view with alarm."

The skeptical position goes further. It holds that since doomsday gets headlines, those who want headlines cry doom. It holds, too, that the emergence of the environment issue has led to something of a "my pollution is more dangerous than your pollution" competition among specialists.

Many specialists, sincerely alarmed over what man is doing to his world—and what he is capable of doing as his numbers grow—feel they are caught in a dilemma: Warn reasonably or talk doom? Their speeches and writings often reflect this dilemma.

For instance, the state official who led off his speech with reference to man as a vanishing species was saying on page three that "doom and gloom" must give way to hard work, and by page seven, the speech was referring to "reasons for optimism."

Asked about this, he said: "Well, I guess a lot of us feel it's necessary to shake the public up."

Then the scare talk is overstated?

"No, not a bit," he said. "If we don't get this environment situation turned around, we could be in for an awful time."

Through all these contradictions, what is the public to believe? Is disaster around the corner? Disaster of what kind, what scope? Which of the doomsday warnings is backed by hard evidence, and which come under the heading of informed—or misinformed—speculation?

The seriously held predictions of widespread disaster fall into two broad areas—climate and population. Briefly they can be put this way:

Increasing atmospheric pollution, partly in connection with ocean pollution and possibly in tandem with natural forces, could bring about radical changes in the Earth's climate—disruptions in the heat balance, in weather patterns and in the atmospheric mix upon which all life depends.

The sustained population increase of this country, aggravating the problems of the environment already present, could bring on serious health problems and a lower standard of living. On top of that, the world's population is increasing so rapidly that, because of food and mineral shortages and inevitably greater pollution, the Earth may not be able to sustain the 6 billion to 7 billion of people who will live on it just 30 years from now.

Large differences exist between these two sets of disaster predictions.

The first, relating to climate, is tougher to prove.

Increasing evidence, some of it in the form of hard data, shows the volume and variety of pollutants going into the air and the oceans. But there is too little data to conclude decisively what will happen to the climate as a consequence.

"These forces are very difficult to sort out," said Peter Weyl, oceanographer at the University of New York at Stony Brook. "The natural system is complex enough even without trying to measure man's mucking with it."

A world cooling, a world warming, a world where precipitation is determined by pollutants rather than acting to cleanse the air of them—all are mentioned.

But large differences of opinion exist, not only among men crossing disciplinary lines but within single fields, including meteorology.

"We are singing different songs, and that's one of the problems," said Dr. A. Murry Mitchell, a meteorologist with the Environmental Services Administration.

Why, then, should climate rate special concern among the environmental disaster predictions?

Because, say those who are studying it, the atmosphere and oceans—the complex linkage of air-water-land organisms called the ecosystem—is so vital to life. It directly influences the climate and is directly influenced by it.

And because, in light of this, they say, "We don't know."

"What I'm mainly worried about," said Weyl, "is our lack of knowledge." This kind of statement reverberates up and down the environmental scene.

"We are inadvertently engaged in a frightening experiment—with our ecosystem, our life support system," said Dr. Fred Sargent, dean of the University of Wisconsin's new College of Environmental Sciences.

The population worry is something else.

The numbers are there, available in the form of population counts and virtually certain trends.

Calculations also abound of what resources—food, energy and raw materials—will be necessary to meet varying levels of living standards for the coming billions.

This evidence is enough to turn optimists into doomcriers.

Yet there is a paradox here; the experts have never been so divided as they now are on the consequences of overpopulation.

The traditional fear of worldwide famine recently has been challenged from a number of fronts.

Many now say there will be enough food.

The environmentalists, meanwhile, have come charging onto the scene, warning that multiplying numbers, together with any real attempt to raise the world's living standards, will result in massive worldwide pollution.

Others warn that before the world runs out of food, it will run out of the minerals and fuels necessary for a decent standard of living.

A battle is shaping up over whether famine or another danger will strike first. It brings no comfort to the experts. Even if they disagree, they see overpopulation as a Hobson's choice: If one thing won't lead to disaster, another will.

But fear of overpopulation is what fuels just about every other environmental fear.

Beyond the global concerns, many scientists believe a localized or regionalized disaster could occur any time in the '70s.

They say, for instance, that with a given set of conditions—stable weather, temperature inversion (cold air trapped by warm air above it) and a deadly mix of pollutants in the air—a city or an urban region could suffer a huge loss of life. Said one of these scientists:

"It's partly projection of trends, partly the laws of probability. You can take your bets on the city. My own pick is Tokyo—you have to see the problems there to believe them."

On yet another front there are those who fear that selective hazards, arising from the climbing presence and long-range dangers of air-water contaminants—pesticides, lead, and mercury, for example—could result in the shortening of millions of lives.

Conclusive data is lacking here. These scientists say "we don't know, but should fear the worst."

Even so, in all the disaster statements, on whatever front, there is careful hedging. The predictions are really just warnings. No one is saying that man is doomed no matter what he does. Even men like Commoner hedge their warnings.

And Lamont Cole, Cornell University ecologist, after ticking off a long list of possible environmental disasters, answered a question: "Oh, yes, I'm optimistic. People are listening now."

Other contradictions are apparent in the thread of the disaster warnings. One of them can be explained this way:

A scientist can simply extrapolate trends and project what would happen if they continued over a number of years. He would be the first to say that long before his projection runs its course, some other force could forestall it. His speech or article, however, can get misinterpreted and blown way out of proportion.

And the scientist can make mistakes that get reported over and over.

Cole, for instance, wrote an article on thermal pollution and the Earth's radiation balance for BioScience magazine in November. He calculated that, on the basis of man-made and Earth-generated energy emissions, the world would become too hot for habitation in 980 years.

But later he said: "The proposition was sound, but I made a mistake in arithmetic. 'It should have been 130 years.'"

Even so, he was asked, isn't disaster likely to befall the earth before then? "Oh, of course," he said.

The growing alarm over what could happen to the climate and the ecosystem is based on simple biological relationships.

Plants on land and in the water absorb solar energy and, through photosynthesis, convert carbon dioxide and nutrient chemicals to food, simultaneously releasing oxygen to the air. Animal life consumes the food. Animal and other organic waste is converted by micro-organisms to carbon dioxide and other inorganic nutrients that become ready to begin the cycle again.

The air, the land vegetation and the oceans act within this cycle as huge, mutually dependent converting systems. Pollution, so the fears go, would prevent these systems from doing their job.

As Dr. F. Fraser Darling, vice president of the Conservation Foundation, put it: the oxygen-carbon dioxide cycle is "a system of great age and stability which we are now taxing with the immense amounts of carbon dioxide which we're adding from the fuel we burn."

Ordinarily, more carbon dioxide would favor greater tree growth, locking up the carbon dioxide for a time. But man is cutting down trees in many places.

Another buffer is the immense amount of ocean plant life, particularly the tiny organisms called phytoplankton.

But here, another villain enters: Pesticides. In laboratory experiments, Dr. Charles F. Wurster, a biologist at the University of New York at Stony Brook, conducted experiments, later backed up in tests at four other labs, showing that pesticides inhibit photosynthesis in the phytoplankton.

Wurster warns that pesticides in the oceans, building through the life chain to deposit great amounts in the bodies of animals, "pose an enormous threat to marine life."

Many species of bird life already are on the decline—the peregrine falcon, the brown pelican, the copper hawk and marsh hawk, the herons, the shearwater, the albatross. In the sea, said Wurster, the pesticides are selectively toxic, with the danger of species replacing species to the point of large ecological changes.

Wurster predicted the situation will only get worse as pesticide pollution will reach a peak ocean effect 10 to 20 years from now—"sheer madness," he said.

Meanwhile, other scientists and laymen saw in the phytoplankton experiments reason to predict large changes in the oxygen-carbon dioxide cycle. Some went so far as to suggest, as one California professor testified before Congress, that oxygen may run low and that by the year 2000 people will be "gasping for a last breath of air."

Leading meteorologists dismiss that fear. "I can't think of a more remote possibility," said Dr. Walter Orr Roberts, director of the Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo.

He and his colleagues say there is more than enough oxygen in the atmosphere—and with no evidence of oxygen depletion, even to a small fraction of 1 percent.

But over the last several decades, carbon dioxide has risen from just under 3 tenths of 1 percent to 3.5 tenths of 1 percent of the atmospheric mix. And the increase is accelerating.

Carbon dioxide is no threat to health, but in the atmosphere, it interferes with infrared radiation returning from earth to the air,

thus leading to a warming of the atmosphere—what is called "the greenhouse effect."

Dr. Helmut E. Landsberg of the University of Maryland estimates that, with this factor acting alone, the Earth could warm about two degrees by the end of the century—enough to begin melting some of the polar ice. But he isn't very concerned about that. The earth is now cooling, not warming. Since 1940, it has cooled about a half of 1 degree.

The explanation is that a buildup of particles in the atmosphere is occurring. They act to block radiation from the sun.

But the experts disagree on what to blame. It's man-made pollution, say some—dust from bad land management together with industrial and auto air pollution.

Dr. A. Murray Mitchell, of the federal Environmental Science Services Administration, believes otherwise. Natural forces are far more to blame, chiefly the rise of volcanic activity since 1940, he said.

A new ice age? Nothing to get excited about, according to Roberts, Mitchell and others. But Weyl warned that a further cooling of the Earth's temperature by one or two degrees would lead to fierce winter weather in many parts of the world.

Some scientists, Landsberg and Roberts among them, are worried about air pollution for other reasons. They warn of changing and potentially disruptive patterns of precipitation.

Dr. Vincent J. Schaefer, a pioneer in cloud-seeding who is now at the State University of New York in Albany, said that a big danger is the buildup of lead particles from auto exhausts. They combine with iodine vapor to produce lead iodide—nuclei for the formation of large concentrations of ice crystals downwind of big-city smog blankets.

The result, said Schaefer, is to form cloud layers but reduce local rain or snow. But when a large supply of moist air moves into the region, the weather could go the other way around—"a massive cloud-seeding phenomenon" triggering long and violent storms.

The magnitude of the population problem can be seen in a few numbers. It took the world until 1800 to reach a population of 1 billion. The second billion came by 1930, and the third billion by 1960. Today's population is 3.5 billion, and this is likely to double in 30 years. Unchecked, it would keep on doubling every 30 years, the experts say.

The cause of this headlong acceleration is not rising birth rates but declining death rates. Better health and agricultural practices across the globe, especially since World War II, have meant a greater percentage of babies growing to adulthood to produce more babies.

For years the spectre of overpopulation has been associated with food resources, with the standard argument that a growing but impoverished population would literally starve. It is still a leading argument of many population experts.

But it now faces challenge.

Three years ago the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization was warning of famine. Two weeks ago, its annual report appeared—saying the world's food problem in the future is more likely to be huge surpluses than starvation.

Technological breakthroughs, including the use of high-yield "miracle" grains, and the commitment of nations such as India to this technology, have led to the reversal, said FAO.

Still, many of the population forecasters reply that the technology will provide only temporary relief.

But optimism over food production is growing.

Dr. Jean Mayer, the nutritionist who serves as President Nixon's special consultant on hunger, told Congress last year that agriculture developments promise a food supply that will keep up with and surpass population growth.

Mayer has a different fear: "I am concerned about the areas of the globe where people are rapidly becoming richer. For rich people occupy much more space, consume more of each natural resource, disturb the ecology more, and create more land, air, water, chemical, thermal and radioactive pollution than poor people."

Other scientists are joining him to warn that the world can't have it all—greater numbers along with the standard of living associated with technologically advanced countries.

Dr. Preston Cloud, a biogeologist at the University of California at Santa Barbara, has estimated that if the world's 7 billion people expected by the year 2000 were to have a standard of living Americans now enjoy, mineral and fuel production would have to multiply 200 to 400 times.

"It might be done, but it couldn't last," said Cloud, "The world has only so much in the way of these raw materials."

Arguments like this have given new impetus to concern over population in this country. Dr. J. George Harrar, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, says:

"In many respects, an advanced industrialized society such as ours with a comparatively low birth rate uses up its natural resources and upsets its environmental equilibrium at a much faster rate than does an underdeveloped poor country with a high birth rate."

To top that, as Cloud points out, this nation, with only 6 percent of the world's population, now uses nearly 50 percent of the raw materials the world now produces. The choice, he said, is whether to slow American economic growth or to continue using the materials underdeveloped nations will need for their own growth.

The other alternative, of course, would be to limit America's numbers. How, and by how much, is the question—one of explosive moral, political and scientific implications.

Nevertheless, most of the authorities in the field agree that it could be easy compared with the task of cutting into the runaway population growth in the world's underdeveloped regions.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 18, 1970]

A WORLD IN DANGER—7: THE ROUGH AND COSTLY ROAD AHEAD

(By Roberta Hornig and James Welsh)

From President Nixon to industrial leaders, housewives and students, Americans want to clean up the environment.

But it will cost billions of dollars, and thus far no one appears ready to pay for it.

And the price will go far beyond dollars. Some of America's traditional values will be called to account—relationships within the federal system, the freedoms of private enterprise, even the habits of the housewife and commuter.

A nationwide poll last year showed 85 percent of the public "concerned" about the environment. But when people were asked how much they were willing to pay each year to improve the environment, 51 percent said they would pay \$10 or less, 18 percent said \$50, 4 percent said \$100, 9 percent said they wouldn't pay anything, and 18 percent said they didn't know.

Calculating from the poll, the American people were willing to spend \$1.4 billion a year in tax money—more than the amount the federal government has been spending annually on environmental programs.

But to really clean up the environment it probably would cost far, far more. Some put the total at \$100 billion to \$125 billion from government and industry over five years.

And it would mean a lot more to the taxpayer than higher taxes.

It would shrink the consumer dollar. A considerably quieter aircraft engine, for example, could bring higher air fares. For the electric power industry to install equipment

sufficient to prevent thermal pollution of waterways will mean higher electric bills.

It could mean lower product performance. A slightly grayer washday collar might be the price of getting a pollution-free detergent.

A little less getaway power might be the price of a pollution-free auto engine. And it might not go as far on a gallon of gas.

It could mean inconvenience—a return to returnable soda bottles, for instance, or traveling to airports sufficiently far out to avoid the worst of the air and noise from big jets.

It could mean a further shift of governmental power toward the center. States are likely to assume greater control of the use of the land, a matter heretofore left to local governments. Washington will assume greater control over air and water standards, now largely the domain of the states.

It could mean tighter regulation of what industry and people are free to do. This would begin with very minor controls—"No Dumping Here" for instance. Before very long, they could range to unprecedented measures such as government-science panels testing new products before they are permitted on the market.

And a growing number of people say something far more dramatic must be included in the price—a set of measures calculated to slow down or bring to a halt the growth of the American population.

Such steps won't come at once. There will have to be a beginning.

Congress returns to Washington tomorrow, many of its members poised for battle over what the beginning should be, what legislation should be passed, what money should be spent.

It will be, in part, a political circus with many side shows. Hearings, speeches, press statements, claims and counterclaims will run the gamut of this vast and complicated subject.

From pesticides to use of the land, from electric power demands to food-packing standards and family planning, the political jostling will be fierce.

On Thursday it's President Nixon's turn. At 12:30 he will go before Congress and the American people with his first State of the Union message. Environmental issues will comprise a big part of the message.

Already Nixon is being second-guessed by congressional Democrats, some of them eager to paint the administration as talking big but doing little to bring pollution to an end.

On the Senate side it just so happens that three men long and closely associated with environmental issues are at least potential dark-horse candidates for the presidency in 1972. They are Sens. Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin and Henry M. Jackson of Washington, and each is ready for battle. Of the three, Muskie has been the most willing, Jackson the least willing, to tackle the President head on.

But it will be in successive messages that Nixon will show more of his hand. The budget message is the key, for money is at the heart of his dilemma over exactly what to propose.

Last year Nixon requested \$214 million for helping communities put up sewage treatment plants. Congress appropriated \$800 million.

It's still under debate at the White House whether to spend the extra money or to impound it, although the betting is that Nixon will spend it. If he doesn't spend it, he will be open to attack, not only from Congress but from local and state governments. Yet if he does spend it, his budgetary problems will increase, and he may be in a position of saying he will ask for less money next year.

Such relatively small issues, of course, approach the basic question: What would it cost to clean up the environment?

The dollar figures fly, and the range of estimates is wild.

The upper end of this range is between

\$100 and \$125 billion, a great deal from government, some from industry.

To get into that upper range, it is necessary to assume an attack on all fronts and to assume that where estimates vary, the highest should be used. (The most glaring example: To separate sewer lines and storm drainage lines across the country could cost anywhere from \$15 billion to \$49 billion).

Water pollution control accounts for the largest part of cost. It includes perhaps \$25 billion for municipal and industrial treatment plants and equipment, the money for sewer line-storm line separation, \$6 billion to eliminate acid-mine drainage, and billions more for pollution arising from pesticides, fertilizers and animal feed lots.

Add nearly \$5 billion for air pollution control over five years; another \$3.5 billion the government has estimated for solid-waste treatment work and research over the same period; a couple of billion for retrofitting ships to control waste; several billion on national parks and urban-area parks; and assorted millions for research in fields like oceanography and climate monitoring.

If all of this were to be attempted in a five-year plan, it would mean spending \$20 billion to \$25 billion a year.

No one in the Nixon administration is thinking in these terms now. Even though the government wouldn't be paying all of it, there just isn't that kind of money around.

With "uncontrollable" expenditures like welfare payments and farm subsidies on the rise by \$8 billion a year, with the tax cut bringing in less revenue than expected, with the financial community expecting restraint because of inflation, the President had about as much budgetary flexibility this year as an \$8,000-a-year commuter facing a stack of unpaid bills.

"There isn't much room to maneuver," a Budget Bureau official laments.

And so the President and his aides are in search of priorities, of more sensational but less costly solutions.

According to insiders, Nixon's program in '70 will include the following:

Air pollution—An increase in federal spending. A 50 percent or even 100 percent increase in funds would not be prohibitive, since federal spending this year amounted to less than \$100 billion. And it would go to combat what the public believes to be the most serious environmental problem.

Water pollution—The administration will emphasize municipal waste treatment plants in a plan calling for about \$10 billion in bonds. Cash obligations would be strung out over 20 to 30 years, with the federal share going no higher than \$500 million a year. The plan also is expected to carry new financing arrangements to help municipalities cope with today's tough bond market.

Parks—A park-purchase plan is planned, with the emphasis on open space in and around big cities, mostly in the East. Spending on parks is relatively low and comes from non-tax money.

It represents part of the income from special charges, including park fees and offshore oil-drilling leases.

Some insiders expect Nixon to announce some sort of "pilot project" for an urban area park, possibly in the Washington area.

Government reorganization—This is the cheapest route to begin tackling problems of making the air and water cleaner, and he is likely to take it.

For years, several government officials and congressmen have been arguing for putting responsibility for water, air and solid wastes in one place, since decisions on one often affect another. The Interior Department is in charge now of cleaning up the nation's waterways and the bets are that it will also assume stewardship over the two more forms of pollution—air and solid waste—now the responsibility of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

And he is expected to rename Interior as the Department of National Resources.

Because of budgetary strictures, other pollution battlefronts may be virtually ignored. They include soil erosion and other agricultural runoff, the sewer line-storm sewer separation, and mine-acid drainage.

On some fronts, the way to attack pollution is not through governmental spending but governmental toughness. Moreover, the tighter the budget, the greater the temptation for government to go this route.

For Nixon to crack down on big industry may run against the grain of Republican orthodoxy. But it could produce real and visible results, especially where products are involved that undeniably pollute the air or water.

Three conspicuous examples are the automobile with its internal combustion engine, the nutrient-rich detergents, and the chemical pesticides. Already two of the most toxic pesticides—DDT and dieldrin—are under a measure of federal restraint.

In all three cases, accelerated research is necessary to find safer versions, or safe substitutes. For research now underway, government already is picking up part of the bill. Industry especially the big auto firms, also is spending millions. It may be called on to spend much more.

But the consumer eventually will pay for it, both in taxes and undoubtedly in higher product prices.

Other dilemmas face the administration in approaching the environmental issue. One of them is reflected in the letter a young man sent the White House:

"Stop pollution now," he said, and the word "now" was repeated 60 times.

No one can stop pollution now. As Dr. Lee DuBridg, the President's top aide on science, puts it, to bring pollution to an end immediately would bring the economy, and civilization, to an end.

Vehicles would have to stop moving. Industry would close down. So would power plants. Farmers couldn't protect their crops.

"We will not," says presidential adviser Daniel Patrick Moynihan, "reverse the tendency of a century in the space of one administration or two, or like as not, the next five."

It's this view of the problem that gives pause to administration staffers as it comes time for Nixon to go before the American people. Says one staffer: "We don't want to oversell the problem and undersell the magnitude of the difficulty of dealing with it."

Sen. Muskie, whose rhetoric has not been lacking on the issue, says "It's necessary to develop a sense of alarm without creating a sense of terror."

With emotions on the rise, with the economic and technical complexities of environmental issues so stubborn, paradox and contradiction are inevitable.

An example is one of the classic conservation flaps—the decision by Consolidated Edison, New York's power company, to build a plant along the Hudson River at Storm Mountain.

A participant recalls that from the storm of protest, "you would think the plant was going to be built in a great wilderness area. In fact, the site amounted to a waterfront slum."

Yet as a result of public opposition, the argument eventually reached the U.S. Court of Appeals. It handed down a historic decision, ruling that the Federal Power Commission must take scenic, historical and recreational values into account in licensing power plants.

Two weeks ago—five years after the fight began—an FPC hearing examiner ruled the site to be the right one after all. If further ruled, though, that Con Ed must put both the plant and the transmission lines underground.

Thus a fairly illogical, emotional argument by conservationists brought good results, in this case the Supreme Court ruling.

But the results—in this case the underground site—can be very expensive. New Yorkers will see this in their electric bills.

The Con Ed case is not isolated. In fact, the issue of where to put power plants, and what kind of power plants they should be, promises to be one of the big environmental fights of the coming year.

Americans have a heroic appetite for electric power. In 10 years, the experts say, the output must be doubled. In 30 years, if the population grows to 300 million, Americans will need nearly five times the current 325-million-kilowatt capacity.

This will require more and bigger power plants. If they don't come along, the likelihood will increase of power failures such as the major blackout of the Northeast five years ago.

Plants fired by coal and other fossil fuels are a major contributor to air pollution. Besides, future growth threatens big shortages of these fluids.

Nuclear power plants are the alternative. They don't pollute the air. And with new "breeder reactors" on the way, no shortage will develop of uranium and thorium fuel.

But thermal pollution of waterways is a colossal problem, and the more nuclear plants there are, the worse the problem gets.

In addition, the "nukes" arouse fear. People become alarmed over possible radiological emissions and over the possibility of an accident, in addition to protesting on grounds of thermal pollution and aesthetics.

From the Atomic Energy Commission and power industry come statements of reassurance. One Westinghouse nuclear energy consultant says the radiation effect from a nuclear power plant on the population within 20 miles "is the equivalent of wearing a radiant dial wrist watch three days of the year."

But many disagree. Within the federal government there are specialists who hold the AEC's standards for radiological emissions should be tightened tenfold.

This thorn alone is polarizing the environment issue throughout the country, and public officials are worried about it.

Some, recognizing the scope of public fear and resistance, urge extra-heavy emphasis on standards and available technology to eliminate radiological hazards and cut down thermal pollution.

But Rep. Chet Holifield, D-Calif., whose Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee held hearings on the subject last year, says that "Unless the demands for clean water and air are kept in perspective, the anti-technologists and single-minded environmentalists may find themselves conducting their work by the flickering light of a candle."

On other fronts, industry is increasingly on the defensive. It is reacting in disparate ways.

Some industrial groups and firms remain hard-nosed.

Industries can be found bending over backwards to please. Commented an official of one Massachusetts firm: "We put in equipment that wasn't even necessary—just to please the public."

Detroit's big auto firms are conspicuous among the industries that are now racing to catch up with public opinion and the possible thrust of governmental crackdown.

Last month Henry Ford II, calling air pollution the industry's most serious problem, pledged manpower and millions of dollars to help solve the problem. Last week, Edward N. Cole, president of General Motors, went Ford one up by predicting his company will turn out "essentially pollution-free cars" by 1980.

Other companies try to advertise their concern for the environment—while taking a slower pace in reform.

And some are still basically ignoring the issue.

A major reason why conflict and confusion have mounted over environmental questions

is that until now no one on the federal level has really been in charge. Agencies dealing with environmental problems are scattered. The White House has touched on the problems in piecemeal fashion. Information is often contradictory, often lacking.

This could change. Many observers see great promise in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, drafted and shepherded through Congress by Senator Jackson and signed by Nixon Jan. 1.

The legislation sets two precedents: It establishes national policy, directing every executive department to weave environmental considerations into all new programs and to make sure old ones conform with clean-environment goals. And it creates a Council on Environmental Quality at the top level.

Nixon has yet to name the three-member council. He may do so in the State of the Union address. Reportedly, he wants to avoid dominance by scientists and will seek to fill possibly two of the positions with generalists who will take a broad look at the problem.

As spelled out in the 1969 law, the council will do an inventory of the nation's natural resources and prepare an annual report on the "state of the environment" for Congress. Its reports will have a major impact on what happens to the environment in the 1970s.

Given a rising public and private commitment, if not an all-out attack, here is what some experts believe will come in the decade.

Air pollution, after worsening through the mid '70's may well diminish to the point that the air in 1980 will be cleaner than it is now.

The air problem lends itself more readily to reasonably priced technology than other problems. The biggest uncertainty is how soon automotive air pollution can be licked.

A combination of tough standards and a lot of money could improve water quality standards—but not uniformly.

What's called "point-source" pollution, where industry or municipalities pour big amounts of waste in the water, could come under control. But the water will remain dirty. General runoff and erosion, especially in rural areas, will see to that.

The problem of where to put mountains of rubbish and other solid waste could be abated, or it could become a monster. Mere money won't help. More degradable products won't help much. The hope here lies in technology—the pollution-free incinerator, and recycling of products. But that isn't around the corner.

The problem of too much noise could go like air pollution. The technology is there; all that's required is the sensitivity and the will to use it. If that happens, noise, after mounting as a problem could level off or recede.

Other urban amenities will be far more difficult to improve. With exceptions (putting power lines underground is one) technology won't help much. It won't help settle fights over what land to develop, what to keep open.

"Government will be hard put to legislate beautiful hot dog stands," says one observer.

Where there is no easy answer, the environment battle will get hotter. The use of urban-suburban land, and the effort to preserve places of great natural beauty, is in this category. The location of airports, and power plants and not-so-clean industry will be continually at issue.

Beyond all these things lie what some people believe are the overriding necessities—channeling urban growth in new directions, selectively limiting consumption habits, placing stringent curbs on population growth.

But at this point, for practical purposes, these are likely to be second-stage issues, issues to be treated gingerly or put off or avoided.

To Congress, the President, and so many others who will become embroiled in this recently dramatized issue, the task at hand

can be summed up in the phrase "quality of life." It will be a task of cleaning up, of making the air and the water and the land healthier and more enjoyable.

Over the decades, as Americans have built a richer economic standard, they have run up a huge bill to the natural world around them. The bill is overdue.

To pay it off in large part, to make sure it runs up no more, could generate a new ethic, the ethic of man as part of a living interdependent organism called Earth, the kind of ethic necessary to cope with the bigger problems of the future.

A GLOSSARY FOR THE ECO-MANIAC

"There are fashions in words," a veteran conservationist noted recently, and "ecology . . . is being bandied about until people are growing sick of it before they know what it means."

Here's a set of definitions of environmental terms that will crop up frequently as the environment becomes more of a popular issue.

Environment—The sum of all living and non-living factors affecting organisms, including man.

Ecology—The study of the relationship of living things to their living and non-living environment.

Ecosystem—A complex of plant, animals and their physical environment, interrelated in such a way that changes in one affect the other.

Pollution—The addition to an ecosystem of substances in a quantity sufficient to produce undesirable changes.

Biosphere—The thin skin of water, air and soil which surrounds the Earth and contains life.

Atmosphere—That portion of the biosphere made up of air.

Lately, mutant word-strains, with "eco" as prefix, are emerging. Seen in print recently were "eco-catastrophe," "eco-activist" and "eco-tactics."

Can "eco-maniac" be far behind?

MYLAI MASSACRE HOAX—AS OTHERS SEE US

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, during the last several weeks the American people have been treated to a gory propaganda campaign in which Hanoi's "dear American friends" and their dupes and stooges in this country have sought to attribute to American soldiers, doing their duty in combat, the image of wanton murderers of innocent civilians—old men, harmless women, and children.

Had it not been for the fact that several million American men are combat veterans of our four wars and several other military operations in the past 60 years, this scheme might have succeeded. Instead, it has only given the enemy additional propaganda to use both in the Vietnam theater and elsewhere in the world.

My contacts with large numbers of Americans during the past month have convinced me that this particular trick of the enemy has failed. The great majority of the men and women of this country have faith in their fighting men and support them. This is as it should be among a free people.

Writing under the pen name of "Z. A. Rust" in the magnificent Manchester, N.H., Union Leader, a distinguished former European diplomat, who has witnessed the machinations of the Red conspiracy in nation after nation in Europe for half a century, views the My Lai hoax objectively and writes cogently and pungently from the viewpoint of an experienced observer. His conclusions merit our serious attention. I include his article, "Massacre of the Military" as follows:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Dec. 15, 1969]

MASSACRE OF THE MILITARY
(By Z. A. Rust)

The military forces of the United States guarantee the national territory not only against an outside aggression but also against the increasing danger of defeat of the civilian authority by foreign inspired and controlled subversive minorities, as was once more demonstrated during the Moratorium manifestations.

In so doing, they insure not only the survival of their country as an independent state but also that of all countries that can still call themselves free, fundamentally defenseless in front of the aggressive and conspiratorial activities of the other nuclear big power.

It is this unique and irreplaceable national and international instrument of defense of all that can still be saved of a three thousand year old legacy of culture and civilization, of moral and spiritual values, that is subjected today in its own country to a deadly cross-fire from almost all the media of information and from many political groups and personalities, while very timorously defended by a panicked officialdom. What is aimed at is the prestige, the self-reliance of the United States Army, the trust, love and admiration of the United States people for their gallant and toiling fighting sons.

What has to be killed before they come back from a thankless war, is the glory that will halo their flags despite the fact that they have not been allowed to win. What has been started in the United States is the massacre of the national army, not by enemy fire on the battlefields but by slandering fellow citizens at home.

There was something of that already in the constitution of that U.S. Senate panel to study "the undue influence of the Military over the U.S. foreign policy."

An obvious hoax: If an such an influence would have existed the war in Vietnam would have been won in the first three months. It was with the same purpose that the slogan had been spread of the "Military-Industrial Complex" with the implication that generals were provoking wars and keeping them going in order to pocket a part of the benefits of the armament industry.

When it was felt that something more tangible was needed, the story of a few confiscated old handguns, sold at a profit by a retired brass, held for sometime the newspapers' headlines and permitted junior reporters to display their talents.

But the big opportunity seemed to come with the story of that North Vietnam spy, allegedly victim of short-justice proceedings. The opportunity was all the more tempting as the military unit implied was the pick of the bunch, the Green Berets, the fabulous parachutists.

The publicity turmoil was enormous. Useless to observe that nobody bothered about the hundreds of U.S. soldiers who might have fallen victims of enemy activities resulting from the information transmitted by this double-agent.—The victims seemed already brought to bay.

The attempt petered out, however, because the muddy stream in which the spy's body had allegedly been thrown refused to give it back.

BETTER CASE NEEDED

A better case had to be found, and the stalkers of the anti-national conspiracy were once more unleashed. One year after the Song My affair, which is called now the "Breakfast Massacre," a sophomore in Claremont Men's College was found who was ready to spread mimeographed letters around him, telling about butchered civilians in Song My and orders received to that effect.

Twenty-two months after the attack of this Viet Cong and North Vietnam stronghold by a U.S. infantry company, the Chicago Sun Times discovered an ex-PVT, who had belonged to this troop, a young man, who let himself be interviewed and hauled before the T.V. vomiting a sensitivity test confession which raised in the liberal press a storm of horrifying and debasing accusations not against the few men of the implied platoon but against the whole of the U.S. forces fighting in Vietnam.

BACK COMRADES

The New York Times, the Washington Post, The Boston Globe, News Week, Time Magazine, Life which have backed for years those whom Hanoi calls its "comrades in arms," appeared with pages after pages of alleged confessions, of sudden and suspicious testimonies, with a panorama of what they call, themselves, "controversial pictures."

Indeed they were pictures of tragedies which might have happened anywhere, anytime in whatever war, and most especially in a war where, thanks to a disastrous decision by the civilian authorities, backed by those same political circles which stir up today this anti-militarist campaign, hostilities are strictly limited to allied and friendly territory.

Together with hundreds of thousands of U.S. readers we have seen a syndicated cartoon representing a U.S. soldier seated on the edge of a basin filled with bodies of murdered children, smoke is still coming out of the soldier's carbine. He looks proudly at his bag of victims.

And this is only one sample of the graphic productions of the slanderers.

The newspapers wave the world "massacre" in their headlines as if everything would have been already investigated and proved.

SAMPLE HEADLINES

Here are some samples: GI Says Massacre was Point Blank Murder—Ex-GI Saw Civilians Shot Like Clay Pigeons.—Nightmare Descends Upon U.S.—Ex-GI Says Brass Halted Viet Massacre—Pilot Saved Viet Children—Case for Withdrawal—Ex-GI Says Captain Shot Boy—Massacre Judge Hits Talking before Trial—Army Secretary Resor Called to Testify on Massacre—Resor Called in Viet Massacre Probe, etc., etc. . . .

On what is based this unparalleled campaign of defamation and vilification of the national armed forces by what must still be called the national press. The South-Vietnam authorities, directly and principally interested in what is supposed to have been a massacre of South Vietnam civilians, and after investigation on the spot ordered by President Nguyen Van Thieu and executed by the highest local authorities, among which was the governor of the province, have repeatedly denied that any massacre took place in the Song My, My Lai area "When Task Forces Barker moved into that region they met with strong resistance from the enemy. The result of the combat was 125 enemy killed and at the same time about 30 civilians living in the hamlet were killed by tactical air-strikes and artillery while the fight was going on.—Reports from newspapers and foreign news agencies recently saying that 527 civilians were killed were completely inaccurate."

WARNS NEWSMEN

Those same authorities have warned the U.S. newspapermen concerning the testimony of the villagers of a region intermittently under Viet Cong domination and continuously under Viet Cong terror. It is, however, those Communist-influenced inhabitants who the United States newspapers and news agencies, the New York Times and the Associated Press leading, have chosen as exclusive informers from the South Vietnam side, concerning the so-called "massacres."

It is true that efforts are made now to find and bring in the Song My region one or two South Vietnam senators who would be ready to refute the official South Vietnam reports on the Pinkville battle, and back the "massacre" version of the U.S. liberal press.

Who are the informers and the delators of their comrades and of their officers on the American side of the controversy? "No one," says the director of this courageous newspaper, "has examined those individuals under oath. At this time it is not known whether they are telling the truth or whether they are lying, or whether they are left-winger, or Communist agents deliberately engaged in a smear campaign against the United States."

The quality of ex-Pvt. Pendleton's testimony, who "volunteered" his information to the Press 22 months after the Song My affair, is obvious.

QUOTE FROM UPI

We quote from the UPI:

Pendleton said he was in the third platoon and entered the village, also called Pinkville, after a platoon led by Lt. Wilhelm L. Calley. Calley has been formally charged with murder. "When we got there, the guys in Calley's platoon were shooting all over the place. There were big groups of bodies lying on the ground in gulleys and in the rice paddies." He knew something was wrong and so "he stayed out of it and did not shoot anybody" (emphasis ours).

In another part of his interview with the UPI investigator, Pendleton, "a roofing employee until a recent injury" said: "There were a lot of dead people, about 15 in a pile."

Whoever fought a war, even among less savage and merciless circumstances than those imposed on an army which is forbidden to win and allowed only to die, knows the sort of people "who stays out of it and does not shoot anybody."

It is just the same people who remember after about two years "that something was wrong" if they are slightly prodded by some inquisitive sleuth on a slander mission.

And who are the accusers? We had recently the comforting opportunity of seeing Capt. Medina on the television, a battle-tried straightforward, heroic figure, answering with military precision and irresistible convincing effect to the harassing questions of a troupe of newspapermen, notebook and ball pen in hand, on the watch for any possible incriminating slip in the captain's explanations.

Most recently Sen. Charles A. Percy from Illinois has triggered another horror investigation following another mimeographed letter, this time against the Marine battalion of Maj. Charles Robb, President Johnson's son-in-law, who volunteered for Vietnam 13 months ago.

Trial by newspapers and news agencies has started immediately. From the curt and categorical denials of Major Robb, columnist Jack Anderson in the New York post puts, typically, stress on the fact that Maj. Robb declared, quite naturally, that he can answer only for what he has done, seen or heard of.

Where were those sanctimonious crybabies of the press and of the political world, when the thousands of corpses of the Hue massacre were discovered? Or, to go a little farther back, when in Katanga civilian population, children, women, Red Cross Nurses

and doctors included were butchered by mercenaries armed, transported and controlled by a Kennedy administration?

Or, to go still farther back, when the bodies of almost 200 United States soldiers were discovered in North Korea, hands tied behind their back and with a bullet hole in the nape of their necks. We do not remember any fuss about this last episode among the anti-anti-Communist political groups and their newspapers and magazines.

The campaign that has just broken out—and will be very likely pushed much farther—against the armed forces of the United States is nothing but an extension of the Moratorium demonstrations. It has the same purpose and is of the same foreign and anti-national origin. It uses the same news media and has the same political groups and personalities as protagonists.

Senator Fulbright has hastened to declare to the inquiring pressmen that the alleged massacre "was one reason more that the U.S. should move promptly for a negotiated settlement of the war." He had no censure against the pre-trial judgments delivered by the liberal news media, but availed himself of this opportunity to attack the production of a patriotic Navy motion picture about war in Vietnam, which he called undemocratic and blatant piece of propaganda.

Sen. Edward Kennedy, hermetically protected by a very special ruling of the Massachusetts Supreme Court against news media prejudgments, considers also the "massacre" in Song My as already proved.

"DRAMATIZED TALK"

"This incident dramatized unfortunately but significantly the toll among civilians during the Vietnam war," he said.

And he came over with an important piece of information: it is not 100 or 500 civilians but 300,000 who have been killed during the war in South Vietnam. Some of those casualties have been "stimulated" by the enemy, said the senator, but according to his information, the majority of them have been slain by United States and South Vietnam troops.

"There never was a better argument for withdrawal from Vietnam than Song My," says the Boston Globe: And the same newspaper adds: "Song My is different you will say, and I will deny it. Song My is America in the 1960's, and God help us still to survive it!"

This onslaught against the U.S. troops in Vietnam was prepared long since; otherwise how could one explain that exactly at the same time the TV channels present to their public the few detractors and slanderers they could find among the more than one million men who have done their one-year stretch in Vietnam, they present also a long and complete photographic demonstration of the material destructions—all of them attributed to the United States forces—that war has provoked in South Vietnam.

ONE CHAPTER

Song My is only one chapter of the constant pursuit of moral and material disarmament, of general withdrawal and surrender, which will leave the last non-Communist big power at the mercy of the international forces which pushes it towards the Great Merger, at the mercy also of the hordes of neo-barbarians foreseen by MacCauly more than a hundred years ago. Against these as has been so often demonstrated during the last three administrations—the Army and the Police are the only possible defence.

Great harm has already been done. It would be irretrievable if the government, yielding to ill-meaning pressures, would deliver the accused officers to civilian courts and fanciful investigators. If those soldiers have to be judged, let them be judged by soldiers, by men who have fought the same war and under the same conditions: surrounded by so-called demilitarized zones of neutral borders inviolable only for them, but

through which the enemy pours his troops and his material, forbidden to fight in enemy territory, deprived of the real use of their Air Force and their invincible Navy, and—as every body knows and the enemy better than anybody else—strictly forbidden to win.

Just imagine to what moral trial will be submitted the United States fighter in Vietnam today, when he learns that any officer leading an attack against an enemy occupied village can be charged with "assault with intent to kill," or with "indiscriminate killing" if the village is taken.

Yes, to prevent a total deterioration of the military spirit among the ranks and files of the United States fighting troops it is of utmost importance to keep the Song My affair exclusively under military control.

But to restore this spirit completely, to restore to the United States people and to the Free World an American Army morally and materially unscathed, this Army must be given the right to win the victory it has deserved by so many sacrifices, so much courage, so much toil and so much faithfulness.

A GRATIFYING STORY

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, with this week being set aside as U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce Week, I wish to bring to the attention of this distinguished body the fine work of the Van Nuys Jaycees in California. Their "Operation Amigo" project is a wonderful example of the fine work that the Jaycees perform throughout the Nation; I want to bring this wonderful story to the attention of my colleagues here in Congress.

A GRATIFYING STORY

At the age of six months Juan Carlos' little legs were hit by Polio. His two legs are paralyzed, and do not know the feeling of what it is to walk. In 1967 Juan Carlos was 2½ years old; by the end of that year he was hopping almost as fast as his brothers and sisters could walk; he was wearing leg braces and crutches brought by the "Operation Amigo" project of the Van Nuys Jaycees.

Juan Carlos will need 10 years of treatment, more braces, bigger crutches, eight surgeries and endless hours of therapy. His pain, physical and emotional, will be immeasurable.

Because of a bone infection, he needed an emergency operation; with no one to bring him to Los Angeles someone thought of the Jaycees. In less than 24 hours he was brought down by one of our members, Lamar Wood. Lamar made the trip non-stop.

Early in January 1967, little Juan Carlos' life was to receive a dramatic shock. He found himself in a huge frightening place, inside a hospital. He was brought down for surgery to correct a deformed bone in one of his legs.

The following morning, Juan Carlos' little body was lying motionless in the center of the operating table. There was no one from home to wait for the result of the operation. They are too poor to afford even one day in Los Angeles, but Juan Carlos was not really afraid.

The sterile knife, the steady hands of the surgeon, the grace of God, and the love of the volunteers were there to help him all the way.

After a speedy recovery made possible mostly by a diet of Chocolate Ice Cream, cake and Coca Cola, he spent six weeks in a foster home, and then a happy reunion with mama and papa back in Mexicali, Mexico.

On October 17, I inquired about this charming little boy; they tell me that five surgeries, two stainless steel pins in each leg supporting his bones, braces, a pair of crutches and therapy are keeping him on the road to his long rehabilitation. They say he still remembers, in English, how to say "I want a Chocolate Shake."

This little Mexican boy's case is typical of those seen by American doctors from Los Angeles Orthopedic Hospital, who each weekend conduct a clinic in Calexico, California for Mexican children from the Mexicali area.

They treat all sorts of Orthopaedic problems, clubfeet, tuberculosis of the bones, even broken bones. But 80% to 90% are post polio cases. The clinic is free to patients, who every Saturday afternoon swarm into the second floor of a Calexico building. Here volunteers, doctors, nurses, therapists, bracing makers, interpreters, clerical helpers work long hours to process as many as 125 children. It is a pitiful, heart tearing sight but one that overflows with hope.

For nearly three years now the Van Nuys Jaycees, and the wives club have brought hope to hundreds, and hundreds of these crippled children thru its international relations "Operation Amigo."

The Jaycees have made 14 trips to the border clinic bringing not just good will, and friendship but needed supplies.

In the past, wheel chairs, leg and arm braces, an x-ray machine and medical supplies have been collected and delivered by the Jaycees to Calexico. A refurbished hospital in Mexicali was the destination for the badly needed iron lung. Operation Amigo has been responsible for the delivery of 74 hospital beds. These beds have been placed at the Mexicali Red Cross, the local hospital and the Mexicali Orphanage. The hundreds of boxes containing clothes are sorted by age and sex, mended, ironed and distributed among the patients. When Operation Amigo began there were 1,200 children in need of treatment; today there are in excess of 3,000. Many parents walk 15 to 25 miles to bring the kids for assistance.

This year the Jaycees have delivered to Calexico an excess of 25 tons of supplies. Chairman Bernie Leick of the Van Nuys Jaycees presented to Don Fernando Espana a certificate of appreciation, the first such award given outside of California soil. Mr. Espana has been instrumental in helping the Jaycees in Mexicali.

The Van Nuys Jaycees were also honored by receiving an award of Juan Carlos, as well as most of the children in the clinic, never had enough money to buy toys, so they had to make their own out of empty food cans. Toys are especially welcome during Christmas time. "They do more for the kids there than anything else". The past two Christmas's have been rewarding to the Jaycees, by the collecting of over 1,200 toys wrapped by the wives. Santa was able to make many children happy. This year we are going to ask the community to participate and deliver to the Jaycees and Santa as many toys as needed. You don't have to speak Spanish to feel the wonderful feeling of joy that these kids display when they are given a simple toy; everybody understands the universal sign of gratitude, a smile!

Operation Amigo is generating friendship among the communities of Van Nuys, Calexico, and Mexicali. The enthusiasm displayed by the membership and wives are an excellent example that "Service to Humanity is the best work of life". We feel confident that "Operation Amigo" is in the right direction. We can proudly say that for these unfortunate children, tomorrow can be better than today.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON BIAFRAN
RELIEF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the urgency of the situation in Biafra was emphasized before a Senate subcommittee and was reported by the Washington Star today:

Earlier today the committee heard testimony from four experts, all of whom were in Biafra until its collapse two weeks ago. They said that a million people could die if food and medical supplies are not rushed into the area within the next ten days.

Witnesses recently arrived from Biafra stress the importance of a massive, continuous airlift to alleviate the suffering and is much preferred to reliance on the use of trucks to deliver the urgently needed supplies. Two State Department officials who also appeared before the above-mentioned subcommittee today stated that looting particularly was hindering efforts to move in relief supplies by truck, since the food and medical supplies were being looted along the way. One of the officials, Ambassador C. Clyde Ferguson, Jr., President Nixon's special coordinator for Nigerian relief, added that an airlift was an alternative to be considered if the security situation is not brought under control on the roads. Reporter Andrew Borowiec pointed up the inadequacy of supply facilities in the January 21 issue of the Washington Star:

The Red Cross representative in Owerri province has enough rations to feed 200,000 people for two days. There are an estimated 1 million starving people in the area. The food is being delivered by one truck and even this ramshackle vehicle is often commandeered by the army.

In contrast, the airstrip at Uli, before the surrender of Biafra, received 280 tons of relief food per day, but unfortunately Maj. Gen. Yakubu Gowon, the Nigerian leader has decreed that Port Harcourt airport would replace the Uli airstrip as the reception point for relief supplies. A UPI dispatch carried by today's Star quotes Gowon as saying:

Let us get rid of Uli, let us get Uli out of our minds. It has been too much in international politics.

Thus, the more strategically located airstrip at Uli has been ruled out for political reasons and Port Harcourt, approximately 70 miles away, has been designated as the reception point for supplies.

Another decision of the Nigerian Government which militates against speedy relief is their determination not to allow the former joint church aid operation to assist in the operation. This was a joint effort of missionaries of various faiths which handled relief before the downfall of Biafra. It has been claimed that this organization was at one time capable of supplying 95 percent of the food to those in need at a given time within a period of 48 hours. This was possible due to the existence of several thousand feeding centers within refugee territory which members of the joint church aid opera-

tion administered. Needless to say, the missionaries had the confidence of the Biafrans and could be utilized to prevail upon the Biafrans who fled to the bush to return for sustenance. Unfortunately, it appears, according to press accounts, that this organization is to be disbanded. Today's Washington Star reports:

Catholic and Protestant missionaries, being taken to Port Harcourt for hours of screening to determine their status with the federal state, complain that while they are away from their stations, food and medical supplies are ransacked by uncontrolled federal troops, who also have commandeered their relief trucks.

William Borders, reporting from Owerri on January 19 for the New York Times, commented:

Meanwhile, more than two dozen Irish priests who have worked in Biafra and who knew its people and its problems intimately, were being held in Port Harcourt, 70 miles away, pending deportation.

Those associated with the joint church aid operation are anxious to help in alleviating the suffering by cooperating with whatever agency controls relief operations. If the press accounts to date are any indication, it would seem that a vital and qualified vehicle is being eliminated at a time when a massive, joint program is urgently needed.

The supply of food, at least for the time being, is no problem. The Chicago Sun-Times of January 22 reports:

More than 1,000 tons of food and medicine for Biafra are stacked up in warehouses of Libreville in Gabon, 4,000 tons more are on Sao Tome Island and an equal amount is enroute by ship, but Biafrans may never see any of it.

One heartening aspect was the announcement today that the United States had agreed to a Nigerian request for six cargo planes, 50 generators, 10,000 blankets, and 10,000 hurricane lamps. In addition, the first air shipment of 50 jeeps and three portable hospitals—requested earlier by the Nigerians—are due to arrive in Lagos tomorrow on a chartered commercial plane. Fifty heavy trucks included in the earlier agreement are being held because of the unavailability of commercial aircraft large enough to accommodate them. The Nigerian Government has again complicated matters by refusing all offers to have them flown in military transports, as first proposed by President Nixon.

It has been suggested that perhaps General Gowon is not fully aware of the dire situation among the Biafrans. This would certainly be understandable if one were to believe some of the reports recently that all is well. Also, an official's judgment is certainly dependent upon the factual nature of the information supplied by his subordinates. However, from the public information now available, one cannot reasonably doubt that the situation is very serious indeed. Instead of the pathetic relief efforts to date, all available assistance should be utilized, letting any political considerations give way to the humanitarian. A crash program, utilizing a massive airlift, must be initiated, with the Uli airstrip included in the operation. The scope and urgency of the problem demands that not only the Nigerian Red

Cross, but an international body such as the International Red Cross, with the expertise and trained personnel to cope with the situation, be invited to participate extensively. With time being a vital factor, food shipments should be dispatched to the needy areas and not merely to the larger cities such as Port Harcourt. Distribution in refugee areas should include the services of the missionaries whose facilities are still available and who are eager to expedite relief efforts.

Regardless of which side one supported before the surrender of the Biafrans, the division no longer exists and basic human needs are paramount. The Nigerian Government is running the show now and must bear the responsibility of caring for thousands of destitute human beings. The means are at hand to cope with the enormous problem, and the refusal of the Nigerian Government, for whatever reason, to use every facility to eliminate the hunger and starvation will not soon be forgotten.

SEQUOIA NATIONAL FOREST

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, December 8, 1969, my colleague, the Honorable GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., of California, took the floor to state that he was sponsoring a bill to add the area of Sequoia National Forest known as Mineral King to Sequoia National Park. The area in question is within the congressional district I represent, and I have been personally familiar with Mineral King most of my life. Unfortunately, Mr. BROWN based his action on incorrect information and at that time inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a great deal of information which deserves correction.

Mineral King is a 7,900-foot high mountain valley on the western slopes of the High Sierra, 55 miles east of Visalia, Calif. Mineral King is located in the Sequoia National Forest, where it is under the management of the U.S. Forest Service, an agency of the Department of Agriculture. This High Sierra wonderland is surrounded by mountain peaks that reach as high as 12,400 feet. Its 20 lakes, streams, trails, and mountain terrain, are ideal for such summer activities as camping, hiking, fishing, and pack trips. As a potential winter recreation site, it has been called the finest in North America.

Yet, due to a hazardous and substandard access road, in existence since the late 1880's, and which cannot be maintained during the winter, the winter recreational potentials of Mineral King have been seen by only a few. However, Mineral King is not now nor could it ever qualify as either primitive or wilderness territory. Since the 1870's, Mineral King has been subject to mining activities, timber cutting and the development of more than 100 private recreational cabins. The existing, hazardous, dirt access road, across Sequoia National

Park to Mineral King, for which Tulare County holds the right-of-way, alone would disqualify Mineral King as wilderness under the terms of the 1964 Wilderness Act. For these reasons, the U.S. Forest Service designated the area for development, as it has done with 84 other winter resorts on national forest lands.

The county of Tulare, with almost one-half of its land in Federal ownership, has cooperated with Federal and State authorities over several years in planning for the Mineral King development. Mineral King is part of a comprehensive program of the county to meet future land use needs without devastating both the landscape and the economy of the county. As a part of that program, the county has encouraged conservation of agricultural lands under the California Land Conservation Act of 1965. Within the next 2 years more than 2 million acres of land within the county, comprising most of the land outside its urban centers, will have been preserved under the act, resulting in a staggering loss in the county's tax base. Tulare County is already an economically depressed area with high unemployment and a tax base too small to meet its growing requirements for public services. For these reasons the Federal Economic Development Administration agreed to contribute \$3 million to construction of the Mineral King access road. Only through completion of the Mineral King recreational area, with its new jobs and capital improvements at the gateway cities, can the county of Tulare hope to correct its present depressed economic condition and absorb the tax revenue losses associated with its land conservation program. The recreational area, when completed, will generate an estimated \$1.5 million in tax revenue annually for the county. One-quarter of permit fees paid to the Forest Service by Disney will return for local schools and roads, primarily in the county of Tulare, and the project will also save the county the cost of maintaining the existing substandard access road to Mineral King, which during the last 2 years alone was \$164,623.

Although the U.S. Forest Service's proposal to develop recreational facilities at Mineral King has been opposed by the Sierra Club, which is attempting to thwart this project through court action, this organization has not been supported in its action by the vast majority of nationally recognized authorities in the field of conservation. In fact, seven of the Nation's most widely respected conservationists, who have taken the time to study the plans of Walt Disney Productions and the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, have joined a Conservation Advisory Committee, which will work with the Disney organization to develop and carry out a program which will make the Mineral King area a prototype in the field of conservation education. The members of this committee include:

Mr. Horace M. Albright, former Director of the National Park Service, and Superintendent of Yellowstone National Park.

Dr. Paul F. Brandwein, president, Cen-

ter for Study of Instruction; former director of Gifford Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies.

Mr. Ira Gabrielson, president, Wildlife Management Institute.

Mr. Thomas L. Kimball, executive director, National Wildlife Federation.

Mr. Bestor Robinson, former president and member of the board of directors, the Sierra Club; formerly chairman of Secretary of Interior's Advisory Committee on Conservation.

Mr. Eivind T. Scoyen, former superintendent of Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Park, and associate director of the National Park Service.

Mr. William E. Towell, executive vice president, American Forestry Association.

I would now like to place in the RECORD a series of written documents which I hope will clarify the facts surrounding this project and indicate the broad public support for the development of Mineral King which exists throughout the State of California:

STATEMENT BY HORACE M. ALBRIGHT

(Originally published in the New York Times, July 26, 1969. Mr. Albright is a nationally recognized conservationist, a former superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, and a former director of the National Park Service. He has been familiar with the Mineral King area in California's Sequoia National Forest for 54 years.)

The U. S. Forest Service, under the policy of multiple use of the public lands under its jurisdiction, designated the Mineral King region in the Sequoia National Forest for development as an all-year recreational area. It advertised for competitive development proposals from private enterprise, considered bids submitted by six organizations, and accepted the proposal of Walt Disney Productions.

During more than four years of cooperative planning by Federal and state governments, only the Sierra Club has objected to this project.

There is really no sound reason for its opposition because:

Mineral King has been subjected to resource utilization for many years—for cutting of timber, mining, hunting, livestock grazing, summer homes. It is not now, and for nearly a century has not been a primitive area. It is not within the purview of the Wilderness Act of 1964.

Although it contains much of the watershed of the East Fork of the Kaweah River, it was withheld from addition to Sequoia National Park when that park was extended to the crest of the Sierra Nevada in 1926, because it was affected by commercial and private in-holdings. This view was not opposed by the Sierra Club.

The Forest Service proposed to lease to Disney for a period of thirty years only the authorized eighty acres, the same that has been done in the development of almost 100 other major winter sports areas throughout the United States.

A road to Mineral King has traversed the Sequoia National Park for many years. The only natural feature that it touches is the Atwell Mill Grove of Big Trees.

The surveyed route of the planned new road fully protects this grove. When built, the new road can no more affect the health and safety of the Atwell Grove than do the roads through the Giant Forest and General Grant Groves in Sequoia-Kings Canyon National Parks, the Mariposa, Tuolumne and Merced Groves in Yosemite National Park, or the Calaveras and other groves in state parks farther north.

The state highway officials, the Forest Service and Disney Productions are to be

commended for their plans for Mineral King. Walt Disney was a dedicated conservationist, and was recognized as such by his election to honorary membership in the Sierra Club. He also received the Department of the Interior's highest tribute, the Conservation Award; and also the American Forestry Association's distinguished service award for his conservation activities.

Walt Disney's organization carries on his ideals. The public need have no apprehensions that Mineral King will be despoiled by the development proposed.

STATEMENT BY MRS. LOUISE DI SILVESTRO

(Published in the Christian Science Monitor edition of December 6-8, 1969. Mrs. Di Silvestro and her family have been familiar and directly associated with the Mineral King area since the 1870's.)

The suit filed June 5 by the Sierra Club for an injunction to prevent any further development of Mineral King in the Sierra Nevada of California, has caused a great deal of concern to skiers, conservationists, and outdoor lovers of our western states and nation as a whole.

The Sierra Club, as a highly vocal group representing a small minority of those concerned, is threatening the use of our forest lands for the good of our children and future generations. By trying to limit the granting of annual special use permits by the Forest Service they threaten the present ski industry which services the needs of thousands of recreation-seeking people; they threaten the commercial interests operating within the forestry areas and thus are attempting to change the very intent of Congress in setting up forestry lands; they threaten the right of our city-bound masses to enjoy the benefits of our public lands and they attempt to hold such lands for a privileged few such as the members of their organization.

My great grandfather built the first wagon road, a toll road, into the valley in 1879 and that wagon road is basically the same one used today and is the main reason why so few people can enjoy and profit from the beauty of the valley.

In 1896 my grandfather started a hotel, store and post office, and built a number of "temporary" cabins to open a resort there for tourists. Until this last winter of 1968-69, when heavy snows destroyed many of the old buildings those same "temporary" cabins and store still comprised what resort there is.

Throughout our years in Mineral King we have watched the resort deteriorate into a shanty town. The cabins would be condemned by state and county anywhere else. Sewage lies in pools in the meadow and flows into the stream. The trails have deteriorated. Campgrounds are inadequate and since the valley has become well known there are not accommodations for those who come to enjoy it, so you find campers parked in the open and by the streams and roadside, destroying and trampling the meadows.

If the Sierra Club wishes to keep the many people out of Mineral King they must fail. This seems to be their attempt as they backed the concept of a ski area there until the massiveness of such a development became apparent. But certainly the valley can best be fulfilled only by such a comprehensive and detailed plan for the entire area and not just by piecemeal. Extensive use, a good all-weather highway, planned resort and recreation area, and good trails into the back country are required.

STATEMENT BY E. CARDON WALKER

(E. Cardon Walker, Executive Vice President of Walt Disney Productions, concerning the Company's development, under the administration of the U.S. Forest Service, of year-round outdoor recreational facilities at Mineral King, California, in Sequoia National Forest.)

In view of recent public discussion concerning the development by the U.S. Forest Service of public recreational facilities at Mineral King in Sequoia National Forest, we believe it is appropriate for Walt Disney Productions, as the permittee selected after competitive public bidding, to restate its position regarding this proposed project.

Mineral King, an area of unexcelled natural beauty, is located along the western slopes of the High Sierra, and has long been recognized as potentially one of the most outstanding year-round recreational areas in the world.

Alpine in character and covering nearly 15,000 acres, Mineral King offers snowfall and terrain for skiing and other winter sports equal to six Squaw Valleys. In the summertime, the area is transformed into a wonderland of mountain glades, twenty crystal lakes and waterfalls, pine forests and grassy meadows—ideal for family outdoor recreation, such as hiking, camping, fishing and other warm weather activities.

National Park and Forest lands adjacent to Mineral King now include nearly two million acres of wilderness for those who desire to hike or back pack to their destination. Mineral King does not now qualify, nor could it ever qualify, as "wilderness," under the definition in the 1964 Federal Wilderness Act.

A dangerous and substandard public road, in existence since early mining days, has made Mineral King accessible to a small number of visitors during the summer months. Many structures may be found on the several hundred acres of private land in the area, including about one hundred cabins, campsites, a post office and general store, a pack station and a large and unsightly garbage dump. Due to inadequate public facilities, pollution now exists in the nearby stream.

In the winter, however, snow completely blocks the road, which is too steep and narrow to clear, making Mineral King accessible only by snow vehicles and effectively concealing from the general public its winter splendor and recreational opportunities.

With these facts in mind, and after twenty years of study, during which it developed a master plan for the conservation of National Forest lands in California, the United States Forest Service designated Mineral King for recreational development. In establishing its conservation master plan, the Forest Service determined that Mineral King was best suited to serve the vast majority of our growing population, who desire to travel to their vacation destination by automobile.

Thus, on March 1, 1965, the Forest Service issued a prospectus inviting the public to submit competitive proposals for an all-year recreational development at Mineral King. As the means of access, the prospectus specifically required the improvement of the public road to all-weather standards.

The development would be on public land, under the administration of the Forest Service, exactly as has previously been done with almost 100 other winter recreation areas throughout the United States.

It was not until all decisions regarding the future use of, and means of access to, Mineral King had been made by the government agencies responsible, that Walt Disney and his organization entered the competitive bidding.

To the Forest Service call, Walt Disney personally responded in good faith to fulfill the ever-growing need for adequate family outdoor recreational opportunities.

After nearly four months of intensive study, the Forest Service chose the Disney proposal over five other presentations. This plan has since been approved and endorsed at every level of State and Federal government, under two administrations and both political parties.

In fulfillment of its commitment under a three-year planning permit, the Company

further refined its master plan and obtained final approval for the development in January, 1969.

The elimination of visitor automobiles from the valley floor, a sub-level automobile reception center, and a completely self-contained village reached via electric, cog-assist railway, are among the highlights of the plan, which is designed to insure maximum protection and enhancement of the area's unique scenic values.

By 1978, the sub-level reception center will provide covered parking for 3,600 automobiles and buses. Winter recreation facilities will serve 8,500 skiers daily, of whom approximately 40% may be accommodated overnight.

The elimination of visitor vehicles from the valley will permit buildings to be situated in patterns compatible with natural land contours, and streets to be designed as "park-walks," or tree-lined concourses, suitable for skiers, pedestrians or horse drawn sleighs.

Thus, the area will be free from noise and potential exhaust fumes, as well as the danger which results from combining pedestrians and automobiles. No other winter recreation area in America has been master planned in such detail, or with such care for the preservation of a site's natural beauty.

In April, 1967, the California Highway Commission, recognizing the economic benefits, employment opportunities and new tax revenues the development will bring to the San Joaquin Valley, and acknowledging the need for additional recreational opportunities in California, adopted a financing schedule which calls for the road's completion by October, 1973. Mineral King will then be within four hour's driving time from southern California, where there is a lack of nearby areas with reliable and adequate snowfall.

In November, 1968, the Department of the Interior formally announced approval of the State Highway Engineer's route for that portion of the road which crosses Sequoia National Park. Design standards have since been agreed upon by Highway Engineers and Park Service representatives.

It is important to note that similar state highways provide access to all other National Parks and National Forests in California. In the case of the Mineral King road, the Highway Engineers have chosen a route and designed a roadway which will preserve and make accessible the area's natural scenic values, without disturbing a single redwood tree.

On April 21, 1967, President Lyndon B. Johnson, under whose administration this project was initiated, expressed the federal government's continuing policy of cooperation with private enterprise in the field of outdoor recreation when he signed a memorandum, which stated in part: "I wish to again emphasize the importance of strengthening the cooperative relationship between government and private enterprise in the field of outdoor recreation. Only by this cooperation can we meet most effectively the growing demand for adequate, accessible and reasonably priced outdoor recreation facilities."

Mineral King offers an outstanding opportunity for government and private enterprise to work together to meet this need—the development of a year-round recreation center to serve families of all income levels.

Walt Disney Productions is one of the few companies with the resources, creativity, experience, and public trust to successfully meet this challenge.

It can easily be seen that Mineral King will, in no way, be another Disneyland. Disneyland relates to Mineral King in only one regard—it stands as an example of the management, operational and maintenance standards for which our Company is famous—standards which will be applied to all

of our work in the field of outdoor recreation.

No other organization has so effectively communicated to the public the drama and beauty of nature, and the need to conserve our natural resources, as has Walt Disney Productions. Walt Disney and his staff have received 37 major awards and honors for their efforts in this area. The operation of Mineral King will give the Company an even greater opportunity to inform, educate and involve the general public in conservation.

We believe the Mineral King project offers a healthy diversification for our Company, at the same time fulfilling an important public need. We are convinced that its development will enhance the area's natural beauty, eliminate the pollution which now results from inadequate sanitation and supervision, while making the area accessible to more than a limited few.

Walt Disney once said, "When I first saw Mineral King, I thought it was one of the most beautiful places in the world, and we will keep it that way. With its development, we will prove once again that man and nature can work together to the benefit of both."

The United States Forest Service has designated Mineral King for recreational development to provide the greatest good for the greatest number of Californians. That is the continuing commitment of this corporation, as it was for Walt Disney himself.

Since 1965, editorial support for the development of Mineral King as an all-year outdoor recreational area has been offered by major newspapers throughout California.

Following are excerpts from a number of these editorials:

Los Angeles Times, Wednesday, June 11, 1969:

"The Sierra Club is an admirable organization dedicated to the admirable task of conserving the nation's dwindling natural resources.

"But the club's members are not the sole arbiters of what constitutes proper conservation policies—the Mineral King project being a case in point.

"A lawsuit has been filed against the federal government by the Sierra Club to prevent the Mineral King area in the High Sierra from becoming accessible to the general public. The Interior and Agriculture Departments acted improperly, it claims, in allowing the area to be developed for the recreational use of more than a handful of hardy backpackers.

"Although a number of technical legal points are raised, the court action essentially is based upon the club's contention that the scenic area would be spoiled by public access.

"The Times disagrees.

"We share Sierra Club members' deep concern over the despoiling of the environment. We also believe that natural resources should be enjoyed by more than a few. The demand for the esthetic and recreational pleasures of the outdoors is too great in this urbanized society to bar the public from such places as Mineral King.

"This does not mean that the appropriate governmental agencies should not keep a very tight rein on the kind and extent of development.

"But conservation, according to the dictionary, means 'protection from loss, waste . . .'

"In a previous editorial approving the opening of Mineral King, The Times noted that conservationists were opposed—and properly so—to the proposed construction of a yacht marina at Cabrillo Beach because it would deny a valuable resource to many for the sake of a few.

"The same principle applies to Mineral King. Its great beauty and recreational po-

tential belong to all the people. And as many as possible should be able to enjoy them.

"To do otherwise would be to permit the loss and waste of part of California's natural treasure."

Los Angeles Times, Thursday, December 1, 1966:

"One of the best natural sites for skiing in the entire world can be found only 228 miles from Los Angeles—in the remote Mineral King area of Sequoia National Forest.

"But very few ever find it.

"The only road is unpaved and impassable in the winter. Those who do reach Mineral King discover that no provision has been made for its use by the public, that the valley is virtually unchanged since the gold mining days of the last century.

"California, however, has changed, even though the Sierra Club often won't admit it.

"With the state's ever increasing population and urbanization has come a tremendous new demand for outdoor recreation activity. Existing mountain and beach park areas are no longer adequate to meet the legitimate needs of California's resident population, plus the more than 6 million tourists who visit annually.

"Mineral King thus represents a wasted natural resource. Its inaccessibility deprives the state and nation of an essential family recreational opportunity.

"An enlightened U.S. Forest Service, however, decided last year that the isolated valley should be made available to more than a handful of hikers. Bids were solicited for the long-range recreational development of Mineral King under strict controls."

"All was going well until the Sierra Club rallied in defense of pure wilderness.

"Disregarding the millions who might be able to enjoy an accessible Mineral King, the club demanded that the valley be kept in its pristine state. To block the development, Sierra officials urged that the Sequoia National Forest corridor for the new highway be declared part of a vast wilderness area proposed for adjoining national park land.

"Such a belated proposal should be rejected promptly by the appropriate federal agencies. Approval would be an act of bad faith toward the successful bidder. Far more important, it would be breaking faith with the public for whom the land is held in trust for the best possible use.

"The Sierra Club deserves praise for its many worthwhile conservation efforts. It must not, however, be permitted to deny this much-needed recreational opportunity, for many millions merely to satisfy a few thousand wilderness purists."

Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Sunday, November 23, 1969 (column by Burt Sims):

"If the conservation campaigning Sierra Club loses its current fight to block development of Mineral King as a year-round resort, the ultimate result—paradoxically enough—could be a resounding victory for conservation.

"Walt Disney Productions has a broadscale program of conservation education in mind for visitors to the Sierra Valley—if and when its \$35 million development program is allowed to proceed.

"And this program was launched last summer, according to Disney spokesmen, before the Sierra Club's suit against the Department of Agriculture and Department of Interior was filed in Federal court in San Francisco.

"Some of the outstanding conservation experts in the nation met at the Disney studio. The draft of a program which resulted from their discussions, studies and review over nearly five months has just been revealed.

"The Conservation Education and Visitor Information project calls for continual lectures and displays at an Information Center highlighting the importance of conservation and each individual's responsibility to general environmental problems; U.S. Forest

Service programs to orient visitors on use of the valley, past and present, and the concept of balanced use of the forest, and establishment of a Conservation Education Center with classrooms which could be used for teacher workshops and to take care of students on field trips.

"Those named to the independent advisory council which is continuing its study, include Horace M. Albright, former director of the National Park Service and former superintendent of Yellowstone National Park; Dr. Paul F. Brandwein, president, Center for Study of Instruction and former director of Gifford Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies; Thomas L. Kimball, executive director, National Wildlife Federation; Bestor Robinson, former president and board member of Sierra Club, and formerly chairman of the Interior Secretary's advisory committee on conservation; Elvind T. Scoyen, former superintendent of Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Park and associate director of National Park Service, and William E. Towell, executive vice president, American Forestry Association.

"Commented Disney president Donn B. Tatum: 'The challenge Walt Disney saw at Mineral King was to make it an example to man's determination to meet an ever-growing public need in a manner that will at all times be in harmony with the area's great natural beauty.

"We have asked these distinguished men to work with us in achieving this goal, and are most pleased at their interest and acceptance."

"Disney project manager Robert B. Hicks said that this advisory council was conceived, created and convened before the Sierra Club filed a suit which, by implication as well as statement, charges the Disney development program is not sufficiently cognizant of conservation requirements."

Examiner, San Francisco, Calif., Wednesday, January 29, 1969:

"The U.S. Forest Service has approved the Disney organization's plan for recreational development of the Mineral King Valley area of Sequoia National Forest, provoking threats of a suit by the Sierra Club.

"We recall that 20 years ago three skiers surveyed Mineral King's potential, remaining there from October until May, and came out with the report, 'Take a half a dozen Sun Valleys, line them up and you'll have some idea of Mineral King.'

"The site is indeed magnificent, not only for winter but summer recreation. It will provide in particular new opportunities for winter sports for Southern Californians who in growing numbers already crowd existing facilities.

"We stand with the Sierra Club on the issue of protection of wilderness resources, but this viewpoint must be balanced against the legitimate recreation needs of increased population.

"Disney was only one of six bidders for Mineral King. The bid would not have been accepted, nor the project initiated at all, if in the government's opinion it held prospects of destructive exploitation. This is especially true since the program was overseen by one of the most conservation-minded national administrations in American history. . ."

Chronicle, San Francisco, Calif., Tuesday, January 2, 1968:

"After careful weighing of the pros and cons, Secretary of the Interior Udall has 'reluctantly' yielded to the desires of the Budget Bureau and of Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, and has agreed to the building of an all-year road that will pass through Sequoia National Park and permit private development of a \$57 million winter sports and summer resort in the Mineral King area."

"Fears of harmful over-development on the Tahoe pattern are largely dissipated by the circumstance that Mineral King is a Fed-

erally supervised, one-company development—and that company is a Walt Disney organization that has well demonstrated its capacity for administering large recreational resorts. It is worth noting that its plans provide for an Alpine Village at the foot of the valley, where all automobiles will be parked with none permitted in the valley itself.

"The new 21-mile road, as added to the State highway system by the 1965 Legislature, will provide comfortable and convenient access to one of the State's finest scenic areas, now visited by a few hundred persons each year. It should confer benefits on the many that far outweigh any damage it is likely to inflict on the High Sierra wilderness—especially if developed and operated in accord with promises put forward by responsible Federal agencies."

Union, San Diego, Calif., Thursday, April 20, 1967:

"The State Highway Commission should approve participation in financing 26 miles of road needed to begin opening up of the Mineral King recreation area in Northern California.

"Population growth of the state will demand this superlative year-round recreation area long before it is totally developed."

"The \$1 million asked for the state for the road next year, and future allocations, will be more than repaid by additional gasoline taxes and sales taxes on new business created."

"The Mineral King recreation area development will benefit all Californians. . ."

Sacramento Union, Friday, January 5, 1968:

"True natural conservation is more than the preservation of wilderness intact. It also includes the best possible use of resources.

"Thus many unique areas, like our redwood parks, should be kept as close to wilderness state as possible. Other lands can best be put to use by developments to preserve wildlife or enhance recreation for millions of persons.

"The plan to develop a Sierra Valley summer and winter resort in the Mineral King area falls into the latter category. Controls to prevent pollution and erosion must be rigid because of the added traffic.

"The government practices true conservation, however, when it approved the program."

Sacramento Bee and Fresno Bee, Sunday, January 21, 1968:

"The right way and the wrong way to go about developing a ski area can be found in two current proposals—the Walt Disney organization's excellent plans for Mineral King near Fresno and the mishmash which has been palmed off as planning for the Ward Creek area near Lake Tahoe.

"The Mineral King Project was approved only after vigorous scrutiny by federal agencies to make sure it would not damage the natural beauty of the area."

(Editorial goes on to discuss the Ward Creek Project.)

San Jose Mercury, Monday, June 16, 1969:

"The Sierra Club is within its rights in opposing the development of Mineral King in the mountain country for public use. We are sorry, however, the conservationist organization took its fight to the courts.

"This issue should be fought out on the basis of public interest, not legal technicalities.

"Other Sierra Club campaigns have shown that the government can be convinced when there is great public support for the Club's position. We don't know that there is such support on the Mineral King protest.

"As the population grows, more semi-wilderness areas must be opened to the general public. That is what the Mineral King project will do. It is not practical to preserve all these rights, too. We have to 'budget' our natural resources but there still is room for all of us."

Tulare Advance-Register, Friday, June 20, 1969:

"To a member or an ardent supporter of the Sierra Club, it must have seemed like collusion last week when three valley newspapers, including this one, reprinted an editorial from the Los Angeles Times.

"It was nothing of the sort. It was simply another demonstration of the valley's solidarity in favor of the Walt Disney Productions development of Mineral King Valley as a year-round recreation area readily available to all of the people who own full title to the land it will occupy."

"We can't recall a single project during our 25-year residence in the valley that has won such universal acclaim as has the Mineral King project from the valley's newspapers, governmental agencies, business and commerce organizations, labor forces, and just plain, ordinary people. Only the Sierra Club has raised a discordant note of opposition.

"There are sound and ample reasons for this unique valley unity in support of a single enterprise. Perhaps this would be a good time to review some of them:

"Great economic benefits are certain to accrue to the valley—and particularly to Tulare County—as a result of Mineral King.

"The valley has been identified by the federal government as an area of high seasonal unemployment. For this reason the Federal Economic Development Agency made available \$3 million to assist in construction of the new access highway into Mineral King. The EDA will carry out job training programs in several Tulare County communities to train the majority of Mineral King employees which the Disney organization has pledged to hire from this area.

"The development of Mineral King will open up one of the world's truly great winter sports areas—equal to six Squaw Valleys—to the public which now is shut out during the winter months by snow which completely blocks the present dangerous and substandard road. In the summertime, the development will open a virtual new mountain wonderland to more than just those hardy few who enjoy the rigors of the trail or who have access to the present cabins in the area.

"In spite of the Sierra Club's wishes that it were so, Mineral King does not now, and never can, qualify as 'wilderness,' as defined in the Federal Wilderness Act of 1964."

"Finally, there is the Disney organization itself, an organization in which most of the people of Tulare County and the valley have expressed complete faith."

Californian,
Bakersfield, Calif.,

Monday, June 9, 1969:

"If the Sierra Club has its way, countless millions of Californians will be deprived of utilizing Walt Disney's proposed Mineral King resort."

"Opposition by the Sierra Club to the Disney development of Mineral King, of course, was expected. The club prefers wilderness area for a few to opening an area to benefit many.

"The Bakersfield Californian supports Disney's proposed resort development of Mineral King. We do not believe either the Interior or Agriculture departments have conducted superficial studies of the overall project. We do not believe the Forest Service has overlooked one detail in the development prospectus. Furthermore, we believe the Walt Disney Enterprises will be a trustworthy custodian of the flora and fauna in the Mineral King area. In fact, we are happy this Sierra wonderland has been assigned to a developer who will not exploit the wilderness.

"In our opinion, the Sierra Club will experience great difficulty in proving Disney's resort development of Mineral King will scar the beauty and destroy the natural resources in this wilderness paradise in the Sierra Nevadas."

Times-Delta, Visalia, Calif., Thursday, June 19, 1969:

"Is the Sierra Club really sincere about not wanting Mineral King developed into a fabulous all-year resort?"

"Or is it attempting, through a recent court suit, to establish itself as the ultimate authority on what public lands will be developed for recreational purposes?"

"Many aspects of the Mineral King case indicate the club is being motivated in its action by the second reason.

"Later this month, a federal court in San Francisco will decide whether to issue an injunction, preventing consummation of agreements between the National Forest and National Park Services with the Walt Disney organization to undertake the multi-million dollar development.

"The Sierra Club seeks its injunction on alleged violations of federal laws pertaining to developments of this type, most of them apparent technicalities. It does not state, as it has in many news releases in the past, that it wants to preserve the Mineral King region as a 'wilderness' area, which it knows is poppycock, since the Mineral King Valley itself does not qualify as that type of an area by government standards.

"The Sierra Club knows full well there are in the neighborhood of two million acres of land in the nearby Sierra area which do qualify under the 'wilderness' concept.

"It is interesting to note that the Walt Disney organization, chosen to develop the project by the Forest Service after it studied proposals from several companies, is not a party to the Sierra Club suit. Again, the Sierra Club knows that the carefully conceived Disney development plan which is continuing, will not be an aesthetic blight in that area.

"Success of the Sierra Club to obtain the injunction to halt the project would be a tragic blow to the entire state because of the acute need for additional recreational spots. Also, an unfavorable decision could affect future developments elsewhere on public lands."

"The Sierra Club's opposition to the Mineral King development is a deep disappointment, coming from such a fine organization. But we hope for the sake of California's recreational development of this area, the petition for injunction is denied in the federal court."

Porterville (Calif.) Recorder, November 19, 1969:

"Despite the setbacks which the Disney Corp. has had in its plans for Mineral King as an all-year recreational area, the Evening Recorder has it on excellent authority that the Disney people's interest in the project has not lessened.

"It will be recalled that the Disney Corp. was selected by the Forest Service from a number of qualified bidders for the development program. There was considerable red tape involved later, but eventually a plan was worked out which satisfied the National Park Service on the access road, a portion of which crosses lands of Sequoia National Park. Mineral King itself is on Forest Service Land.

"In addition, the California state highway department developed an excellent access road plan from Three Rivers into Mineral King and road construction financing was approved.

"Then the Sierra Club interjected itself in the proceedings and filed a protest in federal district court in San Francisco. This action is pending and currently no one knows when a decision may be handed down.

"Meantime, detailed planning for the development of Mineral King by the Disney Corp. has been slowed down; in fact, is now largely in abeyance for even the planning stage runs into a large sum. It would be unwise for the Disney officials to spend such a sum pending outcome of the court action instigated by the Sierra Club but it is encouraging that the Disney firm remains enthusiastic and committed to the project.

"As this newspaper has previously stated, the area encompassed by the proposed development of Mineral King into an all-year around recreation center involves a relatively small amount of land.

"In Sequoia National Forest, only the land required for the access route is involved and the excellent road plan made by the state highway department protects sequoia trees along the proposed route.

"There will be ample areas for hikers, back packers, etc., who want the primitive sort of outdoor recreation which the Sierra Club seems to believe would be somewhat curtailed by the Mineral King project.

"The number of people involved in hiking and back packing into the high country is relatively small compared with the many, many more who could enjoy family recreation in Mineral King as envisioned by the Disney plan. Essentially it boils down to whether the few should prohibit the many from enjoyment of multiple recreation in the high country.

Henry C. MacArthur, Capitol News Service, Thursday, June 12, 1969:

"Once again, the self-righteous organization known as the Sierra Club has taken it upon itself to thwart establishment and building of the \$35 million Mineral King project, which when completed, would offer access to a modern recreation area now denied to a large part of the public."

"Patently, the suit appears as a last-ditch effort on the part of the Sierra Club to delay, and possibly halt the opening of the area to the general public.

"What the Sierra Club doesn't seem to realize is that California is nearly half way through the year 1969, and that the laws they seek to invoke were enacted nearly a half century ago. In other words, the old laws have not been kept up-to-date with a growing California, and along with the growth, and increasing need for recreational areas that the public alone cannot afford.

"Why anyone for selfish or other reasons, should seek to deprive the people of a little help from private enterprise in providing a comfortable spot to 'get away from it all' once in awhile is a question that goes unanswered, except for the fetish the Sierra Club has of keeping the common people out of the mountains."

Facts, Redlands, Calif., Thursday, June 12, 1969:

"In Redlands the irony can be appreciated of the Sierra Club suit to prevent the development of a great ski resort at Mineral King by Walt Disney Productions.

"At one time, the late Mr. Disney considered applying to the U.S. Forest Service for a permit to develop a ski resort on the north slope of San Geronio, about 40 miles east of Redlands, the gateway city to that region.

"He backed off when he found that conservationists—he was philosophically on their side—fiercely opposed any breach of the San Geronio Wilderness Area.

"In life he seized on the opportunity created by a Forest Service call in 1965 for proposals to develop Mineral King as a ski resort. Now, in death, his vision is being blackballed by the conservationist element with whom he had sought to cooperate."

"In this controversy, they are not fighting private interests such as power companies, lumber companies, oil companies or Disney Enterprises. They are blocking the U.S. Forest Service which we believe has an honest record of fidelity to the highest public interest.

"The Forest Service has denied permits for commercial ski development where it has found wilderness values paramount. That is true of our San Geronio.

"It has granted permits where appropriate, resulting in the development of many of the great ski areas of the West—Sun Valley, Mammoth Mountain, Aspen, Squaw Valley and Alta, among them.

"The Forest Service should prevail and Disney Enterprises should proceed with its highly responsible plans for development."

Register-Pajaronian, Watsonville, Calif., February 19, 1969:

"It may take many decades to fully realize the tremendous contribution made by the Sierra Club to preserve our dwindling natural resources for the pleasure of yet unborn generations."

"Nevertheless, we wonder if the Sierra Club isn't carrying its enthusiasm too far (and losing friends) by its continuing and inflexible opposition to the development of the Mineral King area into a year-round resort area of the magnitude of Yosemite."

"The general thesis of the Sierra Club as we understand it is that such a development will pollute and spoil a prime wilderness area (this argument is contradicted by the facts, we feel), and that it should be saved for those with the strength and will to get there on foot."

"The Sierra, true, represents one of the last refuges for the Californian anxious to get away occasionally to recharge his physical and psychic batteries. Nevertheless, it would be a shame to deny where it proves practical, as it does at Mineral King, some of these same benefits and rewards for those less willing or able to endure the sometimes-ordeal of backpacking."

"The mountains and valleys, after all, are not the exclusive preserve of the Sierra Club. They belong to all of us. Even with the opening up of Mineral King, there still remain vast areas in the Sierra where one can retreat and contemplate in silence."

Long Beach, California, Independent Press-Telegram (Bill Duncan, writing in the Southland Sunday edition of December 14, 1969):

"In the 1800s, a handful of prospectors discovered gold on the western slopes of the High Sierra. Word of the discovery quickly spread and hundreds rushed up the mountains to dig and pan for gold. A mountain mining community was founded and, because the veins of ore also contained copper, silver and lead, the miners called their new town Mineral King."

"But the veins were not as rich as had been hoped and slowly the boom town became a virtual ghost town, except for a few optimistic prospectors."

"Mineral King never really died. At one time in the 1890s another kind of prospector laid out a subdivision for Mineral King. It didn't do so well, but the miners had paved the way to one of America's most scenic areas, terrain similar to the Alps with bold, rugged peaks reaching as high as 12,405 feet."

"In the winter, nature drapes an ermine robe of white over the peaks and valleys, only to shed the royal garment in the spring, transforming the area into a wonderland of mountain glades, limestone caverns, crystal lakes, waterfalls, pine forests and grassy meadows."

"Even after the miners left, folk from the hot, dry San Joaquin Valley made their way up the slopes to Mineral King where they built—or converted abandoned miners' shacks into—summer homes."

"Eventually the California Sierra became part of the National Park system and Mineral King was included in the Sequoia National Forest. In annual reports and surveys, park officials have been describing Mineral King for years as one of the nation's greatest potential winter sports meccas. Twenty years ago, three skiers surveyed Mineral King's potential and included in their report this description of the area: 'Take a half dozen Sun Valleys, line them up and you'll have some idea of Mineral King.'"

"However, there was always one major drawback—getting in and out of the place. The narrow, dangerous dirt road leading to the area couldn't be maintained in the winter. In 1949, the Forest Service tried to get

private developers to consider opening up Mineral King for skiing but, despite considerable interest, no proposals came. The building of an all-weather road was too much to surmount."

"The proposal came up again in 1953, but the road still proved too much. Seven years later, in February, 1960, Walt Disney listened in on a conversation of Olympic officials expressing the quadrennial fear that there would not be enough snow when the Olympic Winter Games opened in Squaw Valley, Calif. The discussion also touched on the lack of skiing areas in the United States. This set Disney thinking."

"You could always tell when Walt had an idea," said a close associate of the late entertainment genius. "He had a way of mentally transposing himself into the heart of an idea while standing in the midst of a crowd of people babbling about something entirely different. It was uncanny—he was there in the crowd in physical form, but somewhere else in spirit."

"Disney turned his organization loose on locating potential skiing areas. Scouts scoured Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, Washington and California and brought back their recommendations. One area seemed ideal—the north slopes of the San Geronio Mountains, 40 miles east of Redlands. Disney investigated, but found the area to be part of the national wilderness preserve and rejected the location entirely."

"The search was still on in 1965 when the U.S. Forest Service once again invited proposals for developing Mineral King. The California State Legislature agreed to add the Mineral King Road to the state highway system and to build a 21-mile all-weather road to the recreation area."

"The major obstacle removed, six bidders, including Disney, sought the Mineral King project. In January, 1966, Disney's plan won him a three-year permit to work out a master plan for the development of Mineral King and this master plan was approved Jan. 18, 1969, and Walt Disney Productions got a 30-year lease to develop a year-around family recreational center at Mineral King."

"Disney was dead, but the touch of this magic-maker was definitely in the Mineral King project:

"Construction of an Alpine Village that would look as though it had been there a thousand years."

"Complete elimination of automobiles from the valley floor by building a sub-level automobile reception center a mile and a quarter downhill."

"Lifting the visitors to the village via an electrically powered, cog-assisted rail system."

"Building 22 ski lifts, a combination of chair lifts and gondolas, to reach skiing elevations."

"Creating a year-around family recreation spa for winter and summer sports."

"The one thing it will not be is another Disneyland. Disney, before his death, emphasized this. 'Disneyland is entertainment, but Mineral King will be outdoor recreation, developed primarily for families and in full keeping with the environment.'"

"Mineral King is ideally suited for outdoor recreation. It encompasses approximately 30 square miles in the north portion of Sequoia National Forest, 55 miles east of Visalia. Its valley floor, situated along the headwaters of the East Fork of the Kaweah River, is at an altitude of 7,800 feet, nearly twice the altitude of Yosemite and the same altitude as Aspen, Colo. The valley itself is two miles long."

"The man behind the Disney plan is Robert B. Hicks, Mineral King project manager and an avid skier himself. The skiing potential of the area is what thrills him."

"Eight major basins in these mountains offer snow conditions among the most dependable in North America and provide ski terrain equivalent to six Squaw Valleys," he said. "It is one of the few areas in the United

States which offers uninterrupted ski runs as long as four miles, with a vertical drop of over 3,700 feet. And the area has slopes that will accommodate skiers of all levels of competence."

"The Disney ski plan calls for first phase development to be concentrated in five adjacent bowls, located on north facing slopes—to the south and west of Mineral King Valley."

"Mosquito Bowl, one of the largest and longest intermediate ski areas in the United States, offers runs of nearly three miles and vertical drops ranging from 11,100 feet to 7,500 feet."

"This is a very exciting project," Hicks said. "I believe Mineral King is the most outstanding ski area in the world. It has better weather, more sunshine, less wind and doesn't have the extreme temperatures of other ski areas. It is definitely one of the most scenic anywhere in the world."

"The winter skiing season could begin as early as September and extend as late as May, according to Hicks. On this preliminary plan alone, the Disney organization has spent \$500,000. The total project, when completed, will be a \$35.3 million investment."

"But skiing is only one part of the master plan for Mineral King. Other winter sports include bobsledding, ski-bobbing and riding inner tubes and snow pans down selected inclines. An area will be set aside for snow sculpturing."

"We also plan an outdoor heated swimming pool in the village," Hicks said, "plus indoor-outdoor skating rinks, a ski jump amphitheater and trails for cross-country skiers."

"Summer recreation includes fishing, picnicking, camping, hiking and horseback riding. The village will have hotels, apartments and other lodging accommodations, in addition to theaters, restaurants, specialty shops, a conference center and indoor-outdoor recreational facilities. The plan calls for 465 guest lodging units, accommodating 1,505 persons, the first year. Five years later the village will have 1,030 units for 3,310 guests. About 90 per cent, Hicks said, will be lodging units for families in the moderate to medium price bracket."

"Pricing will be under strict control of the U.S. Forest Service."

"The most significant part of the plan, Hicks said, is the approach that permits the eliminating of automobiles. The sub-level parking garage will be hidden from the view of the valley. "The absence of cars will result in spontaneity of village design," Hicks pointed out, "and this was a major objective in our master planning."

"Streets in the village will be designed as park-walks and tree-lined concourses suited for skiers, pedestrians or horse-drawn sleighs. The area will be free from noise, congestion and exhaust fumes of automobiles."

"The village will occupy between 35 and 50 acres; the parking structure will be on 4½ acres, and in all a maximum of 80 acres of land will be used for construction. None of this land will be owned by Disney and will remain at all times under control of the Forest Service."

"What is proposed for Mineral King isn't unique; in fact, it is the same thing that the U.S. Forest Service has done in conjunction with private enterprise in nearly 100 winter sports areas, including Sun Valley, Squaw Valley and Aspen."

"What we are doing," said a Forest Service spokesman, "is working with private resources to develop a winter recreation area. In this case we are capitalizing upon Mineral King's outstanding recreational potential and we are doing it in such a way that the result would be most compatible with the valley's uniquely spectacular alpine environment."

"The Disney organization was chosen, he said, 'because their plan was the best of the six submitted.'"

"Donn B. Tatum, Disney Productions president, added: 'Mineral King is a logical outgrowth of Disney experience and interest in the outdoors, and in serving the public. In the implementation of this master plan, the Disney organization will dedicate every effort to preserving and enhancing the aesthetic and natural beauty of this magnificent area.'

"Sounds wonderful, doesn't it?"

"But there is a troll under the alpine bridge."

"The Sierra Club of California, the conservationist organization, has filed suit in Federal District Court in San Francisco to block the Mineral King development. The court has granted a temporary injunction to prevent any work from being done on Mineral King until the suit is settled."

"We've pulled all our people out,' Hicks said. 'I've been diverted to planning work on the Disney World project in Florida. For all intent and purpose, Mineral King is at a standstill. We're in a position that we just have to sit and wait.'

"Disney is not part of the lawsuit. The Sierra Club sued only the U.S. government."

"To sue Disney," quipped one Sierra Club member, "would be like suing motherhood, the Flag and the Boy Scouts all at once. Besides, we're not after Disney. We are against turning a wilderness area over to any private entrepreneur."

"Although based on several legal technicalities, basically the lawsuit is testing the U.S. government's right to offer Mineral King for development by private enterprise. The club wants Mineral King kept 'unspoiled,' and this—in the case of Mineral King—means reserved for a few hardy backpackers who are equipped to 'rough it.'

"What the outcome will be is questionable."

"Hicks expressed Disney's frustration and said he wanted the matter settled as soon as possible, 'because we are already a year behind schedule and every day the delay continues puts us further behind.'

"Judging from the angry mood of the Sierra Club, it appears the fight might go on until hell freezes over. And if that happens, the wilderness purists just might claim hell too."

REAL WORKERS AGAINST POLLUTION

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, some people talk a lot about pollution and environmental quality—others do something about it.

Recently, I have read three newspaper articles about a number of Southern Californians who have taken to direct action in combatting smog and other environmental ills.

Each of these Californians directs their actions in a different way; indeed, not all of their efforts concentrate on California problems. Each deserves immense encouragement and praise; they are the vanguard in the crucial struggle to maintain life on this planet.

For 11 years, my friend Smith Griswold headed Los Angeles County's program—fighting smog. Smith Griswold was the man who first suggested that the major automobile manufacturers might be conspiring illegally to limit development of effective air pollution controls—and, of course, this allegation was the key factor in the antitrust suit brought

just over a year ago by the Justice Department against the auto industry. Recently, Smith Griswold has concentrated his emphasis on the need for nonpolluting vehicles, and I conferred with him before introducing by own proposal in this area, The Smogless Car Development Act, during the last congressional session.

The Los Angeles Times named Mrs. Ellen Stearn Harris as one of its "Women of the Year." I concur with the Times in this choice. I have been an avid follower of Mrs. Harris' constant efforts for a clean environment, and I would suggest that the newsletter of the Council for Planning and Conservation would be an excellent model for other local antipollution programs.

The People's Lobby, a group established by Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Koupal last year in Los Angeles, aims to battle pollution through a massive public legislative program. I endorse the somewhat drastic methods utilized by the Koupals. If government does not respond to needs, then it is up to the citizens themselves to bring about changes. I signed the People's Lobby petitions last year, and I still support their strong stand for a quality environment.

I now insert the articles about these leaders in the campaign against pollution:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 19, 1970]

ALIVE AND BREATHING WELL—BUT NOT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By Colman McCarthy)

Smith Griswold, a plugger, wry, smart, with a flinty impulse to say what he thinks, is one of the most dirt and filth minded men in Washington. The dirt and filth he thinks about is not that of the smut hustler but the kind that a successful air pollution fighter is constantly battling. Griswold learned his trade in the pollution capital of the Western world, Los Angeles, where for 11 years he was the air pollution control officer of Los Angeles County. He took neither baloney nor stalling from pollution offenders. During his tenure, he brought 40,000 pollution cases to court, with conviction or guilty pleas in 96 per cent. No pollution control officer anywhere in the country has matched this record, not that many have been trying.

"When the industries find out you're not playing footsie with them," said Griswold, "they get with it. They clean up. But it doesn't do any good to damn only the industrialists for polluting the country; they're just supplying the public with what it wants, and making a profit in the process. It's up to the courts and politicians to keep industry from polluting. You can't expect, say, U.S. Steel to install a billion dollars worth of anti-smoke devices on its chimneys when it knows, down the river, Bethlehem or Republic won't spend a penny on pollution control. It's up to the courts and politicians to make them all stop."

In California, Griswold broke new ground in developing control technology for various industrial operations—such as air pollution controls for refineries, power plants, steel mills, grain and feed operations. The first automobile exhaust control labs were begun in Los Angeles under Griswold. This resulted in the 1966 California law requiring new cars sold in the state to be equipped with exhaust control devices.

"This," says Griswold, "was no more than a flesh wound to the polluters at GM, Ford and the rest of the Detroit crowd. After all, California was only one state. But what happened out there let them know that

the public was wising up. People no longer needed statistics telling them the auto-makers were the nation's major air polluters; they could smell it for themselves."

In 1965, Griswold left Los Angeles to become abatement and control chief at HEW's Office for Air Pollution Control. It was not long before he discovered that Washington was an atmospheric cesspool.

"I had an apartment on Massachusetts Avenue, and the living room had white curtains. In six months' time, they were filthy. In California, your draperies last four or five years and usually the sun rots them before they need a cleaning."

On another occasion early in Washington, Griswold was polishing his car on the curb. He had cleaned it with soap and water thoroughly before waxing it. "It was amazing. Before I could put the wax on and rub it off, so much filth from the atmosphere fell on the car that it gummed up the wax. Instead of shining my car, I wound up smearing it."

Griswold stayed three years at HEW where he was known for his fire and action. He planned, directed and executed the federal air pollution abatement program. He did for the government what he did for California: set up the federal control program for all automobiles.

After making what he thought was good progress, the Congress passed in 1967 the Air Quality Control Act, a major part of which passed pollution control to the states. The latter were generally no more equipped to handle this problem than many other social problems. Soon, the control efforts that Griswold built up were diluted or ignored.

He left the government in late 1967 and set up a private consultancy in Washington. He now has more business than he can handle, minus the restrictions of the government. Among his present clients are Maine and Puerto Rico, both of whom, says Griswold, "want industry, but want it clean."

Griswold's present office looks out over K Street in downtown Washington, "one of the worst soot alleys in the nation. I see in Washington every day at least 10 violations of what would end up with court action in Los Angeles. Just take the black smoke coming from buildings; that was banned in Los Angeles in 1956. Washington has a smoke abatement ordinance, and I've heard of cases where obvious violators are warned. But what does a warning do? Violators keep right on polluting. I haven't heard of anyone being taken to court because of breaking the pollution ordinance."

"Go to the top of any downtown building at any hour of the day. Wherever you turn, you'll see smoke coming from a building—a violation against basic pollution measures. Everyone who has eyes and lungs knows the big violators. Pepco has been one of the worst. The downtown Hilton has been typical of the hotels. At regular intervals, the tubes of the boiler are blown. That's what causes the black smoke plumes to shoot out of the chimney. It makes a man-made pollution cloud."

How do you stop the hotels, apartments and commercial buildings in Washington from polluting the air?

"The first step," said Griswold, "is for the press and television to inform the public what's going on. Name the pollution offenders—specifically by name, what they do, when and where. Are they using high sulphur residual oil in their boilers, which is dangerous to health, or have they converted to low sulphur residual oil? Why aren't they using natural gas, instead of coal? Are the chimneys of buildings equipped with anti-pollution devices?"

"When the public gets outraged at the air pollution all around them, the politicians and lawmakers won't be afraid to act forcefully and stop the polluters. Nor will they be hesitant to raise and spend the money for pollution control, because the politicians love a safe and popular issue."

"Of course, the industries and building managers will say they're doing their best already to curb pollution. They aren't, Detroit is a good example of this. They've known for over 50 years that the internal combustion engine was the major cause of U.S. air pollution. Only now, when the public, informed by the press, is finally putting the heat on, are they saying that changes are coming. They can't stall any more."

After the automobile and building pollutants are controlled, there is the problem of disposing solid wastes by burning. "Washington," says Griswold, "has what it thinks are modern incinerators. But what we need are pollution-free programs for solid waste disposal. The city is finally waking up and getting land fill operations for garbage and rubbish, something Los Angeles did nearly 15 years ago."

Repeatedly, Griswold says that a major air pollution control program in Washington, as in any other city, will cost money. "Mayor Washington knows about the problem, but what can he do? Crime and poverty have him in a corner, plus the politicians who won't give the District the right to run its own affairs. Up against all that, the problem of environment must strike the mayor as minor, indeed."

Griswold, who drives a non-polluting car that runs on natural gas, does not expect much from the Nixon administration on environmental problems. "Some good minds are working, and solutions aren't hard to find. But in government, the squeakiest wheel gets the grease. Right now, it's inflation, Vietnam and the Defense Department that dominate the budget. Nothing dramatic is happening in the pollution field. Just the daily, methodical destruction of our land, air and water. If yesterday, say hypothetically, the Potomac was a clear mountain river but today became a sewer, that would be dramatic and things would happen fast. But since the Potomac, like our other natural resources, was ruined slowly over the decades, well, few get alarmed."

As for air pollution control, Griswold intends to keep on as a free-lance consultant. He has enough demands on his time from people who are serious about keeping the air clean not to think about those who still shirk the problem. He believes most of the facts about controlling air pollution are known, and that no more advisory councils, reports, committees, congressional hearings or speeches are needed. What may really be needed, grimly, is for a major U.S. city to suffer a smog suffocation that would kill thousands of people. "That will get action," says Griswold.

Where will he be when and if such a pollution disaster occurs? Odds on in Maine or Puerto Rico, alive and breathing well.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 26, 1969]

A FOE OF NOISE, WASTE, POLLUTION

(By Art Seidenbaum)

Ellen Stern Harris is a modern kind of earth mother who fights for land, sea and air. She is a state official, a community organizer and a most uncommon scold. The conservation of California is what concerns her and all of a sudden she can claim victories.

This is the year that pollution finally became a priority issue as the skies dimmed and the seas ran dirty. Politicians have plunged into the muck, running from right and left, to embrace nature at last. The media have launched series and specials and new departments devoted to ecology, environment, land use. Conservation replaces confrontation as an acceptable word on college campuses.

Saving the natural world is now an extremely popular thing to do.

Mrs. Harris, a Times Woman of the Year, was at it in the bad old days when most peo-

ple thought that development meant progress, when it was bad manners to mention pollution without covering your mouth and turning your head away.

When Mrs. Harris was lobbying for parks in the Santa Monica Mountains in 1966, newsmen used to run and hide because arguments about open space did not fill columns.

When Mrs. Harris was appointed to the regional Water Quality Control Board in the same year, a government acquaintance congratulated her and said, "Great. But what is it?"

When Mrs. Harris helped start the Council for Planning and Conservation in 1967, a lot of locals ho-hummed and figured it was just another outfit with a long name and little influence.

Well, in 1969 Ellen Harris' time had come and the rest of us finally caught up with her cause.

This year newsmen went to her and you might have read about Mrs. Harris in editorials in the Sunday Opinion Section, in the Metropolitan News Section, and, in profile, in this section. Water, waste, noise, parks and pollution were the subjects; she was busy in all of them.

This year her efforts on the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board changed a "what-is-it" body into an effective force for cleaning up our shoreline.

The State of California has finally set stringent standards on what may be dumped in Los Angeles Harbor or Dominguez Channel. Mrs. Harris was one of the catalysts who made cleaning possible; she convinced the bureaucracy that private industry was polluting the life out of public property.

This year the woman who used to be known as "Brown's Revenge," because she was a late appointment by a lame duck governor, has new friends on the board itself. She even wins votes from industry representatives and admits, "It's astonishing when the people you've been fighting finally agree with you."

And this year, the council with the long name has been joined by more than 50 conservation-minded organizations, from the American Institute of Architects to the Wilderness Foundation, from the citizens' committee that *did* save Cabrillo Beach to the citizens' committee that ultimately saved Hazard Park.

Citizens won several battles this year and the council—which is a clearing house and public amplifier for citizen groups—deserves considerable credit. Ellen Harris writes the council's monthly newsletter, toughly and truly summarizing the battles on all fronts. She runs the outfit out of her own home because its shoestring budget is a conservation battle all by itself.

Instead of sleeping, Ellen Harris often spends her spare time fighting the aural pollution that keeps so many of us awake at night.

This year, in a memorable interview with an executive from the Federal Aviation Agency, Mrs. Harris insisted on a solution for night jet noise. The federal official was foolish enough to suggest, "I have a friend who keeps a small machine in her bedroom that makes a small buzz. It goes all night to draw out the sound of airplanes . . ."

Mrs. Harris could not accept more noise for an answer. Instead she carried the battles of the buzzes to her councilmen and the noise problem has become the subject of continuing public hearings.

Mrs. Harris always does her technological homework, calling on an assortment of sympathetic ecological experts for advice. But her style is direct action. And the only cure for this uncommon scold is results.

"Sometimes," says Ellen Harris, "I think professional people and political people know all the reasons why you can't change things and why you can't make better things happen. I never knew that much."

SCOURGE OF POLLUTERS

The scourge of polluters is an attractive third-generation Californian who went to school in Beverly Hills, chose marriage instead of college, had two children and might have been any other matron if the climate hadn't changed for the worse. She divorced several years ago and admits having just survived "the 40-trauma. My two kids were so lovely. They went out and brought home autumn leaves."

Ellen Harris shares a handsomely conserved Beverly Hills house with the two high school leaves-bearers—Tom Harris, 18, and Jane Harris, 16. They are a family and they talk to each other.

The evening I arrived to interview the Times Woman of the Year, daughter Jane wandered into the conversation. She was cordial and said kind things about her mother. But when I asked Jane a direct question, Jane didn't want to horn into the story: "Don't write anything about me," she said, "I have my rights." Then she laughed.

The Harris office is right off the living room, a clutter of file cabinets and commendations and Xerox copies of reports on what ails us.

A large aerial view of Manhattan Island dominates the long wall of the office. Ellen Harris hung it there as a reminder of what could become of California if the conservationists quit. In the office, she talks rapidly and persuasively, pulling out papers to underline her arguments. In the living room, she listens and waits for questions.

* * * changed into an activist in the first place. She told me it was palm trees. Then she flustered for a moment and apologized for being lucky enough to live on a street with palm trees. Mrs. Harris explained that several years ago she realized the trees on that lucky street were in terrible need of trimming. She called the bureaucracy and the bureaucracy told her to call back in six months.

Six months later, the bureaucracy put her off again, pleading lack of funds, lack of labor—a bureaucratic abundance of the usual excuses. The postponements continued for 18 months, until the day Ellen Harris called once more and threatened to serve a petition on City Hall.

The trees were trimmed immediately and Mrs. Harris had her first lesson in making change; government normally does nothing until an individual enlists support to embarrass government.

RUN BY DEFAULT

"A city or a state is run by default," says Ellen Harris, "because there's a tremendous group of people out there who've been inhibited from participating. They don't know their own power."

Mrs. Harris moved out from under palm trees to a wider perspective. She worked for the mayor's conference on beauty in 1965. She worked for the governor's conference on beauty the same year. Beauty was a good word in 1965 because Ladybird Johnson made a national project out of it. But conservation is an even harder chore, which Ellen Harris learned when she turned lobbyist for open space in local mountains.

As representative for the Friends of the Santa Monica Mountains, Mrs. Harris went to Sacramento and discovered that there's an unfortunate relationship between those who contribute to pollution and to political campaigns. "Too often," says Ellen Harris, "the man who votes away or promises away much of our resources is the same man who's been provided with much of the campaign kitty."

Instead of bringing money, Ellen Harris brought persistence and candor. She learned that there are good guys and bad guys in both parties, that most legislators are affable, approachable and sometimes even con-

vertible. Treated as human and friendly creatures, they behave that way in return.

"Elected officials," say Mrs. Harris, "really can't be intransigent under constant public scrutiny. And the Establishment has given us the tools for public scrutiny—it's up to us to use them."

She came home with an indoor theory of outdoor survival: "What's happening to the ecology," offers the ex-lobbyist, "is happening inside a Sacramento committee hearing and yet we don't teach ecology that way."

"We continue to teach in the classroom and then take people out in the field. That isn't far enough. I'd like to take students to city councils and boards of supervisors where they can learn how to testify and how to influence officials door-to-door."

The lady who didn't go to college now wants to educate the community. "If we can channel our human resources then we can begin to save our natural ones. I'd like to begin a workshop with a whole lot of women such as my former self."

MAN-MADE HORRORS

The course would begin along the coast, where Ellen Harris can point out both the original magnificence and the man-made horrors. Then she'd take them to hearing rooms and introduce them to the good guys and the bad guys. And somewhere along the way, Ellen Harris would show the workshop what you can do with the media.

At the Water Quality Control Board meetings, where she was frequently a minority of one, Ellen Harris learned how the press really makes a difference. "Whenever the cameras are there," she says, "people tend to vote the right way. If you could have the press there—have the lights on and the cameras going even if there was no film in them our side would win."

Woman of the Year Harris is winning with the system. She put the system to serving its original purpose: people.

And now she issues an ecological invitation to everybody: "C'mon in. The water's lousy."

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 8, 1970]

TANGENTS OF SMOG FIGHT

(By Richard Buffum)

The adult, which is not to say mature, smut book stores proliferate here. Creeping urban pollution, including smog, has become a way of life at the intersection of Wilshire Blvd. and Western Ave.

In a dingy office building here, its wide old halls sounding lonely echoes as you walk down them, is suite 205—a euphemism for four cramped little rooms overflowing with clutter. This is state headquarters for the People's Lobby, Inc., where a handful of militant smog battlers are stoutly playing out what may be their last gasp as an organization.

Last August they began circulating a pair of initiative petitions aimed at placing tough pollution abatement measures on the November general election ballot. One is an amendment in the state Constitution guaranteeing that all persons have the inalienable right to live in an environment free of pollution and contamination. The other is a highly technical document known as the Clean Environment Act, which, if added as statute provisions to our state's health and safety code, would force strict pollution abatement standards, with penalties, upon industry, including motor vehicle manufacturers.

PRECARIOUS TIMES

Operating on a shoestring, the People's Lobby, led by Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Koupal, has fallen, unfortunately, upon precarious times. By the Nov. 26 deadline they had failed to obtain sufficient signatures of registered voters to qualify the constitutional amendment for the ballot, and possibly the statute revision.

Taking advantage of a 60-day supplementary period that ends Jan. 26, they are engaged now in urging volunteers in 22 counties into a deadline spurt. Petitions must be in headquarters no later than the 15th. The major obstacle to the success of this grassroots initiative campaign has been a curious psychological reaction of rejection within the established political hierarchy. I would characterize it as a parental attitude toward smog.

It manifests itself this way: politicians, including the leaders of some air pollution control districts, would prefer to construct piecemeal legislation, each taking personal credit for his part in the smog battle, rather than accept a readymade set of pollution abatement measures. This applies particularly to the statute initiative with the sharp teeth.

DIFFICULT TO MODIFY

The very nature of this initiative makes it difficult to modify to less stringent and "more realistic" abatement standards—this is to say, standards more compatible with industry's inherent economic barriers against rapid change.

Moreover, antipollution is good politics today, reflecting a burgeoning desire of the people to clean up their deteriorating environment. The 18 separate smog control measures submitted Monday on the opening day of the Assembly show that our representatives are scrambling to respond.

I hope, however, that the People's Lobby volunteers, manning their card tables on smoggy street corners, succeed in getting at least the health and safety code amendment on the November ballot. There, win or lose, it will serve a highly useful purpose—that of preserving from pressure-tactics erosion the integrity of the initially tough antipollution standards proposed by our legislators.

STATE DEPARTMENT ASSESSES SOVIET ADHERENCE TO UNITED STATES-SOVIET TREATIES

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I thought it would be of interest to my colleagues to read some recent correspondence between the State Department and myself, on the issue of Soviet adherence to United States-Soviet treaties. The letters and documents follow:

DECEMBER 8, 1969.

HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am often confronted by constituents who state that the Soviet Union never obeys its treaty obligations and that it regards a treaty as a mere scrap of paper. I would like the State Department to make an assessment of this sweeping generalization.

In doing so, would you please list the major Soviet/American treaties now in operation and assess each one for the degree of Soviet adherence to it.

The question of honoring treaty obligations becomes of critical importance if, as the President has said, we are entering an era of negotiations and if any SALT talk decisions are to be regarded as binding.

I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, January 20, 1970.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: Secretary Rogers has asked me to reply to your recent letter concerning Soviet-American treaties. I am pleased to have the opportunity to explore with you this complicated, but timely, subject.

At present, the United States and the Soviet Union are joint parties to 170 international agreements, of which 83 are defined as treaties (ratified with the advice and consent of the Senate).

Our first experience in concluding agreements with the Soviet Government was the exchange of letters with Soviet Foreign Minister Litvinov in 1933 when we established diplomatic relations. While most of the provisions of these agreements were observed by the Soviets, during the thirties we were obliged to protest several times against what we considered to be violations of the Soviet pledge not to spread propaganda in the United States through the Comintern. We also objected on a number of occasions against Soviet failure to provide immediate notification and access to U.S. citizens detained in the Soviet Union. This situation was corrected when the US-USSR Consular Convention went into force on July 13, 1968. Since then, the Soviets have observed its provisions on notification and access to detained U.S. citizens. The Consular Convention is the only bilateral Soviet-American treaty.

The Soviets have failed to observe several other international agreements to which both the Soviet Union and the United States are parties. This is particularly true in regard to some of the agreements drawn up in the final stages of World War II in an attempt to determine the postwar political configuration of Europe. It is extremely difficult to provide a complete rundown of these Soviet violations, however, for most of the transgressions involved multipartite international agreements relating, in many cases, to very broadly-defined political concepts.

As an example, I would cite that part of the Yalta Conference Communiqué (1945) dealing with the form of government which was to be established in postwar Poland. The Communiqué referred to such concepts as "democracy," "democratic elements" and "free elections." Agreements couched in such broad terminology can be effective only if all parties are in fundamental political agreement on the kind of results which they wish to achieve. In the case cited herein, a bitter dispute arose between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers concerning the definition of these political terms. With the advantage of hindsight, we realize that the basic problem was not whether an agreement was violated, but whether there was any real "agreement."

As a result of such problems in the early postwar period, the United States has been extremely careful to enter into international agreements with the Soviet Union only when there are safeguards against unilateral secret violations and a high probability that the Soviets will respect those agreements. We have carefully assessed the circumstances surrounding recent negotiations to make certain that the Soviets have perceived their own vital interests to be involved in a successful agreement, just as we have made certain that such agreement is in the interest of the United States. Most, but not all, of the successful international agreements reached under this careful policy have been in technically-related areas, which have provided reliable means to ascertain whether the agreements are being observed. The Soviet record on adherence to international agreements in this field has

been generally comparable to that of other nations.

Examples of technically-related agreements which have entered into force include the Limited Test Ban Treaty (1963), the Outer Space Treaty (1967) and the Agreement on the Rescue and Return of Astronauts and Objects From Outer Space (1968). Each of these agreements involves significant limitations on Soviet rights and activities in the fields of weaponry and space, and the Soviets have respected all of these agreements thus far.

Another significant example of a successful treaty to which both the United States and the Soviet Union are parties is the Antarctic Treaty (1959). This is a wide-reaching, 15-party international agreement covering scientific cooperation in Antarctica and prohibitions against military activities and the placement of atomic wastes in that area. This treaty, which has been operative for 10 years, has been strictly observed by all parties, including the Soviet Union.

Although all of the successful agreements cited above have political, as well as technical, connotations, this is particularly true of the Antarctic Treaty, which regulates the political status of Antarctica. Another "political" treaty which the Soviets have respected is the Austrian State Treaty (1955), which established the status and neutrality of postwar Austria.

I am enclosing for your use a brief information sheet titled "The Soviet Union and International Agreements." This circular cites two very fine sources, if you or any of your constituents wish to pursue further this very complicated subject. I am also enclosing more detailed lists of bilateral and multilateral US-Soviet agreements.

Please accept my apologies for the delay in answering your letter. As you can see from the foregoing, this is a very complicated subject, and considerable attention has been devoted to our reply.

If I can be of any further assistance concerning this subject, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

H. G. TORBERT, Jr.,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

THE SOVIET UNION AND INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

According to a recent count by the Office of the Legal Advisor of the Department of State, there are 170 international agreements to which the United States and the Soviet Union are parties. Of these 83 are multilateral treaties. The only bilateral US-USSR treaty is the Consular Convention which entered into force in July 1968.

A listing of treaties entered into by the Soviet Government and a discussion of how these agreements have been kept is found in Jan F. Triska and Robert M. Slusser, *The Theory, Law and Policy of Soviet Treaties*, and *A Calendar of Soviet Treaties, 1917-1957* (Stanford University Press, 1959 and 1962). There have been numerous examples of Soviet violations of international agreements. Many of these are violations of the political arrangements growing out of the attempted settlement of World War II, and many are agreements to which the United States is not a party.

Because the Soviet Union has not observed a number of its international agreements, however, does not mean that it is useless to enter into such agreements with the Soviet Government. Experience has shown that agreements which have either built in safeguards or are self-enforcing can be made with the Soviet Union. There are numerous bilateral and multilateral agreements which the Soviet Union has made which it has found in its interest to keep. In the field of technical agreements, the record of the Soviet Union appears to be comparable to that of

most other nations. Following is a list of some of the agreements which the Soviet Union has made and, despite some infractions, has generally found it in its interest to observe:

- Austrian State Treaty (1955).
- Antarctic Treaty (1959).
- Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency (1956).
- Convention on Road Traffic (1949).
- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles (1954).
- Constitution on UNESCO (1945).
- International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (1949).
- Convention on the Intergovernmental Maritime Organization (1948).
- Convention on Safety of Life at Sea (1948 and 1960).
- Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea (1948 and 1960).
- Convention of the World Meteorological Organization (1947).
- Constitution of the World Health Organization (1946).
- International Sanitary Regulations (1951).
- Universal Postal Convention (1957).
- Agreement for the Suppression of the Circulation of Obscene Publications (1949).
- Interim Convention on Conservation of North Pacific Fur Seals (1947).
- International Sugar Agreement (1948).
- International Telecommunication Convention (1955).
- Agreement on Cooperation in Exchanges in the Fields of Science, Technology, Education and Culture (There have been four such agreements signed since 1958, covering four successive years).
- Agreement Relating to the Exchange of Medical Films (1955).
- Agreement Relating to the Reciprocal Waiver of Visa Fees to Non-Immigrants (1958).
- Agreement on the Organization of Commercial Radio Teletype Communication Channels (1946).
- Limited Atomic Test Ban Treaty (1963).
- Agreement on Cooperation in the Field of Desalination, Including the Use of Atomic Energy (1964).
- Agreements Relating to Fishing Operations in the Northeastern Pacific Ocean (1964 and 1967).
- Agreement Relating to Fishing for King Crab (1965 and 1967).
- Statute of the International Agency for Research on Cancer (1965).

MULTILATERAL TREATIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS IN FORCE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

AFRICA

General Act for the repression of the African slave trade. Signed at Brussels July 2, 1890; entered into force for the United States April 2, 1892, subject to a statement. 27 Stat. 886; TS 383; II Malloy 1964.

Convention revising the duties imposed by the Brussels convention of June 8, 1899 on spirituous liquors imported into certain regions of Africa. Signed at Brussels November 3, 1906; entered into force for the United States December 2, 1907. 35 Stat. 1912; TS 467; II Malloy 2205.

ANTARCTICA

The Antarctic Treaty. Signed at Washington December 1, 1959; entered into force for the United States June 23, 1961. 12 UST 794; TIAS 4780; 402 UNTS 71.

States which are parties: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States.

Measures relating to the furtherance of the principles and objectives of the Antarctic

Treaty. Adopted at Canberra July 24, 1961; entered into force for the United States April 30, 1962. 13 UST 1349; TIAS 5094.

Measures relating to the furtherance of the principles and objectives of the Antarctic Treaty. Adopted at Buenos Aires July 28, 1962; entered into force for the United States January 11, 1963. 14 UST 99; TIAS 5274.

Measures, including agreed measures for conservation of Antarctic fauna and flora, relating to the furtherance of the principles and objectives of the Antarctic Treaty. Adopted at Brussels June 2-13, 1964; entered into force for the United States July 27, 1966, except for III-VII, III-VIII and III-XI; September 1, 1966 for III-XI. 17 UST 991; TIAS 6058.

ASTRONAUTS

Agreement on the rescue of astronauts, the return of astronauts, and the return of objects launched into outer space. Done at Washington, London, and Moscow April 22, 1968; entered into force for the United States December 3, 1968. TIAS 6599.

ATLANTIC CHARTER

Joint Declaration, known as the Atlantic Charter, by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, made on August 14, 1941. 55 Stat. 1600; EAS 236.

ATOMIC ENERGY (SEE ALSO NUCLEAR TEST BAN)

Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Done at New York October 26, 1956; entered into force for the United States July 29, 1957, subject to an interpretation and understanding. 8 UST 1093; TIAS 3873; 276 UNTS 3.

Amendment: October 4, 1961 (14 UST 135; TIAS 5284; 471 UNTS 334).

AUSTRIA

State treaty for the reestablishment of an independent and democratic Austria. Signed at Vienna May 15, 1955; entered into force for the United States July 27, 1955. 6 UST 2369; TIAS 3298; 217 UNTS 223.

AUTOMOTIVE TRAFFIC

Convention on road traffic, with annexes. Done at Geneva September 19, 1949; entered into force for the United States March 26, 1952. 3 UST 308; TIAS 2437; 125 UNTS 22.

Convention concerning customs facilities for touring. Done at New York June 4, 1954; entered into force for the United States September 11, 1957. 8 UST 1293; TIAS 3879; 276 UNTS 230.

Customs convention on the temporary importation of private road vehicles. Done at New York June 4, 1954; entered into force for the United States December 15, 1957. 8 UST 2097; TIAS 3943; 282 UNTS 249.

AVIATION

Convention for the unification of certain rules relating to international transportation by air, with additional protocol. Concluded at Warsaw October 12, 1929; entered into force for the United States October 29, 1934, subject to a reservation, 49 Stat. 3000; TS 876; IV Trenwith 5250; 137 LNTS 11.

CULTURAL RELATIONS

Convention relating to international exhibitions. Done at Paris November 22, 1928; entered into force for the United States June 24, 1968. TIAS 6548; 111 LNTS 343.

Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Concluded at London November 16, 1945; entered into force for the United States November 4, 1946. 61 Stat. 2495; TIAS 1580; 4 UNTS 275.

Resolutions by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization amending the Constitution of the Organization. Adopted at Montevideo November 22 and December 8, 1954, at the Eighth Session of the Organization. 6 UST 6157; TIAS 3469.

Resolution by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization amending the Constitution of the Organization. Adopted at New Delhi November 10, 1956, at the Ninth Session of the Organization. 8 UST 1395; TIAS 3889.

Resolutions by the General Conferences of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization amending the Constitution of the Organization. Adopted at the Second, Third, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Tenth Sessions of the Organization. 10 UST 959; TIAS 4230.

EDUCATION

Statutes of the International Bureau of Education. Adopted at Geneva July 25, 1929; entered into force for the United States July 12, 1958, subject to a declaration. 14 UST 311, TIAS 5312.

FISHERIES

International convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. Done at Washington February 8, 1949; entered into force for the United States July 3, 1950. 1 UST 477; TIAS 2089; 157 UNTS 157.

Protocol to the international convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries signed under date of February 8, 1949. Done at Washington June 25, 1956; entered into force for the United States January 10, 1959. 10 UST 59; TIAS 4170; 331 UNTS 388.

Declaration of understanding regarding the international convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. Done at Washington April 24, 1961; entered into force for the United States June 5, 1963. 14 UST 924; TIAS 5380; 480 UNTS 334.

Protocol to the international convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries relating to harp and hood seals. Done at Washington July 15, 1963; entered into force for the United States April 29, 1966. 17 UST 635; TIAS 6011.

GERMANY

Agreement on control machinery in Germany. Signed at London November 14, 1944; entered into force for the United States February 6, 1945. 5 UST 2062; TIAS 3070; 236 UNTS 359.

Amendment: May 1, 1945 (5 UST 2062; TIAS 3070; 236 UNTS 400).

Protocol on the zones of occupation in Germany and the administration of "Greater Berlin". Signed at London September 12, 1944; entered into force for the United States February 6, 1945. 5 UST 2078; TIAS 3071; 227 UNTS 279.

Amendments: November 14, 1944 (5 UST 2078; TIAS 3071; 227 UNTS 286). July 26, 1945 (5 UST 2078; TIAS 3071; 227 UNTS 297).

Agreement relating to the lifting of restrictions imposed since March 1, 1948 on communications, transportation, and trade with Berlin. Done at New York May 4, 1949; entered into force for the United States May 4, 1949. 63 Stat. 2410; TIAS 1915; 138 UNTS 123.

HEALTH

Constitution of the World Health Organization. Done at New York July 22, 1946; entered into force for the United States June 21, 1948. 62 Stat. 2679; TIAS 1808; 14 UNTS 185.

Amendments to articles 24 and 25 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization. Adopted at Geneva May 28, 1959; entered into force for the United States October 25, 1960. 11 UST 2553; TIAS 4643; 377 UNTS 380.

World Health Organization nomenclature regulations, 1967. Adopted at Geneva May 22, 1967; entered into force for the United States January 1, 1968. 18 UST 3003; TIAS 6393.

International sanitary regulations (World Health Organization Regulations No. 2). Adopted at Geneva May 25, 1951; entered into force for the United States October 1, 1952. 7 UST 2255; TIAS 3625; 175 UNTS 215.

Additional regulations amending the international sanitary regulations with respect to yellow fever. Adopted at Mexico May 26, 1955; entered into force for the United States October 1, 1956. 13 UST 1986; TIAS 5156; 252 UNTS 338.

Additional regulations amending the international sanitary regulations with respect to the form of international certificate of vaccination or revaccination against smallpox. Adopted at Geneva May 23, 1956; entered into force for the United States October 1, 1956. 11 UST 133; TIAS 4420.

Additional regulations amending the international sanitary regulations with respect to the sanitary control of pilgrim traffic. Adopted at Geneva May 23, 1956; entered into force for the United States, subject to reservations, May 22, 1957. 12 UST 1121; TIAS 4823.

Additional regulations amending the international sanitary regulations with respect to the health part of the aircraft general declaration. Adopted at Geneva May 19, 1960; entered into force for the United States January 1, 1961. 12 UST 2950; TIAS 4896.

Additional regulations amending the international sanitary regulations with respect to notifications. Adopted at Geneva May 23, 1963; entered into force for the United States October 1, 1963. 14 UST 1557; TIAS 5459.

Additional regulations amending the international sanitary regulations with respect to disinsecting of ships and aircraft and appendices 3 and 4: forms of the international certificates of vaccination and revaccination against yellow fever and smallpox. Adopted at Geneva May 12, 1965; entered into force for the United States January 1, 1966. 16 UST 1177; TIAS 5863.

Statute of International Agency for research on cancer. Done at Geneva May 20, 1965; entered into force for the United States September 15, 1965. 16 UST 1239; TIAS 5873.

INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

Convention revising the Convention of the Union of Paris of March 20, 1883, as revised, for the protection of industrial property. Done at Lisbon October 31, 1958; entered into force for the United States January 4, 1962. 13 UST 1; TIAS 4931.

LABOR

Instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization. Dated at Montreal October 9, 1946; entered into force for the United States April 20, 1948. 62 Stat. 3485; TIAS 1868; 15 UNTS 35.

Amendments: June 25, 1953 (7 UST 245; TIAS 3500; 191 UNTS 143). June 22, 1962 (14 UST 1039; TIAS 5401; 466 UNTS 323).

Convention (ILO No. 58) fixing the minimum age for the admission of children to employment at sea (revised 1936). Adopted at the 22nd session of the General Conference of the International Labor Organization, Geneva, October 24, 1936; entered into force for the United States October 29, 1939, subject to understandings. 54 Stat. 1705; TS 952; 40 UNTS 205.

LAOS

Declaration and protocol on the neutrality of Laos. Signed at Geneva July 23, 1962; entered into force for the United States July 23, 1962. 14 UST 1104; TIAS 5410; 456 UNTS 301.

MARITIME MATTERS

Convention for the unification of certain rules with respect to assistance and salvage at sea. Signed at Brussels September 23, 1910; entered into force for the United States March 1, 1913. 37 Stat. 1658; TS 576; III Redmond 2943.

International load line convention, final protocol and annexes, together with Final Act of the International Load Line Conference. Signed at London July 5, 1930, with exchanges of notes at Washington February 8, June 1 and 28, August 9, and October 5, 1932; entered into force for the United States Jan-

uary 1, 1933, subject to declaration. 47 Stat. 2228; TS 853; IV Trenwith 5287; 135 LNTS 301.

Modification of Annex II (6) (a) of the international load line convention. Entered into force for the United States August 23, 1938. 53 Stat. 1787; TS 942; IV Trenwith 5348.

Modification of the first paragraph of Annex II of the international load line convention. Entered into force for the United States July 13, 1957. 10 UST 1271; TIAS 4266.

Modification of the fifth paragraph of Annex II of the international load line convention. Entered into force for the United States August 7, 1959. 11 UST 1992; TIAS 4550.

International convention on load lines, 1966. Done at London April 5, 1966; entered into force for the United States July 21, 1968. 18 UST 1857; TIAS 6331.

Convention on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization. Signed at Geneva March 6, 1948; entered into force for the United States March 17, 1958, subject to a reservation and understanding. 9 UST 621; TIAS 4044; 289 UNTS 48.

International convention for the safety of life at sea, 1960. Done at London June 17, 1960; entered into force for the United States May 26, 1965. 16 UST 185; TIAS 5780.

Convention on the high seas. Done at Geneva April 29, 1958; entered into force for the United States September 30, 1962. 13 UST 2312; TIAS 5200; 450 UNTS 82.

Convention on the continental shelf. Done at Geneva April 29, 1958; entered into force for the United States June 10, 1964. 15 UST 471; TIAS 5578; 499 UNTS 311.

Convention on the territorial sea and contiguous zone. Done at Geneva April 29, 1958; entered into force for the United States September 10, 1964. 15 UST 1606; TIAS 5639; 516 UNTS 205.

International regulations for preventing collisions at sea. Approved by the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, London May 17 to June 17, 1960; entered into force for the United States September 1, 1965. 16 UST 794; TIAS 5813.

International agreement regarding the maintenance of certain lights in the Red Sea. Done at London February 20, 1962; entered into force for the United States October 28, 1966. TIAS 6150.

Convention on facilitation of international maritime traffic, with annex. Done at London April 9, 1965; entered into force for the United States May 16, 1967. 18 UST 411; TIAS 6251.

METEOROLOGY

Convention of the World Meteorological Organization, and related protocol. Done at Washington October 11, 1947; entered into force for the United States March 23, 1950. 1 UST 281; TIAS 2052; 77 UNTS 143.

Amendments: April 11, 1963 (16 UST 2069; TIAS 5947). April 27, 1963 (16 UST 2073; TIAS 5947). April 11 and 26, 1967 (18 UST 2795; TIAS 6364). April 26, 1967 (18 UST 2800; TIAS 6364).

MILITARY AFFAIRS

Agreement concerning an armistice with Romania, with annex and protocol. Signed at Moscow September 12, 1944; entered into force for the United States September 12, 1944. 59 Stat. 1712; EAS 490.

Armistice agreement with Bulgaria, with protocol. Signed at Moscow October 28, 1944; entered into force for the United States October 28, 1944. 58 Stat. 1498; EAS 437; 123 UNTS 223.

Armistice agreement with Hungary, with annex and protocol. Signed at Moscow January 20, 1945; entered into force for the United States January 20, 1945. 59 Stat. 1321; EAS 456; 140 UNTS 397.

Act of military surrender. Terms between the United States and other Allied Powers

and Germany. Signed at Rheims May 7 and at Berlin May 8, 1945; effective May 8, 1945. 59 Stat. 1857; EAS 502.

Declaration regarding the defeat of Germany and the assumption of supreme authority with respect to Germany by the Governments of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the Provisional Government of the French Republic. Signed at Berlin June 5, 1945; entered into force for the United States June 5, 1945. 60 Stat. 1649; TIAS 1520; 68 UNTS 189.

MOROCCO

Convention for the establishment of the right of protection in Morocco. Signed at Madrid July 3, 1880; entered into force for the United States March 9, 1882. 22 Stat. 817; TS 246; I Malloy 1220.

General act of the International Conference at Algeciras, with an additional protocol. Signed at Algeciras (Spain) April 7, 1906; entered into force for the United States December 31, 1906. 34 Stat. 2905; TS 456; II Malloy 2157.

MOSCOW AGREEMENT

Communique on the Moscow conference of Foreign Ministers. Signed at Moscow December 27, 1945; entered into force for the United States December 27, 1945. 60 Stat. 1899; TIAS 1955; 20 UNTS 259.

NARCOTIC DRUGS

Single convention on narcotic drugs, 1961. Done at New York March 30, 1961; entered into force for the United States June 24, 1967. 18 UST 1407; TIAS 6298; 520 UNTS 204.

Addition of substance dihydrocodeinone-6-carboxymethylxime (codoxime) to Schedule I of the single convention on narcotic drugs, 1961. Notification dated December 7, 1967. 18 UST 3279; TIAS 6423.

Addition of substances acetorphine and etorphine to Schedule IV of the single convention on narcotic drugs, 1961. Notification dated February 19, 1968. TIAS 6458.

NAVAL VESSELS (SEE ALSO MARITIME MATTERS; RULES OF WARFARE)

Protocol on the establishment of a four power naval commission, the disposal of excess units of the Italian fleet, and the return by the Soviet Union of warships on loan. Signed at Paris February 10, 1947; entered into force for the United States February 10, 1947. 61 Stat. 3846; TIAS 1733; 140 UNTS 111.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN

Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. Done at Moscow August 5, 1963; entered into force for the United States October 10, 1963. 14 UST 1313; TIAS 5433; 480 UNTS 43.

PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

Convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes. Signed at The Hague October 18, 1907; entered into force for the United States January 26, 1910, subject to declarations and an understanding 36 Stat. 2199; TS 536; II Malloy 2220.

Convention respecting the limitation of the employment of force for the recovery of contract debts. Signed at The Hague October 18, 1907; entered into force for the United States January 26, 1910, subject to an understanding. 36 Stat. 2241; TS 537; II Malloy 2248.

PEACE TREATIES

Treaty of peace with Italy. Signed at Paris February 10, 1947; entered into force for the United States September 15, 1947. 61 Stat. 1245; TIAS 1648; 49 and 50 UNTS.

Treaty of peace with Romania. Signed at Paris February 10, 1947; entered into force for the United States September 15, 1947. 61 Stat. 1757; TIAS 1649; 42 UNTS 3.

Treaty of peace with Bulgaria. Signed at Paris February 10, 1947; entered into force for the United States September 15, 1947. 61 Stat. 1915; TIAS 1650; 41 UNTS 21.

Treaty of peace with Hungary. Signed at

Paris February 10, 1947; entered into force for the United States September 15, 1947. 61 Stat. 2065; TIAS 1651; 41 UNTS 135.

POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS

Constitution and convention of the Universal Postal Union, with final protocols, general regulations, and regulations of execution. Done at Vienna July 10, 1964; entered into force for the United States January 1, 1966. 16 UST 1291; TIAS 5381.

PRISONERS OF WAR (SEE ALSO RED CROSS CONVENTIONS; RULES OF WARFARE)

Geneva convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war. Done at Geneva August 12, 1949; entered into force for the United States February 2, 1956, subject to a statement. 6 UST 3316; TIAS 3364; 75 UNTS 135.

PUBLICATIONS

Agreement for the suppression of the circulation of obscene publications. Signed at Paris May 4, 1910; entered into force for the United States September 15, 1911. 37 Stat. 1511; TS 559; III Redmond 2918.

Protocol amending the agreement for the suppression of the circulation of obscene publications signed at Paris May 4, 1910, with annex. Done at Lake Success May 4, 1949; entered into force for the United States August 14, 1950. 1 UST 849; TIAS 2164; 30 UNTS 3.

Convention concerning the international exchange of publications. Adopted at Paris December 3, 1958; entered into force for the United States June 9, 1968. TIAS 6438; 416 UNTS 51.

RED CROSS CONVENTIONS (SEE ALSO PRISONERS OF WAR; RULES OF WARFARE)

Convention for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and sick in armed forces in the field. Dated at Geneva August 12, 1949; entered into force for the United States February 2, 1956, subject to a reservation and statement. 6 UST 3114; TIAS 3362; 75 UNTS 31.

Convention for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded, sick, and shipwrecked members of armed forces at sea. Dated at Geneva August 12, 1949; entered into force for the United States February 2, 1956, subject to a statement. 6 UST 3217; TIAS 3363; 75 UNTS 85.

RENUNCIATION OF WAR

Treaty providing for the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy. Signed at Paris August 27, 1928; entered into force for the United States July 24, 1929. 46 Stat. 2343; TS 796; IV Trenwith 5130; 94 LNTS 57.

REPARATIONS

Protocol on the talks between the Heads of the three governments at the Crimea Conference on the question of the German reparation in kind. Signed at Yalta February 11, 1945; entered into force for the United States February 11, 1945.

Department of State Press Release 239, March 24, 1947: "A Decade of American Foreign Policy—Basic Documents 1941-1949. Prepared at the Request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations by the Staff of the Committee and the Department of State." (Senate Document 123, 81st Cong., 1st sess.); "In Quest of Peace and Security—Selected Documents on American Foreign Policy 1941-1951;" (Department of State Publication 4245); *Foreign Relations of the United States: "The Conferences at Malta and Yalta, 1945,"* pp. 968-975.

RULES OF WARFARE (SEE ALSO CULTURAL RELATIONS; PRISONERS OF WAR; RED CROSS CONVENTIONS)

Convention for the exemption of hospital ships, in time of war, from the payment of all dues and taxes imposed for the benefit of the state. Done at The Hague December 21, 1904; entered into force for the United States March 26, 1907. 35 Stat. 1854; TS 459; II Malloy 2135.

Convention relative to the opening of hostilities. Signed at The Hague October 18, 1907; entered into force for the United States January 26, 1910. 36 Stat. 2259; TS 538; II Malloy 2259.

Convention respecting the laws and customs of war on land, and annex. Signed at The Hague October 18, 1907; entered into force for the United States January 26, 1910. 36 Stat. 2277; TS 539; II Malloy 2269.

Convention respecting the rights and duties of neutral powers and persons in case of war on land. Signed at The Hague October 18, 1907; entered into force for the United States January 26, 1910. 36 Stat. 2310; TS 540; II Malloy 2290.

Convention concerning bombardment by naval forces in time of war. Signed at The Hague October 18, 1907; entered into force for the United States January 26, 1910. 36 Stat. 2351; TS 542; II Malloy 2314.

Conventional concerning the rights and duties of neutral powers in naval war. Signed at The Hague October 18, 1907; entered into force for the United States February 1, 1910, subject to a reservation and an understanding. 36 Stat. 2415; TS 545; II Malloy 2352.

Treaty for the limitation and reduction of naval armament. Signed at London April 22, 1930; entered into force for the United States December 31, 1930. 46 Stat. 2858; TS 830; IV Trenwith 5268; 112 LNTS 65.

All provisions of this treaty with the exception of Part IV, which relates to rules of international law in regard to the operations of submarines or other war vessels with respect to merchant vessels, expired on December 31, 1936. Under the terms of article 23, Part IV "shall remain in force without limit of time."

Convention relative to the protection of civilian persons in time of war. Dated at Geneva August 12, 1949; entered into force for the United States February 2, 1956, subject to a reservation and a statement. 6 UST 3516; TIAS 3365; 75 UNTS 287.

SEALS

Interim convention on conservation of North Pacific fur seals. Signed at Washington February 9, 1957; entered into force for the United States October 14, 1957. 8 UST 2283; TIAS 3948; 314 UNTS 105.

Protocol amending the interim convention on conservation of North Pacific fur seals. Done at Washington October 8, 1963; entered into force for the United States April 10, 1964. 15 UST 316; TIAS 5558; 494 UNTS 303.

SLAVE TRADE (SEE ALSO AFRICA; TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN)

Convention to suppress the slave trade and slavery. Concluded at Geneva September 25, 1926; entered into force for the United States March 21, 1929, subject to a reservation. 46 Stat. 2183; TS 778; IV Trenwith 5022; 60 LNTS 253.

Protocol amending the slavery convention signed at Geneva on September 25, 1926, with annex. Done at New York December 7, 1953; entered into force for the United States March 7, 1956. 7 UST 479; TIAS 3532; 182 UNTS 51.

Supplementary convention on the abolition of slavery, the slave trade and institutions and practices similar to slavery. Done at Geneva September 7, 1956; entered into force for the United States December 6, 1967. 18 UST 3201; TIAS 6418; 266 UNTS 3.

SPACE

Treaty on principles governing the activities of states in the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies. Done at Washington, London, and Moscow January 27, 1967; entered into force for the United States October 10, 1967. 18 UST 2410; TIAS 6347.

SPIZBERGEN

Treaty relating to Spitzbergen, with annex. Done at Paris February 9, 1920; entered into force for the United States August 14, 1925.

43 Stat. 1892; TS 686; IV Trenwith 4861; 2 LNTS 7.

TELECOMMUNICATION

Convention for protection of submarine cables, signed at Paris March 14, 1884; Declaration respecting the interpretation of Articles II and IV, signed at Paris December 1, 1886; Final Protocol of agreement fixing May 1, 1888 as the date of effect of the convention, signed at Paris July 7, 1887; entered into force for the United States May 1, 1888. 24 Stat. 989; 25 Stat. 1424; TS 380; 380-2, 380-3; II Malloy 1949.

International telecommunication convention with six annexes, and final protocol to the convention. Signed at Geneva December 21, 1959; entered into force for the United States October 23, 1961, subject to declarations. 12 UST 1761; TIAS 4892.

Telegraph regulations (Geneva revision, 1958) annexed to the international telecommunication convention (Buenos Aires, 1952), with appendices and final protocol. Signed at Geneva November 29, 1958; entered into force for the United States January 1, 1960, subject to declarations. 10 UST 2423; TIAS 4390.

Partial revision of the radio regulations (Geneva, 1959), with annexes and additional protocol. Done at Geneva November 8, 1963; entered into force for the United States January 1, 1965, subject to declarations. 15 UST 887; TIAS 5603.

Partial revision of the radio regulations, Geneva, 1959, to put into effect a revised frequency allotment plan for the aeronautical mobile (R) service and related information, with annexes. Done at Geneva April 29, 1966; entered into force for the United States August 23, 1967 except that the frequency allotment plan contained in Appendix 27 shall enter into force April 10, 1970. 18 UST 2091; TIAS 6332.

TRADE AND COMMERCE

Convention concerning the formation of an International Union for the Publication of Customs Tariffs, regulations of execution, and final declarations. Signed at Brussels July 5, 1890; entered into force for the United States April 1, 1891. 26 Stat. 1518; TS 384; II Malloy 1996.

Protocol modifying the convention of July 5, 1890 relating to the creation of an International Union for the Publication of Customs Tariffs. Done at Brussels December 16, 1949; entered into force for the United States September 15, 1957; 8 UST 1669; TIAS 3922; 72 UNTS 3.

TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN

Agreement for the repression of the trade in white women. Signed at Paris May 18, 1904; entered into force for the United States June 6, 1908. 35 Stat. 1979; TS 496; II Malloy 2131; 1 LNTS 83.

UNITED NATIONS

Declaration by United Nations. Signed at Washington January 1, 1942; entered into force for the United States January 1, 1942. 55 Stat. 1600; EAS 236.

Charter of the United Nations with the Statute of the International Court of Justice annexed thereto. Signed at San Francisco June 26, 1945; entered into force for the United States October 24, 1945. 59 Stat. 1031; TS 993.

Amendments: December 17, 1963 (16 UST 1134; TIAS 5857; 557 UNTS 143). December 20, 1965 (TIAS 6529).

WAR CRIMINALS

Agreement for the prosecution and punishment of the major war criminals of the European Axis. Signed at London August 8, 1945; entered into force for the United States August 8, 1945. 59 Stat. 1544; EAS 472; 82 UNTS 279.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

Convention concerning the creation of an international office of weights and measures, regulations and transient provisions. Signed

at Paris May 20, 1875; entered into force for the United States August 2, 1878. 20 Stat. 709; TS 378; II Malloy 1924.

Convention amending the convention relating to weights and measures. Dated at Sevres October 6, 1921; entered into force for the United States October 24, 1923. 43 Stat. 1686; TS 673; IV Trenwith 4868; 17 LNTS 45.

WHALING

International whaling convention with schedule of whaling regulations. Signed at Washington December 2, 1946, entered into force for the United States November 10, 1948. 62 Stat. 1716; TIAS 1849; 161 UNTS 72.

Amendments to the Schedule:
June 7, 1949 (1 UST 506; TIAS 2092; 161 UNTS 100).

July 21, 1950 (2 UST 11; TIAS 2173; 161 UNTS 108).

July 27, 1951 (3 UST 2999; TIAS 2486; 177 UNTS 396).

June 6, 1952 (3 UST 5094; TIAS 2699; 181 UNTS 364).

June 26, 1953 (4 UST 2179; TIAS 2866; 252 UNTS 316).

July 23, 1954 (6 UST 645; TIAS 3198; 252 UNTS 324).

July 23, 1955 (7 UST 657; TIAS 3548; 252 UNTS 330).

July 16-20, 1956 (8 UST 69; TIAS 3739; 278 UNTS 278).

June 28, 1957 (8 UST 2203; TIAS 3944; 300 UNTS 376).

June 23-27, 1958 (10 UST 330; TIAS 4193; 337 UNTS 408).

June 22-July 1, 1959 (11 UST 32; TIAS 4404; 361 UNTS 272).

June 24, 1960 (13 UST 493; TIAS 5014; 435 UNTS 324).

June 23, 1961 (13 UST 497; TIAS 5015; 435 UNTS 328).

July 6, 1962 (14 UST 112; TIAS 5277; 495 UNTS 254).

July 5, 1963 (14 UST 1690; TIAS 5472; 495 UNTS 256).

June 26, 1964 (15 UST 2547; TIAS 5745).

July 2, 1965 (17 UST 35; TIAS 5953).

July 1, 1966 (TIAS 6120).

Protocol to the international convention for the regulation of whaling signed under date of December 2, 1946. Done at Washington November 19, 1956; entered into force for the United States May 4, 1959. 10 UST 952; TIAS 4228; 338 UNTS 366.

WORLD WAR II

Agreement regarding Japan. Signed at Yalta February 11, 1945; entered into force for the United States February 11, 1945. 59 Stat. 1823; EAS 498.

Protocol of the proceedings of the Crimea Conference. Signed at Yalta February 11, 1945; entered into force for the United States February 11, 1945. Department of State Press Release 239, March 24, 1947; *Foreign Relations*, The Conferences at Malta and Yalta, 1945, p. 975 ff.

Protocol of the proceedings of the Berlin Conference. Signed at Berlin August 2, 1945; entered into force for the United States August 2, 1945. Department of State Press Release 238, March 24, 1947; *Foreign Relations*, Conference of Berlin (Potsdam) 1945, Vol. II, p. 1478 ff.

BILATERAL UNITED STATES-SOVIET TREATIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Aviation

Civil air transport agreement with exchange of notes. Signed at Washington November 4, 1966; entered into force November 4, 1966. 17 UST 1909; TIAS 6135.

Amendment: May 6, 1968 (TIAS 6489).

Agreement supplementary to the civil air transport agreement. Signed at Washington November 4, 1966; entered into force November 4, 1966. 17 UST 1909; TIAS 6135.

Amendment: May 6, 1968 (TIAS 6489).

Arrangement relating to the inauguration

of air service between New York and Moscow. Exchange of notes at Moscow July 8, 1968; entered into force July 8, 1968. TIAS 6560.

Consuls

Consular convention. Signed at Moscow June 1, 1964; entered into force July 13, 1968. TIAS 6503.

Cultural relations

Agreement on exchanges in the scientific, technical, educational, cultural and other fields in 1968-1969 with annex. Signed at Moscow July 15, 1968; entered into force July 15, 1968; effective January 1, 1968. TIAS 6570.

Desalination

Agreement on cooperation in the field of desalination, including the use of atomic energy. Signed at Moscow November 18, 1964; entered into force November 18, 1964. 15 UST 2146; TIAS 5697; 535 UNTS 307.

Extension: November 18 and December 3, 1966 (17 UST 2310; TIAS 6174).

Films

Agreement relating to the exchange of medical films. Exchange of notes at Washington March 17 and September 5, 1955; entered into force September 5, 1955. 6 UST 3969; TIAS 3409; 256 UNTS 307.

Fisheries

Convention regarding navigation, fishing, and trading on the Pacific Ocean and along the northwest coast of America. Signed at St. Petersburg April 17, 1824; entered into force January 11, 1825. 8 Stat. 302; TS 298; II Malloy 1512.

Agreement relating to fishing operations: the northeastern Pacific Ocean. Signed at Washington December 14, 1964; entered into force December 14, 1964. 15 UST 2179; TIAS 5703; 531 UNTS 211.

Agreement relating to fishing for king crab. Signed at Washington February 5, 1965; entered into force February 5, 1965. 16 UST 24; TIAS 5752; 541 UNTS 97.

Extension: February 13, 1967 (18 UST 183; TIAS 6217).

Agreement on certain fishery problem in the northeastern part of the Pacific Ocean off the coast of the United States with exchange of notes: Signed at Washington February 13, 1967; entered into force February 13, 1967. 18 UST 190; TIAS 6218.

Amendment: February 27 and April 9, 1968 (TIAS 6474).

Agreement on certain fishery problems on the high seas in the Western area of the middle Atlantic Ocean. Signed at Washington December 13, 1968; entered into force January 1, 1969. TIAS 6603.

Agreement on extending the validity of the agreement of February 13, 1967 (TIAS 6212) on certain fishery problems with exchange of letters relating thereto and to the agreement of December 14, 1964 (TIAS 570). Signed at Washington December 18, 1967; entered into force December 18, 1967. 18 UST 3162; TIAS 6409.

Amendment: February 27 and April 9, 1968 (TIAS 6474).

General relations

Arrangements relating to the establishment of diplomatic relations, nonintervention, freedom of conscience and religious liberty, legal protection, and claims. Exchanges of notes at Washington November 16, 1933; entered into force November 16, 1933. Department of State Publication 528; European and British Commonwealth Series 2 new series; Eastern European Series, No. 1 old series.

Judicial procedure

Agreement relating to the procedure to be followed in the execution of letters rogatory.

¹ Art. 3 obsolete by virtue of Alaska cession treaty (15 Stat. 539; TS 301); art. 4 expired April 17, 1834.

Exchange of notes at Moscow November 22, 1935; entered into force November 22, 1935. 49 Stat. 3840; EAS 83; 167 LNTS 303.

Lend-lease

Preliminary agreement relating to principles applying to mutual aid in the prosecution of the war against aggression, and exchange of notes. Signed at Washington June 11, 1942; entered into force June 11, 1942. 56 Stat. 1500; EAS 253; 105 UNTS 285.

Agreement relating to the disposition of lend-lease supplies in inventory or procurement in the United States. Signed at Washington October 15, 1945; entered into force October 15, 1945. 7 UST 2819; TIAS 3662; 278 UNTS 151, and 315 UNTS 249.

Maritime matters

Declaration concerning the admeasurements of vessels. Signed at Washington June 6, 1884; entered into force July 20, 1884. 23 Stat. 789; TS 304; II Malloy 1526.

Occupied territory

Agreement relating to a change of boundary lines between the American and Soviet zones of occupation in Germany. Signed at Wanfried September 17, 1945; entered into force September 17, 1945. 5 UST 2177; TIAS 3081; 235 UNTS 345.

Protocol defining the location of the boundary of Greater Berlin, with annex. Signed at Berlin June 25, 1955; entered into force June 25, 1955. 6 UST 3781; TIAS 3378; 270 UNTS 15.

Pacific settlement of disputes

Treaty for the settlement of disputes. Signed at Washington October 1, 1914; entered into force March 22, 1915. 39 Stat. 1622; TS 616; III Redmond 2815.

Prisoners of war

Agreement relating to prisoners of war and civilians liberated by forces operating under Soviet command and forces operating under United States of America command. Signed at Yalta February 11, 1945; entered into force February 11, 1945. 59 Stat. 1874; EAS 505; 68 UNTS 175.

Rules of warfare

Convention relating to the rights of neutrals as sea. Signed at Washington July 22, 1854; entered into force October 31, 1854. 10 Stat. 1105; TS 300; II Malloy 1519.

Telecommunication

Agreement on the organization of commercial radio teletype communication channels. Signed at Moscow May 24, 1946; entered into force May 24, 1946. 60 Stat. 1696; TIAS 1527; 4 UNTS 201.

Memorandum of understanding regarding the establishment of a direct communications link, with annex. Signed at Geneva June 20, 1963; entered into force June 20, 1963. 14 UST 825; TIAS 5362; 472 UNTS 163.

Territorial acquisitions

Convention ceding Alaska. Signed at Washington March 30, 1867; entered into force June 20, 1867. 15 Stat. 539; TS 301; II Malloy 1521.

Trade and commerce

Agreement regulating the position of corporations and other commercial associations. Signed at St. Petersburg June 25/12, 1904; entered into force June 25/12, 1904. 36 Stat. 2163; TS 526; II Malloy 1534.

Visas

Agreement relating to the reciprocal waiver of visa fees to nonimmigrants. Exchange of notes at Moscow, March 26 and August 11 and 20, 1958; entered into force August 20, 1958. 9 UST 1413; TIAS 4134; 336 UNTS 269.

²Declaration of accession by Nicaragua signed at Granada June 9, 1855 (7 Miller 139).

ANOTHER DISTINGUISHED AMERICAN CALLS FOR TOTAL VICTORY IN VIETNAM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the August 1964 issue of Reader's Digest included a thoughtful and thought-provoking article by a prominent and respected American. It was entitled "Needed in Viet Nam: The Will To Win" and clearly advocated what all informed people knew was both possible and necessary—swift termination of the war in Vietnam by military victory.

This author not only advocated victory, but urged that the goal of the South Vietnamese be as forthright as that of the enemy—total victory and consolidation of the people of all Vietnam under one government.

The article of more than 5 years ago clearly warned of the dangers of pursuing a no-win war, and as clearly cautioned of the Asian holocaust which retreat without total victory would bring about. He traced the crisis in Laos to the sellout in Korea, and the war in Vietnam to the sellout in Laos. The author's facts, his reasoning, and his conclusion were absolutely correct.

They still are.

In August 1964 we counted 230 American soldiers slain in this war. We now number our dead in excess of 40,000—because we failed to follow the advice of Richard M. Nixon, then a private citizen.

I include the Nixon call for victory in Vietnam in my remarks at this point:

NEEDED IN VIETNAM: THE WILL TO WIN
(By Richard M. Nixon)

In the jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam the United States for the past seven years has been involved in a bitter, discouraging war against the communist Viet Cong. Into this war we have poured more than a billion dollars. In it we have lost the lives of 230 American soldiers. We have committed our prestige as a great power. And where have these efforts and sacrifices brought us? Only to the prospect of a grave, and irreparable, defeat.

In the last year, our immediate prospects in South Vietnam have gone from fairly bad to immeasurably worse. Time and again we have demonstrated that we have no real intention of winning this war. Instead, we are trying to achieve a precarious balance of not-quite-winning and not-quite-losing. Our allies in Asia are losing faith in us. Too often, they have seen us falter and renege on our decisions.

An Army colonel in Thailand who had attended West Point 20 years ago said to me, "The United States backed down in Laos after brave talk that it would not tolerate a communist take-over; it has talked two ways on Vietnam and allowed the president of that country to be murdered; it went 80 percent of the way in Cuba and then backed down. It is hard for us to believe that you mean to win in Vietnam."

Most leaders in Asia believe that Sen. J. William Fulbright was speaking for the administration when he urged a more flexible, less firm policy toward communism. Among other steps, he suggested a re-examination of our policy toward Red China.

The Fulbright speech, the increasing talk of a more "accommodating U.S. policy," coupled with France's recognition of Red China, have had a massive impact in increasing the fear that the United States will weaken its resolve, and that Red China is riding the wave of the future.

Black Moment. The murder of Vietnam's President Ngo Dinh Diem last November in a coup encouraged by the United States had a disastrous effect upon U.S. repute throughout Asia. This assassination was one of the blackest moments in the history of American diplomacy. We cannot dodge responsibility for what happened. To our friends and allies there it means that the United States will use a friend until he no longer serves our purpose and then let him be liquidated. As one foreign minister told me: "Whenever the United States becomes displeased with any action, heads will roll—particularly when that action occurs in a country friendly to the United States. It is dangerous to be a friend of the United States; it pays to be neutral—and sometimes it even helps to be an enemy."

With such a record, it is not surprising that our allies should be disheartened and confused. Many people in this country are also beginning to question whether we should continue the struggle.

Against such a background, what chance is there that we can prevent disaster?

I recently undertook a journey through all of Southeast Asia—from Pakistan to Burma, Thailand, Laos, South Vietnam, Malaysia and the Philippines to Japan. I spoke with most of the leaders and many of the ordinary citizens of these countries. Every military man with whom I talked privately admitted that we are losing the war. But every one of those men believes that it is possible for us to win it. I came home convinced that there is no need for us to accept either neutralization or outright defeat. But neither must we continue our present ambiguous and debilitating efforts to maintain a stalemate.

What we must do is to instill in ourselves and our allies a determination to win this crucial war—and win it decisively. We must recognize that we are in a life-and-death struggle that has repercussions far beyond Vietnam, and that victory is essential to the survival of freedom.

In this article I propose to show why such a victory is entirely within our grasp. I believe that, far from being in insoluble dilemma, our present situation constitutes an unparalleled opportunity to roll back the communist tide, not only in South Vietnam but in Southeast Asia generally, and indeed in the world as a whole. But first, let us look closely at the alternatives to victory and see what they mean.

Pull-Out. Starting at the extreme of the spectrum of possibilities: what would happen if we were to pull out of South Vietnam completely? This proposal has certain attractions. It would put an immediate stop to our expenditure of men and money. Furthermore, if it were true, as many hold, that we were wrong in ever getting involved in South Vietnam in the first place, it would be an honest admission of that fact. But before accepting this course, let us consider the consequences.

In the continuing context of our worldwide struggle against communism, the war in South Vietnam—like the Korean War almost 15 years ago—is merely one battle in the whole campaign for Asia. The immediate prize is South Vietnam itself. But far more than this one country is at stake. On the fate of South Vietnam depends the fate of all of Asia. For South Vietnam is the dam in the river. A communist victory there would mean, inevitably and soon, that the flood would begin: next would come the loss of Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Malaysia

and Indonesia, which is only 45 miles from the Philippines and next door to Australia. Can anyone seriously suggest that in such a circumstance the United States would not have to engage in a major war to save the Philippines from the same fate as Vietnam? And what of Japan?

Already deprived of China as a trading area, Japan would also be deprived of her trade with an area containing 200 million people, which currently enables her to obtain many of the raw materials necessary to supply her factories. Under these circumstances, political forces in Japan which are even now advocating an accommodation with Red China would soon gain ascendancy. The vast industrial resources of Japan—Asia's only modern industrial power—would thus be lost to us and gained by our enemies.

Moreover, the communists' conquest of Southeast Asia would draw a boundary line from pole to pole. Overnight, the United States would cease to be a power in the world's greatest ocean. Our ships and planes could thereafter circumnavigate the globe only with communist permission. Can anyone doubt the effect of this defeat on Africa, Latin America, and even on our allies in Europe? And can anyone doubt that long before this happened the United States would have become involved in a major war, if not a world war?

NEUTRALIZE

Of course, there are those who will say that this picture is much too dark. Like Neville Chamberlain, who in 1938 described Czechoslovakia as a little-known and "far-away" country, they deride the importance of South Vietnam and scoff at the suggestion that to lose one more major segment of Asia means to lose it all. Such optimists contend that we should reach an agreement with our adversaries—as Chamberlain reached an agreement with Hitler at Munich in 1938. We would grant the communists their objectives in South Vietnam in exchange for their promise not to ask for more. This brings us to the second alternative—that of so-called "neutralization."

OBJECT LESSON

For an example of the dangers of neutralization we have only to look at Vietnam's neighbor, Laos.

Laos, after all, is where the trouble began. In 1961 and 1962 there was a great deal of talk by the United States about the importance of Laos. We declared that this little country must at all costs be defended against communism. Laos thus became a symbol of American determination to hold the line. And how did the United States hold the line? As we all know, it didn't. We talked big and acted little. When the chips were down, the United States backed away from its brave words and agreed to a compromise. As a result, Laos is going down the drain. Every top government leader to whom I talked in Asia said that the failure of the United States to back up its strong words by strong action had a disastrous effect. Our actions demonstrated that we can't be trusted to do what is necessary to save freedom.

In Laos the United States made the mistake we have made so many times before. We trusted the communists. Our delegation, led by Averell Harriman, went to Geneva in July 1962. There we were persuaded to try the experiment of neutralism. Along with the U.S.S.R. and 12 other nations, we signed a solemn agreement—and promptly withdrew some 800 advisers who had been helping to train government troops to resist the communist Pathet Lao. By the same treaty, the communists promised to withdraw some 10,000 Viet Minh troops. We honored our side of the agreement. The communists broke theirs. Instead of withdrawing troops, the communist leader Prince Souphanouvong used them to launch new attacks. Mean-

while, North Vietnam, aided by our departure, used Laos as a corridor for supplying and reinforcing the Viet Cong guerrillas in South Vietnam. Could anything be more irrational than to suggest now another neutralization agreement with the same enemy? Neutralization, where the communists are concerned, means this: We get out. They stay in. They take over. In these circumstances, neutralization is but another name for appeasement. It is surrender on the installment plan—another step toward, not away from, nuclear war.

Many people to whom I talked in Asia expressed the fear that the United States would tire of the struggle and get out of Vietnam. They pointed to the dangers of such an action—to them, and to us. But in one way our present course is even more dangerous. It would be better to get out voluntarily than to be kicked out, and that is what we now face. In one case, it would be an orderly retreat. In the other, it would be a humiliating defeat. Both would result in the eventual loss of Southeast Asia. As one head of government told me, "It is not the loss of Vietnam that would be a disaster for the United States, but the fact that this was another defeat for the United States and the forces of freedom in Asia." The West simply cannot afford another defeat. One more surrender or retreat, and creeping communism will become galloping communism throughout that part of the world.

WHY DO WE HESITATE?

There are those who say that this is the wrong war at the wrong place at the wrong time. The contrary is true. If we are ever to stop the communist advance in Asia the time is now. The place is Vietnam.

Today in Asia the appeal of communism is at its lowest point since World War II. The economic failures in China and North Vietnam are well known in Asia, as are the economic successes in the free-world nations like Thailand and Taiwan. Communism can now be spread only by force—by infiltration, terror, murder-in-the-night and subversion.

Militarily, the communist world is also at its weakest point because it is divided. Soviet Russia and Red China are not merely rivals, they are bitter enemies. Moscow does not want to see Peking grow strong and expand in Southeast Asia. On the contrary, Khrushchev has every reason to hope that China's ambitions can be held in check. This deep division between our enemies reduces the danger that the war in Vietnam will escalate into nuclear war. Without Soviet support, Red China is a fourth-rate military power. If this country really wants to turn back the communist advance in Asia, this, then, is the time and place to do it.

HOW TO BEGIN

Granted that we have the will to win in Vietnam, how can we go about it?

Let me say at once that I am firmly opposed to the use of nuclear devices of any sort, even if applied solely to the jungle foliage, not only because of the disastrous effect this would have on world opinion, but because it is wholly unnecessary. We can win the war in Vietnam without using nuclear weapons. This does not mean, however, that we can win it without taking the offensive. The Red guerrillas in South Vietnam are winning because they are supplied from positions in Laos and North Vietnam which we refuse to seal off.

It is a strange way to fight a war, and it is hauntingly reminiscent of our failure to win in North Korea. General MacArthur's strategy for winning that war, it will be recalled, was to attack the communist sanctuaries across the Yalu River. That strategy was rejected on the ground that the risk of provoking both Russia and China was too great. I believe our decision then was wrong, and that MacArthur was right. Such an action

then would have stopped the communist expansion in Asia.

Today, in Vietnam, we are again fighting under the same kind of self-imposed handicap. And here the risk of becoming involved in a larger war is less, because this time Russia and China are enemies—not allies.

HOW TO WIN

To the best of my knowledge, no competent military authorities contend that we can win in South Vietnam without denying the enemy his privileged sanctuaries across the border in North Vietnam. By the same token, few top strategists in the Pentagon doubt our ability to destroy these sanctuaries and the enemy's supply routes. Most military men are agreed that, once these routes have been cut, the problem of the Viet Cong who then will be left isolated in South Vietnam can be readily solved. After the northern border has been sealed, the same tactics that were used successfully to clean out the guerrillas in the Philippines and in Malaya can be used effectively in South Vietnam.

What tactics should be used to deny the enemy his present sanctuaries and to interdict his routes for supply and reinforcements? This is a decision for the military, but I have good reason to feel satisfied that the military choice is reasonably wide. Certainly we should strengthen the Vietnam air force so that it would be able to bomb the roads, bridges and supply routes into South Vietnam. Certainly we should extend guerrilla warfare over the border and harass the enemy in the north.

The problem is not one of tactics and strategy. It is a problem of will—and morale. We must make up our mind to win this war by whatever means short of nuclear attack seem most effective, and then instruct our top soldiers to develop the plan for doing so.

In deciding to win the war in South Vietnam, we must, of course, define precisely what we consider victory to be. I suggest that if this battle is to be won the South Vietnamese must adopt the same strategy and the same general objective that the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese have with regard to South Vietnam. Their objective is that South Vietnam must become communist like North Vietnam. The goal of the South Vietnamese should be no less forthright—a free North Vietnam.

This objective is realistic. At the present time in North Vietnam there is fertile ground for that appeal. Communism has been disastrous for the people of North Vietnam. It has brought misery and hunger on an unparalleled scale. The communists no longer tell the people of South Vietnam that they should turn communist to get a better life. The terrible conditions in North Vietnam are too widely known. The communist line now is that the Americans will eventually pull out, that the communists will win and that the people should turn communist to avoid being on the losing side. If there is to be action in North Vietnam, the people must know that the Americans intend to win—and that when they do the North Vietnamese will have a chance for a better life. Only in this way will they be encouraged to give assistance to guerrilla forces from the south.

Once the supply lines from the north have been cut, the terrible pressure on South Vietnam will be eased and we can make genuine progress. From my conversations with the leaders in Asia, I know that if the United States assumed a determined, offensive policy the response among our discouraged Asian allies would be electric.

THE RISK INVOLVED

There are those who fear that a more vigorous American policy would involve us in a major war. There is a risk to be sure,

but the risks of following a strong, determined course are infinitely less than those of following a course of compromise, vacillation, accommodation and appeasement.

The present administration's policy, which cannot lead to victory in Vietnam, does not reduce the danger of major war. It increases it. The only way to avoid a major war later is to win the smaller war in Vietnam—and to take the risks involved in accomplishing that objective.

Those who like myself urge a "win" policy in Vietnam can be expected to be charged with warmongering and endangering world peace. The contrary is true. History shows that the appeasers, the compromisers who refuse to stand up against aggression, have to take a stand sooner or later—and always at a less favorable time and place.

The decision is upon us. And it is urgent. If we fail to win in South Vietnam—whether through following our present equivocal policy, through neutralization or through outright surrender—communism in Asia will achieve a new and vastly increased momentum. Our defeat will confirm the Chinese communist contention that the United States is a paper tiger, careless of commitments to its allies and readily susceptible to defeat by terrorism, subversion and guerrilla warfare.

Encouraged by our retreat, the communists will increase their aggressive action, not only in Asia but in Africa, Latin America and the Near East. We will then either have to fight a major war, probably with nuclear weapons, against odds far greater than those that face us now—or else let the communists win World War III without even fighting it.

Conversely, a victory for us in South Vietnam will shatter the myths of communist invincibility and of the inevitability of a Chinese take-over in Southeast Asia. It will restore all the prestige we have lost and give us more besides. Thereafter, the tide of communism in Asia, and perhaps in the whole world, will not only cease to rise but start to recede.

The crisis is one not of competence but of confidence. It is a test not of power but

of our capacity to use our power correctly and with courage. All that is needed, in short, is the will to win—and the courage to use our power—now.

JAYCEE WEEK

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, this week of January 18 is Jaycee Week, during which time the U.S. Jaycees are celebrating the 50th anniversary of the founding of this wonderful service organization.

In this day and age when our ears are ringing with complaints about America and our eyes are blurred by ceaseless demonstrations denouncing the shortcomings of the United States, it is indeed refreshing to pause and reflect on the constructive activities of the Jaycee organization. While many in our society are busy tearing things down, the Jaycees are engaged in building things up.

The Jaycees are the first to recognize that America has problems, but instead of wringing their hands in desperation about these complications, they devise ways and means by which to solve them. Problems to the Jaycees are a challenge and not a despair.

America is a great country, socially, culturally, governmentally, and economically. It is the product of a great "team effort," for many great individuals and organizations have had a part in moulding this fabulous national complex called the United States. The Jaycees have played a highly important part in that team effort.

It gives me great pleasure to extend a hearty salute to the U.S. Jaycees on their 50th anniversary.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. JAYCEES

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 22, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is especially appropriate today, on the occasion of the presentation of the state of the Union message to Congress, to honor the U.S. Jaycees on their 50th anniversary.

With chapters of their organization in hundreds of communities across America, Jaycees have piled up an unbelievable record of service to their fellow men. Many of their projects individually receive little attention because they are not ostentatious or glamorous. Jaycees have established themselves in most American communities as the service club which can be depended upon to provide the manpower and talent necessary to effect necessary public service programs.

Today, President Nixon delivered his state of the Union message. Mr. Speaker, aside from the national and international problems we in Congress consider daily, America is a great and strong Nation. It remains that way because so many of its citizens are concerned with the welfare of their fellow men. The U.S. Jaycees are concerned and are responsible for the excellent state of this Union.

I congratulate them on their tireless efforts and on their sincere expressions of humanity and concern for all people. This is their 50th anniversary and they deserve our tributes.

SENATE—Friday, January 23, 1970

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who rulest the worlds from everlasting to everlasting, we commend to Thy keeping this good land which Thou has given us. Let Thy spirit pervade our homes, our communities, and our institutions. Bind us together in a firm allegiance to the enduring values Thou hast revealed.

We pray especially for the Members of this body. May Thy spirit illuminate their daily work. Deliver them from fear of what others may do or say when they stand for the right. Keep them resolute and steadfast in fidelity to the founding principles, working with firm faith and high hope for the better world which is yet to be. When problems seem too great and burdens too heavy, help them to remember the vastness of Thy wisdom and the greatness of Thy love.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered by the Senate on yesterday, the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 292—U.S. FORCES IN EUROPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the New York Times of January 21, 1970, on page 4, there is published an excerpt from a speech by Under Secretary of State Richardson in Chicago, telling us

how the European countries, our allies, especially Germany, are hoping to offset the balance-of-payments drain on our military deployment in Europe and how we are exploring ways and means of making this arrangement more adequate.

In that same issue of the New York Times, on page 64, an article states that Germany has just cashed in prematurely a billion marks' worth of U.S. Treasury bonds purchased in 1968 to offset the drain caused by the stationing of American troops in West Germany.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled "Germany Recalls Bonds of United States Early" printed in the RECORD.

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

GERMANY RECALLS BONDS OF UNITED STATES EARLY

FRANKFURT, WEST GERMANY, January 20.—The Bundesbank disclosed today that it has prematurely recalled a billion marks of United States Treasury Bonds purchased in 1968 to offset the dollar drain caused by