

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EVALUATION OF OPERATIONS OF EMBASSIES

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, a distinguished journalist from the State of Maine, William J. Caldwell, editor of the Maine Sunday Telegram, recently completed an assignment as a member of the USIA's overseas inspection team.

He has written two very perceptive and informative articles evaluating the operations of our embassies overseas. What he has found is most encouraging.

Because of the extremely valuable nature of his articles, I ask unanimous consent that they be placed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW GOOD ARE U.S. DIPLOMATS?

(By Bill Caldwell)

PART I—"THE BOUQUETS"

(NOTE.—In a two-part article, the author, just back from a round-the-world trip, reports his assessment of the U.S. Foreign Service.)

"What's wrong with our Embassies?" This loaded question is often fired at me by American taxpayers when they learn I am home from a 30,000 mile trip around the world, and that part of my business on that trip was to inspect certain operations in American Embassies.

My answer surprises most Americans. For my answer is: "The career officer in the American Foreign Service is, man for man, the best-qualified, hardest-working diplomat in the world."

This favorable appraisal gets a mixed reaction.

Taxpayers are glad to hear someone say they are getting their money's worth out of the Foreign Service. But on the other hand, taxpayers do not like someone to praise their favorite whipping boy. And the State Department is, always has been, and always will be the favorite whipping boy of John Q. Public and most of the Congress and press. This is a strange but true fact. Strange, because America itself is the most polyglot of all nations. The recent roots of the majority of our citizens reach into foreign soil. And for 25 years the United States has been the greatest of all international powers in the world, be it reluctantly.

Nevertheless, Americans are suspicious of "foreign policy"; and especially suspicious of the home-grown diplomats who make a career out of Foreign Service.

All-in-all, most citizens feel that "foreign policy" is a necessary evil at best, an expensive rat-hole at worst; and if there could be less of it, the nation and the taxpayer would be better off. This attitude is understandable.

Since World War II the American taxpayer has been paying through the nose to foot enormous bills incurred by "foreign policy". He has paid out staggering billions of dollars to provide economic aid and technical assistance and military hardware to scores of nations. He has seen sons drafted into military service to protect, to fight for, and die for the defense of faraway countries. He has

seen nations eagerly accept generous help from us then turn their backs, either in enmity or ingratitude upon the United States. Yet despite all this vast expenditure of money and manpower for 25 years, the American taxpayer sees his country up to its neck still in trouble, in wars, and threats of wars and in expensive commitments, all across the globe.

Understandably therefore American taxpayers ask "What's wrong with our Embassies? Why can't they solve foreign policy problems?"

To this question, most Americans expect one of two answers. Either they expect to hear that American diplomats are novices in international intrigue compared to the wily British, French or Russians; or they expect to hear the old canard that the American diplomatic corps is an ivy-league coterie of striped-pants snobs, or political fatcats, who do not earn their expensive keep.

But, after two months of seeing our Foreign Service in action in Rome and in Athens, in Algeria and Morocco, in Israel and Lebanon, in India and Thailand, in Hong Kong and Japan, my conclusions are quite the opposite.

"Man for man" I tell questioners, "we probably get better value for our tax dollar from the U.S. Foreign Service than we do from the Pentagon, the Department of Agriculture or any other government agency. Don't believe talk that British or French or Russians play the diplomatic game better than Americans. In most countries I visited, the British and the French embassies there admit, (privately at least) that the American Embassy knows more about what is going on below the surface than they do!"

If the U.S. Foreign Service corps is so good, then what makes it so excellent? And why is it so little known to the American public? One reason, the Foreign Service is so good is that it is a small, elite corps. In any given Embassy staff, less than half of all Americans on duty there are Foreign Service Officers. The rest fall into a variety of different categories which, at best, make them sort of 'associate members' of the hand picked, professional, career Foreign Service corps.

Another reason for its excellence is that officers for the Foreign Service are recruited, on a very selective basis, from the cream of their class on college campuses. Thereafter, in Washington, these recruits are put through rigorous school-room training. They must pass tough screening exams even before they move along into on-the-job training in the State Department and overseas.

Then, while they are serving in junior, or reserve, status, they take further exams and a series of individual evaluation interviews. Finally, a limited number are admitted into the Foreign Service, whose total number is rigidly limited. The letters "F.S.O." are a mark of distinction.

Out of the 24,433 persons employed by the State Department at home and abroad, only 3,204 carry the classification "F. S. O."—Foreign Service Officer.

As part of his contractual agreement, a Foreign Service Officer must agree to serve anywhere in the world. For junior officers, "anywhere" often means hardship posts in the remote hinterlands of African and Asian countries.

After a stint of apprenticeship in vice-consular and related fields, a young Foreign Service officer may choose (or be chosen for) various language or technical specialties. He may specialize in Africa or the Middle East or Asia or Latin America or in European nations, or in Eastern European nations. He may specialize in political or economic, cul-

tural or information-propaganda affairs, or in trade and commercial relations, or in intelligence and evaluation work.

As he climbs the promotion ladder, he and his family are transferred every few years to new posts in different countries. They grow expert at acclimatizing themselves quickly to new geographical, new language, new religious and cultural and political environments. They must with each move learn to develop valuable new contacts with new "opposite numbers" in new host governments and in other embassies. They must learn to work in harness with a whole new set of colleagues within their own embassy. Depending on the post, their living quarters may be a rundown old palace, a modern apartment, a luxurious villa or a make shift quonset hut. Whatever it is, they must adjust to it.

Foreign Service officers must learn to take whatever is dished up; and like it. From time to time they will be sent Stateside to undergo more intensive training in specialized, high pressure schools in U.S. university graduate schools or attend the War College.

As a Foreign Service Officer progresses up the promotion ladder, he also must prove more than his professional ability. He must also prove his personal ability to get along well with every type of person from visiting Congressmen, to foreign princelings, to oil wildcatters, to nosy journalists, to globe trotting Americans in trouble with the local law, to Heads of State and even to getting along with the President on an inspection trip. He must also regularly pass written exams and an unceasing set of "personal evaluation" reports, which delve into everything from the way he writes dispatches, to the length he wears his hair, to the way he hosts a dinner party, to every detail of how he performs his duties and even into how he spends his off duty hours.

A U.S. Foreign Service Officer is, in the last instance, the personal and privileged personal representative of the President of the United States. The prestige and reputation of his country can hinge upon his professional ability and his personal conduct. He is always under the microscope.

Thus, there are a number of resignations along the way.

To keep one Foreign Service officer at his post can cost the taxpayers as much as \$40,000 or \$50,000 per man per year.

First there is the salary of the Foreign Service officer, which, in the middle senior grades amounts to \$15,000 to \$22,000 a year. In hardship posts, this pay will be increased by 25 per cent.

To this must be added the high costs of transporting him, his wife and his family and his furniture and his car half way around the world. And then of bringing him and his family back on home leave to the United States every two years or so. To this must be added the costs of his housing overseas, and his entertainment and travel allowance, and the schooling costs of his children. Finally, to all this can be added the expensive business of encoding, decoding and transmitting all his cables and secret dispatches back to his bosses in Washington, millions of words every month.

Is the Foreign Service a good career?

This is another question often asked by parents and by college students.

Perhaps the best answer I can give is this. I have found fewer unhappy or maladjusted men and women in the Foreign Services overseas than I find among their counterparts in jobs back home. Perhaps this is due to the careful selection and screening process they go through. But it is a fact that

most foreign services officers are deeply and personally involved in satisfying work. Their personal libraries are filled with books of every kind on the countries in which they serve. The arts from those countries is eagerly collected by many. Many spend holidays and weekends traveling away from the capital cities in which they are stationed, and venturing into the hinterlands and villages, getting to know the people of the nations in which they work. Many study the history, culture and language of each nation where they serve.

The wives of foreign service officers are more important to their husbands' work than are wives in the U.S. These young American girls may have more servants than they would ever have at home, larger houses, do more lavish entertaining. But the best of them are a vital and ingrained part of the total U.S. Embassy team. They too involve themselves deeply in the life of the country where they are stationed; they teach school, work in hospitals, help run out-patient clinics. Extremely few are captive of the "tea-and-bridge" clans, into which the wives of many other embassies fall.

Yet, at the end of the line, less than one in a hundred capable Foreign Service officers ever reach the peak of the career ladder and become an Ambassador—even Ambassador to a minor nation. A few, through apple-polishing, political patronage, or family friendships, may cling to high positions overseas. But man for man, the unknown U.S. Foreign Service officer, whose name is never known to the public, matches and excels his counterpart in the diplomatic service of any other nation.

PART 2—THE BRICKBATS

"The Bouquets" was the title of the Focus article last Sunday, in which I highly praised the career officers in the U.S. Foreign Service.

I called them "The best-qualified, hardest-working diplomats in the world." And this conclusion is based on hundreds of firsthand contacts with them recently on a 37,000 mile, round-the-world, mission.

Today's contrasting article is titled "The Brickbats". And in it, I intend to be as plain-spoken about the faults I saw in American operations overseas as I was in praising the good which I saw.

Bigness—bloated Size—is the worst single fault in "the American Presence" overseas.

Our diplomatic, military, technical and economic assistance programs and our information programs in many countries are overstuffed with people and with money. This single fact more than any other often triggers hostile demonstrations outside our Embassies and our U.S. Information Service libraries and cultural centers.

There are other dangers to "Bigness" overseas. As the result of it, our Embassies are sending more information to Washington than we can possibly digest. As the result of it, we have started more economic development and technical assistance programs than the host government we are trying to help, can digest, or we can ever complete.

As the result of the size and multitude of our undertakings abroad, some programs have developed so much momentum and so much life of their own, that they are almost impossible to stop. They go on, even when they no longer help achieve our "foreign policy" goals. Today certain long-established American programs, paid for with American dollars and staffed with American experts, even seem to operate in contradiction to the foreign policy being enunciated by President Nixon and Secretary of State Rogers. Yet it is almost impossible to lop these programs off. Ambassadors who cut back never last long.

Cutting back the American Presence overseas is more difficult than it was to build it up. We've got so much rope out now that

we are tripping over it, if not in danger of hanging ourselves on our own rope.

How did our Foreign Operations get so big, so fast?

Within three lifetimes, the State Department has grown from a boss and 8 clerks to almost 25,000 people.

When Thomas Jefferson became the first Secretary of State in 1790, he had 8 people on his staff in Washington.

Even after World War I, in 1920, there were only 400 people working for the Department of State. But since World War II, the U.S. Department has mushroomed into the biggest Foreign Office in world history.

In 1970, there are 24,438 people working for State, at home and abroad. We have 117 Embassies overseas, 68 Consulate Generals, 67 Consulates and nine missions.

Last week in Part One of this article, we threw merited bouquets at the Foreign Service, as an elite, highly professional corps, we called them the heart of the State Department, the best informed diplomatic corps in the world.

But this Foreign Service Corps numbers only 3204 officers; and of these, only 1850 are serving in embassies overseas.

In fact, out of the 24,438 people in State, only 17,431 are overseas, while the other 7007 are at home.

And out of the 17,431 State department employees overseas, only 6,451 are Americans. The remaining 10,980 are foreign nationals working for the State Department.

The cost of operating the State Department is \$404 millions this year.

What does this multitude do?

The biggest single job of these 24,438 State Department employees revolves around paper work—the gathering, writing, transmitting and reading of cables and dispatches, memos and "policy papers" and "position reports".

The message traffic between the State Department and its overseas posts amounts to 10,000 cables, reports and memoranda each day.

In a single day, the number of words passed between State and its diplomatic posts amounts to more than the entire daily report of the Associated Press and United Press International.

These two news services supply almost all U.S. newspapers and news magazines with the full story of what is happening everywhere on earth.

But the words in and out of our State Department each day exceeds the total output of these wire services combined.

Can such a torrent of words ever be put to useful purposes in advancing American Foreign policy?

Or is this Niagara of words drowning our State Department in a sea of paper?

Has State's reporting process taken on a life and momentum of its own, so that its prime function is to keep certain hundreds of people busy writing, other hundreds busy encoding, transmitting, decoding and other hundreds busy reading and filing?

Are we busy finding out more and more about facts and suppositions which mean less and less to the conduct of a realistic foreign policy?

Many high officials in State fear death by drowning—from-a-torrent-of-words, but they seem unable to turn off the spigot.

Big as State is, State Department people are only a drop in the bucket among all the other "official Americans" overseas.

State has 6,451 Americans on its overseas rolls (only one-third of them are Foreign Service officers).

The US military of course has millions of men abroad.

The Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) has 4100 of its own American staff overseas, plus another 2300 American employees under contract, for a total of 6400 Americans abroad. (In addition A.I.D. em-

ployes 7800 local nationals overseas; and has 3100 Americans manning the desks at home in Washington). A.I.D.'s budget is big—\$1.6 billions.

The United States Information Agency (USIA), which handles Information and Cultural Affairs overseas, has a total of 4700 Americans and 5500 local nationals on its payrolls, in 200 different locations. Out of the 4700 Americans in USIA, 1400 serve overseas. This agency's budget is \$174 millions for this year. Noting that USIA must carry the whole load of telling the American side of the story around the world in 200 different posts, one USIA official says that USIA's \$174 million budget to do this job is 25 per cent less than the budget of the University of California.

U.S. Embassies are so large because all the thousands of A.I.D. and U.S.I.A. staffs are attached to the Embassy in the country where they serve. In addition, the Embassy has military advisors attached to it, plus innumerable "specialists" sent out by Agriculture, Labor, Treasury and CIA. Even the Bureau of Fisheries, the Bureau of Narcotics, and other Washington departments feel they must have their own experts to represent their interests abroad. No Ambassador enjoys the situation.

"I must give house-room to hordes of people" one U.S. Ambassador recently told me "over whom I have no final control. They report back to their own bosses in Washington, and get paid by a different agency than State. If I tried to send them home as unneeded, I would start an inter-agency feud in Washington. And get no thanks from State for throwing them into a free-for-all fight with other government departments."

Another Ambassador was annoyed at the size of the number of "military advisors" inside his Embassy. "I wanted one well qualified expert to advise me on certain military affairs. The Pentagon had just the right man. He was a Colonel. But the Pentagon cannot send out a full Colonel unless he has a Deputy, and the Deputy has an Administrative officer; and they all have secretaries. And cars and drivers. Now, instead of the one Colonel I asked for, I have eight from the Pentagon!"

A third Ambassador talked about the hundreds (literally) of A.I.D. technical experts under his wing. "Take the alfalfa expert. A good man. Found out more about growing that crop than anyone ever knew here. Up went production. And soon he discovered that some insect was infesting the harvest. Out came a specialist in killing that insect. Now that expert has discovered something else in the pest line. So another expert is coming to fight that. They are all doing a "bang-up job" the Ambassador said. "But I worry about the question "Are they advancing U.S. foreign policy?" I wonder if some of the health and housing, education and Peace Corps experts working out here are not needed more back home!"

Here, in summary, are the "brickbats" I would throw at our Embassies overseas.

1. They send too many reports back to Washington—often at Washington's request. And too much of this paper work has no real bearing on the conduct of U.S. foreign policy.

2. Ambassadors—and not Washington officials—must have the final authority over the number of official Americans assigned to their country. Each Ambassador should be "captain of his own ship," with complete authority to send any crew member home at any time, and to refuse any additional ones, if only because he feels his ship is too crowded.

3. Every program in every country should be assessed in a hard-nose fashion by the Ambassador on the scene. His yardstick should not be "Is this a good program?" For the answer is usually "yes". His yardstick instead should be "If this program were stopped

now, would the U.S. be any worse off five years hence?" Using this yardstick, scores of programs and people could be cut out. And American foreign policy could concentrate on the essentials.

4. Many programs, started when the world revolved around a U.S.-Soviet confrontation, or when we felt Red China was an immediate threat, still are going full blast today. Meanwhile U.S. policy has changed. But the programs, with a life and momentum of their own, have not changed. The reason for many programs has vanished; but the programs go on, nevertheless.

5. U.S. business is expanding fast in many nations, becoming an integral part of that nation and of the overall America presence there. As this private U.S. representation increases, the number of Official Americans might well decrease, especially when relations between the Embassy and the U.S. business community are effectively maintained. Too often there is a gulf between the "business" Americans and the "diplomatic" Americans at the working level.

Quality and quantity seldom go hand-in-hand, especially in the field of foreign policy. If the Quality of U.S. presence overseas is to be kept high, then the Quantity must be reduced.

Today our conduct of Foreign policy is suffering from the "production line" syndrome, that the more of everything the better. It is suffering from the shibboleth that a mass of information, or a mass of activity, are by themselves virtues.

They are not.

A Maine lobsterman in Ile au Haut summed it up well last summer when he described to me an M.I.T. professor who summered on the island.

"That man" said the lobsterman "knows everything. But he don't understand a damn thing!"

There is a mass of knowledge in our State Department today. But there is too little understanding of what, precisely, we are trying to accomplish in our foreign policy.

DOES THE ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT ISRAEL?

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the President recently addressed the National Emergency Conference on Peace in the Middle East in an effort to allay the fears and criticisms that had been occasioned by the peculiar mechanisms of Secretary of State Rogers, in his purported efforts to assuage the tempers of the Arab States at the expense of Israel.

The immediate reaction to the President's message would seem to indicate that he had succeeded in providing comfort to those who attended that conference.

I do not share their enthusiasm, nor their belief that the President clarified his administration's policy toward Israel in any great degree. In that connection, I wrote the President asking several questions concerning his speech and accompany my remarks, both with the text of the President's speech as well as my letter of inquiry to him in that regard.

The materials follow:

NATIONAL EMERGENCY CONFERENCE ON PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST, STATLER HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

WASHINGTON, January 25.—The following is text of President Nixon's message presented this afternoon to the National Emergency Conference on Peace in the Middle East at the Statler Hilton Hotel. It was delivered by Max Fisher of Detroit (Mr. Fisher is chairman of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, chairman of the United Israel Appeal and former chairman of the United Jewish Appeal), and is a special consultant to the President.

I am aware of your deep concern that Israel may become increasingly isolated. This is not true as far as the United States is concerned.

The United States stands by its friends. Israel is one of its friends.

The United States is deeply engaged in trying to help the people of the Middle East find peace. In this effort, we are consulting fully with all those most concerned.

The United States believes that peace can be based only on agreement between the parties and that agreement can be achieved only through negotiations between them. We do not see any substitute for such negotiations if peace and security arrangements acceptable to the parties are to be worked out.

The United States does not intend to negotiate the terms of peace. It will not impose the terms of peace. We believe a durable peace agreement is one that is not one-sided and is one that all sides have a vested interest in maintaining. The United Nations resolution of November 1967 describes the principles of such a peace.

We are convinced that the prospects for peace are enhanced as the governments in the area are confident that their borders and their people are secure. The United States is prepared to supply military equipment necessary to support the efforts of friendly governments, like Israel's, to defend the safety of their people. We would prefer restraint in the shipment of arms to this area. But we are maintaining a careful watch on the relative strength of the forces there, and we will not hesitate to provide arms to friendly states as the need arises.

The United States has as its objective helping the people of the Middle East build a peaceful and productive future. I believe that all Americans can unite for that goal.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1970.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have before me your message of January 25th to the National Emergency Conference on Peace in the Middle East.

I was particularly intrigued and confused with the statement contained in your text "the United States is prepared to supply military equipment necessary to support the efforts of friendly governments, like Israel's, to defend the safety of their people."

I am led to believe by the careful phrasing of that statement that you construe other governments in the Mid-East to be "friendly governments" who may require military equipment "to defend the safety of their people."

Please advise what other countries in the Mid-East, other than Israel, that you believe to be "friendly governments" and from what sources the threats to the "safety of their people" emanate?

Very frankly, Mr. President, it appears to me that the text of your address was designed to accord some hope to those who believe the efforts of Secretary Rogers have

been detrimental to the position of Israel, and at the same time, designed to offer considerable hope to the Arab nations as to the ambivalence of this Nation's policy in the Middle East.

In that regard, this message appears to me to be much in the same mold of your November 3rd speech on Vietnam, where you were seeking by less than careful delineation of policy to allay criticism.

One other portion of your statement that concerns me is your suggestion that if there is an imbalance in the "relative strength of the forces" in the Middle East, that our Country "will not hesitate to provide arms to friendly states as the need arises."

In that regard, if an imbalance in arms exists between Israel and Jordan, would it be our policy to provide arms to Jordan to redress that balance?

Respectfully yours,
JEROME R. WALDIE,
Member of Congress.

COMMENT ON PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, James Reston, of the New York Times, has written a most provocative article on the President's state of the Union message and his efforts to reform welfare, foreign policy, industrial pollution, Federal-State-local relations and many other spheres of domestic problems. I commend this article to the attention of our Nation's legislators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1970]

WASHINGTON: PRESIDENT NIXON AND THE NEW AGE OF REFORM
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon is bringing the ship of state back home for repairs. It will be a long, slow voyage, but he seemed to be saying in his State of the Union Message that the old girl had been battered in stormy foreign waters too long, and needed to be tidied up, scraped, painted and remodeled for her 200th anniversary in 1976.

It was a magnificent speech; we will find out later whether it is a policy and who will pick up the tab. But not since Teddy Roosevelt have we heard a Republican President talk so much about reform. Welfare, industry, the police, and the Federal, state and local governments are all to be transformed into a more peaceful, secure, fair, and prosperous society.

ZIGZAG TO THE LEFT

There was always a question about whether Mr. Nixon would go to the right or the left once he was well-established in office. But he has now at least charted his course and defined his destination. He will zigzag to avoid the torpedoes and take advantage of the wind, but his destination is to preside over the great festival of freedom in 1976, and to get there from here he must eventually go to the left.

The surge of reform in America, as Richard Hofstadter has reminded us, was not always directed by the Democrats. Though turned

back temporarily in the twenties, it included the Administrations of Teddy Roosevelt and even Dwight Eisenhower and has "set the tone of American politics for the greater part of the twentieth century." What Richard Nixon did in his address to the Congress was to stake out a place for himself alongside his two Republican heroes, and try to take over most of the Democratic issues in the process.

THE DEMOCRATIC FLIGHT

On the political point, he has clearly made progress in his first year. He has retained control of the crime issue. He has blunted the peace issue. He has taken the lead in reforming the welfare program, and he is clearly trying to pin the inflation tail on the donkey.

Moreover, he shored up his position with the young and the cities in this speech by trying to take over the pollution issue, while reassuring the Republicans by promising to redirect more power to the state and local governments.

Hubert Humphrey says Mr. Nixon is not "an artist in politics" but this is a fairly artful if not artistic performance. The Democrats have been talking for years about "re-ordering the nation's priorities" and "re-allocating its resources," and now the President has challenged them and his own party to do just that.

This, of course, is only the rhetorical part of the voyage, and Mr. Nixon's utopian aims occasionally sounded a little like a tour-director's dream, but there is clearly nothing wrong with his objectives that couldn't be cured by another \$10-billion cut in the Pentagon budget plus a good hefty tax rise.

His remarks on the plight of the Negroes were not exactly an exhaustive account of the problem; but perhaps the weakest part of his address was on foreign affairs, which he will deal with later. He did talk about the nations of the non-Communist world having acquired a new "determination to assume responsibility for their own defense," but with one or two notable exceptions, this phenomenon has escaped almost everybody's eyes.

Also, he claimed that the result of his new foreign policy has not been to weaken our alliances but to give them new life, new strength, and a new sense of common purpose. Again, if this has been the general reaction to the President's decision to cut his involvement in foreign nations, it has certainly not received the attention it deserves.

CONSERVATIONIST NIXON

The main thing about the State of the Union speech, however, is probably what it tells us about the state of the President. He is clearly broadening and deepening his philosophy. All the old emphasis is there on crime, inflation and a balanced budget—and these gotta bigger hand in the House than anything else—but he is now thinking in longer terms about the condition of life in America.

In fact, he denied industry's right to pollute the air and waters of the Republic and threatened them with new regulations and penalties if they did. More surprising, he even dared to suggest that wealth was not the same thing as happiness, and in the Republican liturgy of the past, this is heresy.

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, over the years, I have made many requests to extend remarks and include

extraneous material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, I cannot recall an occasion when I have ever before requested permission to include the text of an advertisement, but I am doing so today.

The current issue of U.S. News & World Report, February 2, 1970, contains a full page ad sponsored by Warner & Swasey, manufacturers of productivity equipment and systems of Cleveland, Ohio, with a message that appeals to me. The Warner-Swasey people seek to call attention to what is right about America, rather than what is wrong about America. This theme is one all of us would do well to emphasize.

Under unanimous consent I submit the text of this advertisement, for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

Yes, there are dirty plays, but not one has even approached the performance record of homey "Oklahoma" or "Fiddler on the Roof".

Foreigners are scornful of our ghettos. Yet tens of millions are being spent by businesses to rebuild slums with modern homes, and the median Negro family income has risen to \$5360 a year and the number earning \$7000 has doubled in ten years.

45 percent of Americans attend church and 70 percent consider religion very important.

More Americans finish high school than is true of any other nation, and we're getting ready to improve that even more by special programs (developed in America) for preschool children. And the number of American adults who continue their schooling even into old age is the wonder of the world.

Book buying has doubled in 10 years—good books.

50 million Americans donate time and 14 billion dollars every year to charity.

And you can add paragraphs of what else is good from your own experience.

All of which makes a pretty good national anthem, doesn't it—a lot healthier than the sorry blues which too many love to sing.

WARNER & SWASEY.

CLEVELAND.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I recently received eloquent testimony to the fact that Americans of all backgrounds are willing and anxious that due recognition be given to the remarkable goals and achievements of the late Dr. Martin Luther King.

Anthony Cama is a schoolteacher in Lynn, Mass. He also serves on the Committee of Italian Culture for the Order of the Sons of Italy in America. He has recognized and nobly advanced the universal values which Dr. King sought to realize.

Recently I received from Mr. Cama a letter enclosing a poem which he had written and distributed to Sons of Italy chapters throughout the Nation, and offering his support for a resolution which I have submitted declaring the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King a national day of recognition. I ask unani-

mous consent that this most moving tribute be printed in the RECORD.

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

IMMORTAL TITAN

This eulogy and poetic tribute to martyred Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., one of America's greatest apostles of brotherhood and symbol of the American Negro's struggle for justice and dignity, was composed for the Sunday Post by a Lynn school teacher, Anthony Cama, who called the Christian leader "an immortal Titan in the fight for civil rights in America."

BLACK ETERNAL FLAME

(By Anthony Cama)

Black is the mourning flag that shrouds this land,

The torch of freedom lifts its anguished cry,
For Martin Luther King is still of voice and hand

And storms of sorrow cloud the starlit sky!
Within this nation's heart our millions weep,
For Martin Luther King, a man of fate,
And few shall be the spirits who will sleep
Until each slave has marched through freedom's gate!

Let every native son stand up and sing,
America . . . America . . . O, land of liberty,
Let every churchbell raise its voice and ring . . .

That God bade every man to stand erect and free.

For Martin Luther King, a black eternal flame,

Cried out to all the world, be free at last.
Thank God, almighty! Blessed be God's name . . .

We shall overcome . . . We are free at last!

MODIFYING EXISTING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS FOR USE IN EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES, OR HOW TO EAT AN ELEPHANT

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, last November Dr. Bruce Monroe spoke before the "Systems 70 Conference" of the North American Rockwell Corp.

Dr. Monroe's paper, "Modifying Existing Management Systems for Use in Educational Agencies," presents an interesting point of view toward solving some of the problems confronting educators today.

Dr. Monroe points out that systems analysis in the area of transportation, housing and law enforcement, to name just a few, has resulted in increased efficiency, while at the same time providing savings in time and money.

To all who are interested in education, and its need for new ideas, I recommend the reading of Dr. Bruce Monroe's paper.

The paper follows:

MODIFYING EXISTING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS FOR USE IN EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES OF HOW TO EAT AN ELEPHANT

In keeping with the theme of this conference; "management system requirements and systems solutions for the next decade;" in order to analyze requirements of educational systems, it would be appropriate first to attempt to predict the nature of society during the coming decade in order to predict the type of individual the schools and colleges

of this nation will need to be producing to further develop that society. Analysis of the types of educational programs needed to produce those individuals would then follow. Finally, the management needs of those programs would be determined. Since the first two steps have already been done in other publications I won't attempt to repeat them here, but will concentrate on the last two, educational program development, and management systems. Also in order to provide a context in which to organize these remarks and recommendations, I would like to state five assumptions about public and private education, educational systems and the management of educational systems. Following these, the specification of educational management system requirements, educational program areas needing improvement and finally two proposed procedures will be described.

FIVE ASSUMPTIONS

1. The first assumption concerns the purpose of an educational system. The Constitution delegates to the States, responsibility for an educational program to guide and support regional and local efforts in providing schools to maximize the development of the individuals experiencing the school's programs. Development of the individual includes attitudinal, emotional and interpersonal development as well as intellectual skills and the physical well-being of the student. Schools exist to produce rationale, responsible, effective citizens. A recent emphasis has been to plan educational programs in such a way that every student, regardless of his so-called ability, interest, background, home or income, succeeds in his school experience.

2. A second assumption is that the educational programs of the 50 States, our protectorates and territories are amenable to improvement. By their own statements and by review of students' reactions to school, it is clear that there are changes to be made. 750,000 youths a year drop out. Suicide among students is twice that of out of school youth of the same age and similar in other respects. Forty types of educational malpractice have been documented and suits have been filed for damages by parents. Manpower training programs this year found 30,000 functional illiterates with high school diplomas in one review. In a society in which the knowledge explosion has exceeded the ability to keep enough factual information in his head, to perform successfully in our society, the traditional school program based on "telling" and "remembering" is no longer relevant.

The two social institutions most like schools are monasteries and penal institutions. The monastery, penal institution model previously appropriate is no longer functional. Schoolmen talk about developing new types of school programs, new schedules, new staffing patterns and new ways of teaching.

3. A third assumption is that the local and state educational programs (for many reasons) are unusually complex enterprises (as are other forms of public service). Providing successful, worthwhile experiences for millions of children from all walks of life for up to nine hours a day, 200 days a year is a large-scale, complex, expensive operation.

4. Another assumption. Although state-wide, regional and local programs are called "systems," they operate (for the most part) in nonsystematic fashion. Their management is too often responsive to public pressure and daily problems, rather than being forward looking and comprehensive. They have outmoded organizational plans. Little in the way of modern management systems has been applied to operation of the state educational efforts and the local districts programs.

In the last ten years however, some attempts have been made to apply systems management techniques to public and pri-

ate educational efforts. In November, 1967, the United States Office of Education called the first national conference on System Analysis in The Educational Environment. Since that time approximately five hundred education projects around the country have attempted (in one aspect of operation or another) to apply system analysis, operations research and system development techniques. However, in no case to date has this been done in a comprehensive, wide-scale, thorough fashion across an entire educational endeavor, as has been recommended by system analysts.

In other forms of public service; (transportation, housing, law enforcement, public health and welfare) experience indicates that operations research, system analysis and development and research and development techniques (as a system approach is variously called) have been applied with benefits to public service enterprises. Savings in time, money and increases in efficiency and satisfaction have been documented in instances where system analysis has been applied.

To quote Dr. Leon Lessinger, Associate Commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education, "In the same way that planning, market studies, research and development, and performance warranties determine industrial production and its worth to consumers, so should we be able to engineer, organize, refine, and manage the educational system to prepare students to contribute to the most complex and exciting country on earth."

5. A final assumption is that an investment in educational system analysis and development would bring a guaranteed return to tax payers. Documentation of the United States Chamber of Commerce cites an annual loss of over \$600 million dollars to personal income and the gross national product as the result of the lost earning power of $\frac{1}{4}$ of a million dropouts.

To apply system management practices and system analysis and development techniques to education; nationwide, statewide and regionally is an enterprise of a large order of magnitude, to use an analogy, approximately equal to eating an elephant single-handedly. However, what evidence there is indicates it would be justified (in terms of the returns to the individual and the economy), to invest up to 600 million dollars a year in this effort. One percent of the yearly budget for education equals \$500 million, and any corporate board of directors would recommend an investment in research and development of over 1 percent.

The final assumption, in summary is that the educational enterprise needs to begin investing more heavily in applying system analysis and development procedures and particularly management systems.

What then would be the requirements of such educational management systems?

REQUIREMENTS FOR AN EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

To be of maximum usefulness and adaptable to the wide variations of practice in educational agencies, an educational management system must at least:

Insure an adequate flow of information to the learner as well as to decisionmakers affecting what the learner will experience.

Increase the visibility of learning progress to the learner, parents and school staff,

Heighten the shared accountability for learning progress among parents, the learner and the school staff,

Have minimum response times between learner diagnosis and the learning prescription,

Make cost-effectiveness proposals about alternative courses of action,

Interface approximately twelve other public information systems including the local library, the Department of Labor job bank, the Educational Research Information Cen-

ters, the Instructional Objectives Exchange and others,

Facilities individualization of the curriculum and instruction,

Speak a language that young children can understand,

Make multi-variate probability statements about alternative courses of action for the learner,

Be at least regional in scope to allow regional program emphasis to be modified,

Account for the influence of home, peer group and other social agencies on learning progress,

Be sufficiently standardized in language to allow transfer of learners from school to school and region to region,

Emphasize problem solving skills and learning ability not the acquisition of factual information.

Now then, to what areas of educational programs could these educational management systems be most profitably applied?

Like any complex endeavor, certain aspects of the operation of an educational program are more efficient than others. Below are two lists indicating well managed and less well managed program functions:

TYPICALLY EFFICIENTLY MANAGED

Ensuring physical welfare and safety of student.

Transporting students.

Attendance accounting.

Scheduling students and teachers for group activities.

Dispensing instructional information.

Maintaining facilities.

Recording and reporting operational information.

Fiscal accounting and payroll.

Purchasing and warehousing.

Devolving personal staff time.

NEEDING MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT

Comprehensive planning.
Specifying student and program performance objectives.

Routine, thorough diagnosis of student.
Measuring student and program accomplishments.

Reallocating budgets by program.
Comparing cost/effectiveness.
Monitoring and evaluating staff productivity.

Individualizing or modifying curriculum and instruction.
Ensuring quality of product.

Analyzing wider range of program alternatives.
Assessing student data profiles.

Allocating appropriate resources in instruction.
Matching student schedule to needs.

Providing relevant parent and public information.

It is recommended that educators responsible for the above needy functions capitalize upon management systems developed in the operational programs and the research and development procedures of the aerospace, communication and other scientific industries.

Existing systems and procedures would then be adapted to the unique requirements of educational programs.

The obvious next question then is, "How do you proceed to eat an elephant?" A friend tells me you do it by, "taking one bite at a time."

The remaining remarks will describe two procedures, (one short term and one long term) which I propose as a *reasonable first bite* and *long term procedure for eating the whole elephant*. What I will propose first is rigorous application (on a national, state, regional and local basis) of management systems technology, and eventually a system analysis and development of the national educational enterprise at a cost of approximately 60 million dollars of investment per year for the next ten years.

TAKING THE FIRST BITE; A SHORT-TERM APPROACH TO REDEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS: ADAPTING EXISTING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS TO EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS

The following steps represent the major milestones in a procedure to adapt an existing management system (of the appropriate scope and complexity) to an educational program.

1. Review the long range and intermediate objectives of the program in operational terms.
2. Analyze functions and tasks required to accomplish the objectives.
3. Separate management functions from total functions.
4. Rank order management functions in terms of complexity and difficulty to perform.
5. Review management procedures now in use or available for use.
6. Assess and allocate internal capability to carry out selected management functions.
7. Locate additional capability, contract for services as required.
8. Vary selected parameters of existing systems to accommodate the specific management functions.
9. Create new procedures as appropriate.
10. Plan phased change-over from existing procedures.
11. Assess system and sub system functions and modify as necessary to point of diminished return.

A word of caution, however, about the above procedure. As experienced educators are painfully aware, the commitment to invest in a change process must permeate the entire environment before the change process can hope to succeed.

A LONG TERM APPLICATION OF OPERATIONS RESEARCH, SYSTEM ANALYSIS AND SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL, STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATION SYSTEMS

In the last three years a national program has come into existence as a result of the funding of Congress and foundations interested in education. The project is entitled CAPE, the Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education and has recently been absorbed as a project by the Educational Commission of the States (the ECS). The ECS is a non-profit organization with 43 member states with a membership of governors, chief state school officers, legislators and others concerned about education. The current budget of CAPE is 2½ million dollars and the 1970 budget is projected at \$4 million. The procedure for assessing the progress of education in the United States consists of sampling students from 700 schools chosen to be representative of all the schools in the United States. Using samples of students of approximately 20 to 30 thousand, student achievement is measured in the areas of citizenship, science, writing, math, music, literature, etc. In three year cycles. The results of student achievement are summarized regionally (rather than by state or local districts) so that there can be no comparisons possible between specific district or schools. Pre-school and out of school youth are assessed as well as in-school age youth.

The proposal herein suggested that this information be used as background information to begin a *national systems analysis* of selected areas of school functioning, those that CAPE finds to be less successful.

Since the CAPE project is currently being carried on by the Educational Commission of the States, it might well be appropriate to organize through that agency eight regional analyses of educational needs. If that organization found it inappropriate, another suitable pseudo-governmental, non-profit

public agency would be utilized to act as policy maker and program manager of this effort, much as NASA coordinates the Space Program.

How the program might proceed would be as follows. As CAPE indicates regional variations in the effectiveness of school programs to teach certain subject matter, those programs that are found to be least successful in any region would be the target of comprehensive system analysis within that region. Assuming there was some persistent problem areas (for instance, reading) in several regions; a cooperative task force made up of system analysts from several regions could analyze and suggest modifications in reading practices within that total area. In time, by pooling the results of these system analyses (conducted in the separate regions) a comprehensive analysis of the entire educational effort in the Nation and the States would be accomplished. This could be done in approximately a three to four year time period.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATION SOLUTIONS

Assuming a thorough-going system analysis of the sort that made the Moon Program successful, a concentrated development phase would then be appropriate. Utilizing the existing (or certain of the existing) regional educational laboratories and bolstering their capability with additional resources from foundations, private industry, the arts and sciences; educational systems would be evolved, developed, field tested, implemented broadly, monitored and improved over time. Such a development phase could reasonably require several years and hundreds of millions of dollars.

The model for system development within the regional efforts would follow a typical system analysis and development model of the sort attached.

Concern obviously needs to be given (at all points in this process) to ensure that local districts not lose autonomy and were given opportunity to modify the basic program to meet local requirements. What is not being proposed is a national curriculum with a standardized educational program such as is typical in certain European countries; rather a national effort in system analysis and development which would make available a range of alternatives a highly reliable, educational system among which local and regional programs would originally choose and subsequently modify. Using the elephant analogy again, there are lots of ways to eat an elephant and local districts would be encouraged to choose those ways which are most comfortable, with proviso that they eat the entire elephant and within a reasonable period of time.

The mass media today is full of pronouncements by educators and others concerned with education about the need for accountability and guaranteed performance in education. It is reasonable to assume that while education can become accountable to the same extent that other public service agencies are accountable, it is also reasonable to offer them the experience and services of other large complex organizations that have been over similar ground previously to help avoid reinventing the wheel. It is in that frame of reference that these proposals are offered. Private industry, foundation-supported research and development and other public service agencies have proven their ability to perform successfully in equally large, complex, problematic enterprises. As consumer of the educational product of the national educational effort and as tax payers who support it (if not as parents, uncles, grandparents and neighbors)—we have a responsibility and a right to demand sound educational management.

INFLATIONARY TRENDS

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette recently published a most informative and interesting editorial on administration attempts to curb spiralling inflationary trends. I commend this to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A SHOWDOWN ON SPENDING

Senate approval of an appropriations bill \$1.3 billion above Mr. Nixon's request for the Health, Education and Welfare Department defies a promised presidential veto and creates a major political issue for this year's congressional elections.

President Nixon objects to the additional spending on the ground that it obstructs his efforts to reduce federal spending to control inflation. Congressional opponents argue that they are trying to "reorder priorities"; that is, to transfer to domestic needs some of the money cut out of the defense budget.

Actually the issue isn't that simple. It would be perhaps if the President had attempted to cut back on HEW spending, particularly for education. The fact is, however, that the President's requests for HEW are 700 million higher than President Johnson's budget called for and \$2.1 billion higher than spending last year.

So it isn't as if the President were trying to get inflation under control at the expense of domestic programs. He just isn't willing to spend as much as a high-powered education lobby has pressured Congress into.

In order to make the increased education spending attractive to congressmen, lobbyists urged that it be sweetened by boosting to \$585 million the amount to be spent on the so-called "federally impacted" school districts, which are scattered over 355 congressional districts.

Although Democratic and Republican administrations have attempted to curb or end this program as an indefensible boondoggle, it is now so thoroughly woven into the fabric of federal aid to education as to be inextricable. Under this unconscionable grab, the nation's richest county, Montgomery, Maryland, where many congressmen live, got \$5.7 million in 1968 while the 100 poorest counties in the program got \$3.2 million.

The irony of this program lies in the fact that communities vie endlessly for federal installations to boost their local economies and once the installation is obtained, then claim federal school subsidies because they have to educate the children of the federal employees who move in. That way, they have their cake and eat it, too.

Not all of the increased funds Congress has voted for HEW go into the federally impacted program, of course, but the Nixon administration voiced defensible objections in each category of spending.

That will make little difference because of the emotions aroused by the issue. President Nixon has chosen a politically unpopular issue for a showdown with Congress. Seemingly to be against federal aid to health, education and welfare (while actually only disagreeing over the amounts involved), is like being for sin or against motherhood.

For that reason, we would not be surprised to see Congress override the President's expected veto. Members of his own party are keenly aware of the political implications in an election year and he can anticipate some GOP defections.

Even so, we think the issue should be clearly understood. If it is, we believe many Americans will give the President high marks for courage and integrity in trying to bring inflation under control by restricting federal spending.

FREEDOM IN DEED

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, in 1880, a band of men, women, and children, seeking to exercise their right to follow the religious creed of their choice, left the security of their homes and followed in the track of the Mormon pioneers. Rather than continuing to Utah, they decided to make their homes and rear their families in the beautiful mountain enclosed Star Valley of western Wyoming.

They named their new settlement Freedom, in frank recognition of the fundamental value they cherished and for which they cut their old ties and roots to move to a rugged new land.

For 90 years they have labored to make their home a productive and secure place where they could exercise their beliefs secure in the knowledge they could pass on their values to their children. In five wars their young men journeyed far from the mountains and valleys of home to defend the liberties they loved so well and knew so intimately. Today many of their sons are engaged in the struggle in Vietnam.

Throughout the Nation there is dissent over the whys and wherefores of Vietnam, but the citizens of Freedom accept the task as another responsibility of liberty. They are matter-of-fact about their support for the policies of our President.

Therefore, you can imagine their dismay when they learned that their home was to be the site of a tri-State moratorium rally that would denounce America and her policies.

Despite their dismay they did not react with violence or anger, more with sorrow. They would not deny their fellow Americans the opportunity to express dissent even if it was shame they felt about the actions of the dissenters.

Said the citizens of Freedom:

Such a moratorium as you plan to hold and has been held in the past we feel will only give aid and comfort to the enemy.

The statement noted that the town of Freedom is "not in sympathy with you in this action. We will not support it, and to be very frank with you, we do not want it in our town."

Darrell Jenkins, a Freedom resident said:

We recognize the right of people to dissent and to demonstrate but let them do it somewhere else, where the people want them to.

In short, their actions have been in the

best traditions of the values on which this Nation was founded. I believe their behavior to be a valuable object lesson for my fellow Members and the citizens of America.

Accordingly, I ask that an article about Freedom from the Casper Star-Tribune of January 13, 1970, be printed in the RECORD:

"LET THEM DISSENT SOMEWHERE ELSE":
FREEDOM

(By Jeanes Wagner)

LOVELL.—Which was to Freedom? The people of Freedom, Wyoming located in Star Valley, have reason to wonder.

On Christmas Day, they learned that their town had been selected for a tri-state moratorium rally on Feb. 15 by the Vietnam War Moratorium Committee at the University of Wyoming.

No one in Freedom had been notified of the plans at that time and still have not, they claim.

"We support the President of the United States in his efforts to end this war by honorable means and in such a way that the sacrifices that have been made by our American boys shall not have been made in vain," Freedom residents notified the committee.

"Such a moratorium as you plan to hold and has been held in the past we feel will only give aid and comfort to the enemy."

The statement noted that the town of Freedom is "not in sympathy with you in this action. We will not support it, and to be very frank with you, we do not want it in our town."

Darrell Jenkins, a Freedom resident said, "We recognize the right of people to dissent and to demonstrate but let them do it somewhere else, where the people want them to."

Jenkins, who has a son in Vietnam with five months to serve, said, "I would like very much to see him home as well as all the other boys, but I feel that unless it is done in an orderly manner all the lives lost so far will have been lost in vain."

In the Star-Valley Independent the day that Freedom got the news about the moratorium, a letter from a GI in Vietnam was printed. It came from SP—Phil Hurd and said in part, "I'd like to say thank you to the fine people in Star Valley for not supporting the protests that are constantly in the news. That can cut a man's morale quicker than anything, to think we have to be over here, and not have your support."

"The statement we have drawn up has been signed by almost all the adult members of the town and many of the teenagers, including nearly all of the boys who are in, or will be in the draft age the next two years," Jenkins said.

"We have absolutely nothing to offer anyone planning a gathering of this nature," Jenkins said. "Our business district consists of one service station. At one time we had in our town a bank, two or three grocery stores, a hardware store, a blacksmith shop, garage, barbershop, pool hall, motel, cafe and liquor store. Now we are down to the service station, the last grocery store having closed its doors this past summer. Freedom is a rural town that fell victim to modern highways and highspeed travel," he said.

Jenkins added that the only place a meeting can be held indoors is in the LDS Church house and since the moratorium is scheduled for a Sunday, that building will be in use.

Freedom, he said, isn't ideal for outdoor meetings, either, as the temperatures have been down around 30 degrees below zero already this year and often during February the area is subject to severe blizzards.

To further complicate matters, snowmobile races are being held in Star Valley the same day as the planned moratorium and all the motels in the area are already booked solid, he said.

Freedom was started in 1880 by Mormon pioneers.

"It is proud that it has managed to survive at all in the face of economic difficulty. It is proud of its citizens who have served their country in wars past and who are now serving in Vietnam," Jenkins said.

"If there were any legal way to stop the rally we would," Jenkins said. "As it is, we don't intend to support it. The position is that this is a free country and the highways are public and there is nothing we can do. We don't seem to have any rights when it comes to our feelings."

THE NEED FOR A DEFINITION OF "DISADVANTAGED"

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very fascinating and penetrating editorial commentary in the Des Plaines, Ill., Valley News, of Thursday, January 15, has just come to my attention.

The editorial discussing the definition of a "disadvantaged" person was by the publication's editor, Harry Sklenar, and his commentary, I believe, is a positive contribution to a discussion of current events. The editorial follows:

WHO IS "DISADVANTAGED"?

It has become increasingly apparent that a concise definition is needed as to who and how to classify a "disadvantaged" person.

In the most popular definition, that of economic level, the government criteria is that the "disadvantaged" person is one whose income is about \$3,000 to \$3,500 annually.

In the labor market, the "disadvantaged" are those who lack the knowledge of reading and writing and the ability to understand. Now it is possible that a foreigner well able to earn above the government disadvantaged level can remain disadvantaged economically on the labor level due to language problems.

The person that is classified as "disadvantaged" in one community area on the basis of income level could well be somewhat affluent in another type of community; say a laborer able to earn more than the \$3,000 or \$3,500 annually by cutting grass, washing cars, or other such tasks in one type of neighborhood, while this same individual would be unable to make a living doing these same chores in another area such as the coal mining region due to the fact that the people there do this work themselves or cannot afford to pay others to do this for them.

In another definition, the "disadvantaged" are persons who are handicapped, such as blind, deaf, crippled, or otherwise unable to do tasks that normal individuals can be assigned.

Readers may be aware that the minority races such as the Negro, the Mexican, and the Indian are rated as "disadvantaged" due to racial basis. However, the Irish, the Greek, and other foreign nationalities faced similar problems on arrival in the United States. Currently, the Czechs are complaining that the U.S. Immigration Department is limiting the quota for Czechs. Thus Czechs can claim being "disadvantaged" in not being given equal quotas. The Chinese and Japanese, or other Orientals could make a similar claim.

The question to be studied is if the label is a deterrent to personal advancement, a condition of society, or simply a state of mind. More important, though, a definition is needed of just who is "disadvantaged" and on what basis is one rated.

"TELLING IT LIKE IT IS"

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, these days we hear a great deal about lack of communication between the young people and their elders and we hear claims that our young citizens are all against the so-called establishment.

On Monday of this week, Vermont's distinguished senior Senator, the Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN, spoke to a group of young Americans who had been chosen to participate in the U.S. Senate youth program by the William Randolph Hearst Foundation. It is my understanding that following the speech, Senator AIKEN, who has always been known in Vermont for "telling it like it is," was given a rousing ovation by the students. The Senator's message is just as appropriate for all generations, however, and I am pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

SPEECH BY SENATOR GEORGE D. AIKEN, TO THE U.S. SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM, SPONSORED BY THE WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST FOUNDATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 26, 1970

I am very proud that I have been invited to meet with you young people who have been chosen to represent your states.

I know that Mr. Hearst and his associates are proud to have sponsored and assembled such an outstanding group here in the Nation's Capitol.

While you are in Washington, you are expected to learn all you can about the actual operations of your government—Legislative—Executive—and Judicial.

I put the Legislative Branch first because it is elected directly by the people and without its advice and consent (and, of course—appropriations) the other two Branches could not function.

I am not going to spend time explaining the operations of the Congress or any other special part of our government.

You have school books and you will be furnished plenty of material while you are here to tell you all that.

And, above all else, you have eyes and ears. Besides, learning for yourself is the best way anyway.

Unless I am mistaken, you already know that the United States is the most powerful—the most representative—the most envied and the most legitimate country in the world today.

Our country has done more in the last twenty years to raise living standards and improve the lot of people the world over than has been done by any nation in any similar era in history.

Yet, in spite of this, we are at times censured and condemned by half the nations of earth.

Just what is this government of ours anyway?

It is important that we understand ourselves before we try to change the existing order.

Our government is the oldest continuing government on earth barring perhaps the British government and the scholars even argue that one.

Those who preach revolution or yearn for "charisma" (a very popular word these days) in their political leaders have to put up with this fact, and it is a formidable one.

Now, I hope it will not come as a shock

when I tell you that our government is a government of "Special Interests".

To young people the term "Special Interests", indeed any kind of self-interest, often smacks of evil—or conspiracy.

A nation that is no more than the sum total of its special interests seems to be insufficiently inspiring, insufficiently dedicated to cope with the vital problems of today.

But when I refer to "Special Interests", I am not thinking of powerful groups of industrialists or bankers or utilities or anything of that sort—powerful as such groups may be.

I am thinking of a thousand and one special interests which are represented in one degree or another in each of our major political parties.

I am thinking not only of business, but of economic—racial—labor—religious—agricultural—aesthetic and all the hundreds of other special interests including yours and mine.

Included in any list we will find political divisions at all levels of government—community—city—county and state.

Our real job in politics is to keep these special interests, including yours and mine, honest while providing equal opportunity and justice for all.

That is why we have laws and regulations which are supported by traditions and customs.

This task is not easy and from time to time it appears that one or more special interests may be achieving supremacy over all the others.

The urge for monopoly is strong in the human breast.

It is an urge which is responsible for much of our human progress, but which if uncontrolled is a sure formula for disaster.

The seeming domination of one group over all others, however, is never absolute or lasting, a fact to which the downfall of mighty nations of the past bears testimony.

The special interests which make up our two political parties are almost by definition provincial interests.

Our country is too big for any one of them to dominate because our adherence to democracy is too dedicated.

When the people and their elected representative keep our special interests within bounds, the result is a kind of provincial patriotism that helps keep the peace both at home and abroad.

Even special interests want to survive, just as you and I do—just as most people in the world do.

It is only when politicians feel they have to exhibit their emotions in public, only when they feel they have to be dramatic, entertaining or demonstrate their power that we get into trouble.

I fear that is how we got into trouble in Viet Nam.

We committed a kind of moral aggression in Viet Nam under the guise of preserving self-determination.

But the weight of our intervention made self-determination impossible.

That is history and I do not want to dwell on it here.

Nations, like people, have their own special interests.

A nation must understand its real interests or it gets into trouble.

But, we have to be honest about our real interests.

We cannot afford to clothe them in moralisms, as we have so tragically done.

I realize that to young people this way of thinking may seem very dull, but the message I am trying to convey is very important even if not dramatic or entertaining.

A few moments ago, I referred to the fact that some young people seem to want "charisma" in their political leaders.

The use of this word may make one appear

quite intellectual, but as a matter of fact the user probably does not know its origin or even what it means.

I asked a member of my staff to find out for me the origin of this word.

It was coined by a German Sociologist, Max Weber, less than a hundred years ago.

Actually, the word itself was invented by the Greeks.

It literally means "gift of God."

Weber used the word to describe the revolutionary leader who grabs power by illegitimate means—by overriding both traditional and constitutional processes alike.

This fellow, Weber, had the courage to be dull for he never did take a stand approving or disapproving "charismatic" leaders.

He did acknowledge that such leaders could sometimes open the way to revolutionary change.

But his definition rested on the word "illegitimate."

He certainly didn't think of "charismatic" leaders as just colorful fellows with entertaining personalities.

I am sure Weber would have scoffed at the modern usage of "charisma" as applying to a person who has some kind of personal magic or star quality.

As so often happens with many of our words today, the original meaning of "charisma" has been changed and almost lost.

So from now on when you hear the word "charisma," I hope you will remember Professor Weber's original definition.

This country was founded as the result of a revolution.

Maybe we will need another in the near or distant future, but before tossing "charisma" around, let's be sure that we want to go illegitimate.

With all its faults, no government in the world today is as legitimate as ours.

Our tradition is the tradition of keeping special interests within the law.

We reward their achievements with money rather than political power because we think it is safer that way.

Real political power rests with people, most of whom do not want their private problems made into Federal cases—people who may work for special interests but vote for themselves.

It is by working to keep our special interests honest and law abiding that we have been able to sustain a tradition of continuous social change.

When political leadership gets lax, others step in to arouse the social consciousness of the country.

Often it has been the special interest of young people to act as the Nation's social conscience.

It is true today that your direct special interest is to keep our traditions honest.

What should concern all of us is that our traditions are apparently not adequately understood or taught in many of our schools today.

It is so much easier to demonstrate—or to serve up opinions with commercial or "charismatic" sauce than to try to understand our traditions or the issues of the day.

Words like "charisma" are often just emotions unaccompanied by appropriate ideas—words that tend to excite without carrying the burden of thought.

One of the worst examples of this current nonsense is the slogan of that rather popular philosopher: "The medium is the message."

Better had he said that "the media has triumphed over matter".

As far as I am concerned, what is said is far more important than the style in which it is delivered.

The problems of dealing with special interests have even robbed a great many young people of a sense of humor.

Their self-appointed spokesmen want to be taken seriously—but to be taken seriously you have to know how to laugh.

Laugh more at the pretensions of special interests and you will better shame them into curbing their greed.

More important, however, is the fact that a sense of humor is first cousin to a sense of forgiveness, a quality badly needed in the world today.

A nation that cannot admit and forgive its own mistakes has nowhere to go but to the psychiatrist's couch.

A nation consumed with guilt feelings is a grave danger, not only to itself, but to the peace of the world.

There is, of course, such a thing as historical guilt and nations have committed grievous errors that have served only to bring out the worst in man.

The recent history of the world is no exception.

Individuals who identify themselves too closely with historical guilt are often sick people—people who cannot even forgive themselves.

A nation led by such people would be a menace to itself and to the peace of the world.

Young Americans should always indulge their social consciousness since it is their duty and indeed their special interest.

The quacks and experts alike will want to make Federal cases out of your private problems.

I hope you will give these self-promoters the ridicule they deserve.

But, if perchance you should be tempted to batter down the doors of our traditions, be sure you understand them.

If I may quote an adage so old that I can't recall its origin: "Look before you leap."

Be sure you can replace these traditions with something better lest we suffer the fate of other nations of the past where "charisma" rather than reason was the motivation.

The substance is still more important than the form—or "image" as they say these days. It is important for nations and people to understand their real interests.

So as young people if you should run out of patience and become sorely tempted be sure you really want to weaken the oldest functioning political system on earth rather than deciding to strengthen it by working within our tradition of keeping the special interests honest.

Traditions are the inhibitors of society. Some are good, others need modernizing, while still others need to be discarded.

Remove all traditions at once and anarchy results, just as madness often results when an individual loses all his inhibitions.

I am not trying to dissuade you from questioning the established order or from trying to make desirable changes.

Your special interests is to serve as the Inquisitor of the Establishment.

The special interest of the older generation, however, is not to recant on bended knee all of our traditions just because they are under fire.

The demands of youth should be respected, but at the same time the older folks should be able and willing to explain the reason for a particular tradition or custom.

It is also the job of all people to be prepared to accept the loss of a particular interest or tradition if this action will benefit the community as a whole.

This is what is meant by progress—strengthening the established order with reason.

All of us have a role in keeping the special interests honest.

This natural system of checks and balances should guide all of our activities.

There are inevitable changes with each generation and there always will be.

In fact, there had better be or we will become a sterile society.

One thing I know is that if each of us places to keep all special interests honest—or perhaps just has the courage to be a little dull and practical—we can go a long way in improving the relations between all people.

Now, one final word. I believe all of you expect to finish high school this year.

Most of you will go on with your formal education.

In a few short years, you will take your places in all walks of life—in all of our States—probably in all continents.

You will have high ambitions—you will have your own special interests, which will likely change as time goes on.

I hope you all realize that the most important special interest of all is the community—your community.

Without the community, the county, the state and the Nation cannot succeed.

For here is the bedrock of all good governments and the community is what you make it.

The fact that you have been selected for the William Randolph Hearst Youth Program indicates that you are already in training for better service to your communities.

From here on you will be stepping up the ladder of good citizenship and good government.

I have been honored by being asked to speak to you again—and I am sure you understand the message I have tried to convey.

LEGISLATION TO PROTECT THE DELICATE ECOLOGY OF OUR STREAMS

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would provide for some limitation of channelization projects conducted by the Soil Conservation Service which may endanger the delicate ecology of our streams.

While some of the projects which have been completed under the Watershed Protection and Flood Control Act of 1954 have had beneficial results in flood control and land reclamation, they have too often been accomplished at the expense not only of the natural beauty of the streams affected but of the wildlife inhabiting those streams. In one instance, a stream which had an average of 240 pounds of game fish per acre before channelization averaged only 5 pounds of small fish an acre afterward. The drop in the water table which has accompanied channelization in some instances has had a devastating effect on the wildlife, trees, and plants living in the surrounding area. Serious erosion of the banks has also occurred as a result of the channelization of some streams resulting in considerable land loss and the muddying of previously clear water.

The bill which I am introducing would not interfere with channelization where it is justifiable but it would provide a mechanism to prevent projects which might cause irreparable damage to the environment in the name of conservation.

HILL DEBATE OVER VETO SHOULD FOCUS ON HEW BILL'S WASTEFUL DEFECTS

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the most conservative columnists in Washington are not Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden. Mr. Mankiewicz was press secretary to Senator Robert Kennedy. Mr. Braden is a former liberal member of the California State Board of Education and a one-time Democratic candidate for Lieutenant Governor of California.

So I, and I am sure a lot of my colleagues, were agreeably surprised this morning to see their column in the Washington Post supporting the President's veto of the HEW appropriations bill.

Let us see for a moment, what their reasoning is. They sum it up this way:

The extra education money, in short, reinforces existing inadequacies in public education, fattens needless programs to appease powerful lobbies, acts as a bonanza to upper middle-class property taxpayers and will be sold somehow as an "investment in America" by the people who otherwise think it wrong to waste public funds.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Braden comes from California, that State that stands to gain the most from this pork barrel. I commend his column in its entirety to all my colleagues. For their convenience, I hereby insert it in the RECORD:

HILL DEBATE OVER VETO SHOULD FOCUS ON HEW BILL'S WASTEFUL DEFECTS

(By Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden)

It will be unfortunate if the debate over President Nixon's veto of the Health, Education and Welfare appropriation turns only on the issue of inflation. High HEW officials are anxious that the occasion be used to strike a major blow at what is wrong with our schools.

The President's veto is courageous, since it pits him against one of the nation's most powerful lobbies, and is risking the chance that he will be called "anti-education" by his own Silent Majority. But it will be even more courageous if Mr. Nixon chooses to tell the truth about this bill, which is that like much of the money we spend on education, it allocates resources to the wrong places and does little or nothing for our children, the quality of whose education seems to deteriorate in direct proportion to the money spent on it.

The HEW bill, asking for one billion more educational dollars than the President budgeted, is only part of what the government spends on education, but it reflects what is wrong with the whole.

\$400 million extra goes to so-called "impacted areas." These are school districts with a high percentage of Federal employees. But only those who actually live on Federal land penalize the local schools (they don't pay property taxes)—and they are too few to justify the windfall.

Thus in Fairfax County, Virginia, a booming Washington bedroom community, \$229,000 will go to school districts in lieu of taxes for Federal employees who live on Federal installations. But more than \$10 million will be paid for "off base" children, whose parents own property, pay taxes and contribute to the general business expansion.

A truly scandalous increase is \$200 million in funds for vocational education. A sounder move would have been to strike out the more than \$200 million already in the bill.

The vocational education program is the most entrenched of the school lobbies, dating back to the early years of the century, and consists largely of the purchase of shop equipment and the training of students for long-vanished jobs.

The increase in Title I funds is at least arguable, but even here, the President has sound reasons for a veto based on educational grounds. Title I money is supposed to be spent on the direct benefit of poor children. But in the South as well as the North, educational administrators have swindled the Congress and the taxpayers by withholding from these children ordinary expenditures that would otherwise be made. The result is that poor children get Title I money, middle class children in the same districts get the major share of funds raised by local taxes, and the only beneficiary is the property taxpayer.

Finally, liberals hot to override the Nixon veto will have to answer the argument that these extra funds are for the fiscal year that ends July 1. Thus they would have to be spent in three or four months. It is in order to prevent the inevitable mountain of slide projectors and band uniforms, that HEW officials support the veto and ask for an orderly study of how these funds could be profitably spent over twelve months instead.

But a measure of the pressures at work lies in a little-noticed cut put through by Congressmen who fear being savaged by the education complex. HEW had asked for \$25 million, to test whether intelligent people who knew their subject could teach their subject, without having to go through the dreary years of teacher education. This picks at the iron lock held by teachers colleges on the profession. The appropriation went out—fast.

The extra education money, in short, reinforces existing inadequacies in public education, fattens needless programs to appease powerful lobbies, acts as a bonanza to upper middle-class property taxpayers, and will be sold somehow as an "investment in America" by the people who otherwise think it wrong to waste public funds.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, criticism is occasionally directed toward commissions and departments, so it is nice when commendatory comments are received. The following is a resolution passed unanimously by the executive committee of the American Trucking Association in Washington, D.C., January 22, 1970:

With increasing frequency, there are intimations in Federal executive policy statements, direct and indirect, to the effect that the regulation of freight transportation should be greatly altered or substantially abandoned.

Some of these statements assert, usually by innuendo rather than directly and specifically, that the Interstate Commerce Commission has fallen over its nearly a century of service, to serve the interests of shippers and the public.

The trucking industry has had its differences with the Commission, and doubtless

will continue to do so. These differences sometimes extend to the statutes also. But the record is clear that this country has enjoyed, under its laws and successive Commissions, service and equity in transportation that are unsurpassed.

The present system of transportation has been developed under a system of regulation that has been proven to be in the public interest. The growth and prosperity of the national economy confirm this.

The rampant discrimination and intolerable favoritisms and exploitations in transport early in this nation's history, before Federal regulation was established and strengthened, prove the preponderant wisdom of the Congress on this subject since 1887.

We deplore the disregard of history and of the basic facts of transportation economics, as evidenced in the statements to which we object. We deplore the apparent reckless spirit of experimentation, with which some recurrent proposals, such as those for unlimited railroad ownership of truck lines, for unqualified entry into for-hire trucking, and for withdrawal of freight rate regulation are voiced. We believe these and similar proposals threaten the welfare of industry, agriculture and general business, as well as that of our own enterprises. Consumers would suffer.

We reject the notion that the principles that have permitted and fostered the country's independent motor carrier industry have changed, or that what was right earlier has now become somehow wrong, in total.

We unanimously reaffirm our support of independent ownership of the modes of transportation and continued regulation of transportation in the public interest, as embodied in law, and as administered. We will oppose by every proper means all attempts to eliminate or weaken these.

COMMITTEE ON PORNOGRAPHY

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, Congress has the opportunity this year to respond to the needs of America. Not only do we have the opportunity, we have the responsibility to act to end those blemishes on our social structure. This responsibility cannot be neglected longer. America is crying out loud to this Congress for leadership.

When one small, insignificant segment of America seeks personal financial gain by exploiting the fears, suspicions and baser instincts of our people, Congress and the House of Representatives in particular, have an obligation to step forward with new laws or regulations to free our people from the threat to our general welfare.

The smut peddlers, the sex salesmen and the filth distributors have flourished undisturbed for many years. These masters of horror have used the tiny vestiges of precivilized man to their infamous advantage. They have, through their unrestricted distribution systems, found their way into the lives of millions of American homes and have often left their dirty fingerprints on the minds of young people. They have hidden behind what they call freedom of the press in order

to build upon their hideous foundation of social misfits and mentally unstable people.

Mr. Speaker, to continue to allow the unnatural abuse of the constitutional guarantee of freedom of information through the press is to invite further tests of the national health. While I have a great faith in America, I am unwilling to have her social institutions strained unendingly. I reject the claim that pornography is protected under freedom of the press and I reject the argument that if pornography is not wanted, it will not be produced.

I call for an end to the unrestricted national distribution of trash to homes where small children can easily become exposed to it and to public distribution centers where decent citizens are likely to be present.

I support the concept expressed by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SCHADEBERG). Mr. SCHADEBERG has called for a special House committee to probe this growing national problem. The opportunity to be of service to America rests with you, Mr. Speaker. It will be your responsibility to acknowledge the threat to decency and to respond positively to this threat.

ADVANCE FEED GRAIN PAYMENTS, 1970

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, in Iowa, representatives of the four major farm organizations—Farm Bureau, Farmers' Union, Grange and National Farmers Organization—have jointly agreed to a resolution which supports the concept of my bill, House Joint Resolution 1058, concerning mandatory advance payment in the 1970 feed grains program.

This united approach is unique among farm organizations. It shows the seriousness of the concern by farmers and other members of the agribusiness community and that immediate steps be taken to pass legislation that would require the Secretary of Agriculture to make such advance payments this spring.

The letter and statement follow:

NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE,

Des Moines, Iowa, January 23, 1970.

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE,

House Office Building,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHERLE: On agricultural policy one often hears the cry, "If only farm organizations could get together and agree on what they want, it would be a great help." I think you will agree with the statement and also that many areas of agreement among farm organizations and commodity organizations can be found, if the effort is made.

I am happy to inform you that such an effort is being made in Iowa. Representatives from the four major farm organizations—Farm Bureau, Grange, Farmers' Union and NFO—some commodity organizations and rural oriented church organizations are meeting about once a month to discuss and prepare statements on topics on

which all agree. We are not a formal organization nor a lobbying group. Our intent is to merely make known the areas and topics of agreement among these various organizations.

Attached is our statement on advance payments! Please give it your consideration. Wishing you many joys in the new year, I am

Sincerely yours,
(Rev.) JOHN GEO. WEBER,
Chairman.

IOWA FARM AND COMMODITY ORGANIZATIONS'
(IFCO) STATEMENT ON THE 1970 FEED
GRAIN PROGRAM

With wheat and feed grains in surplus supply; with available credit "tight"; and with interest rates at an all time high; the Iowa Farm and Commodity Organizations (IFCO), meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, January 12, 1970, urges the United States Department of Agriculture to reconsider its ruling of no advance payments and to restore the diversion payments to the 1969 level.

Unless such action is taken, less than adequate participation in the 1970 Feed Grain Program may jeopardize its success and further worsen the situation on the nation's farms.

PETTIS WOULD VOTE NAY ON
FOREIGN AID

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, since I was serving as a host at a panel on science and technology, sponsored by the Science and Astronautics Committee, I was unfortunately too late in responding to the rollcall vote on the conference report on H.R. 15149, the foreign aid bill. However, I would like the RECORD to show that had I been present, I would have cast a "nay" vote, because the legislation is no more palatable to me today than it was the day it was approved by this body—an occasion when I also voted "nay." At that time I pointed out, and the objection bears repeating again, that our foreign aid program has become absolutely excessive and unreasonable. When foreign aid was first instituted on a large scale as the Marshall plan back in 1946, it served a valuable purpose in restoring the economic health of Western Europe after the devastation of World War II. But now it is largely a dreadful farce that nets us nothing but trouble, resentment, and uncollectable debts.

My objection also is based on the sad economic picture I see here at home. Federal taxes are at their highest level ever; State and local taxes are continually rising, and yet most of our own people are hard pressed to borrow money at even 10 percent to buy a decent home, at the same time that we are lending money to foreign nations at 2 and 3 percent so they can loan it back to us at 6-percent interest.

If the President is looking for ways to cut Federal spending and curbing inflation, then this bill—and not health and education funds—was the place to wield

the scalpel. In approving a \$2 billion-plus foreign aid bill and vetoing the money for the Nation's health and educational needs, the administration has demonstrated that its priorities are in sad disarray.

ROAD GANG'S ANNUAL MEETING

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, the distinguished chairman of the House Subcommittee on Roads, the Honorable JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, made an outstanding address concerning the future of the highway program and the Highway Trust Fund at the annual meeting of the Road Gang.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI has again demonstrated his complete grasp of the highway transportation problem. I am most gratified that our highway legislative program is under his able guidance.

In his address, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI makes an important statement with regard to broadening the purposes of the Highway Trust Fund and the tax base supporting it.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI is forthright and steadfast in his position that trust fund moneys must not be diverted to non-highway purposes.

I would hope that every Member will take time to read this important address:

ROAD GANG'S ANNUAL MEETING

You have been kind enough to invite me to talk at your meetings several times in the past, and for one reason or another, we have never been able to work it out until now. I must admit I have somewhat mixed feelings about appearing before you in this year's climate. It certainly would have been a lot simpler to have done it a few years ago, before the preservationists decided that highways have replaced money as the root of all evil, and before the social scientists decided that highway taxes are the bottomless pitcher from which can pour forth an endless stream of dollars to solve all of the Nation's manifold troubles. But I didn't make it back then, so now I guess I'll travel the rougher route.

The preservationists are wrong, of course. Neither automobiles nor highways are the root of all evil. And all the purple prose about which one generates more of the other is a slick way of avoiding the real source of problems. It's a lot harder to deal effectively with that. The problems arise, first, because we have so many more people than we thought we'd have, and second because most of the people of this country still believe they're supporting a form of government that guarantees them a high degree of individual freedom. I'm not qualified to comment on what you do about steadily increasing population, but I assure you I strongly support that maximum degree of individual freedom which is the basis upon which the country was founded and upon which I am convinced its continued existence depends.

One of the unique things about the people of the United States is that we still retain the right to live and work and go where we want to, in pretty much the manner we want to, within the limits of our income or our credit rating. And this, I think, is what the

so-called experts who have so harshly attacked the highway program in recent years have either forgotten or are prepared to abandon. I'm willing to forgive if it's a case of having forgotten, but on the other alternative I don't see any choice but to stand up and fight.

And that, my friends, is the meat of what I have to say to you today. I expect to cover a few other related subjects, but the one point I would like to make loud and clear is that the difference between 1956 and 1970 is a lot more than just 14 years. We've had the Highway Trust Fund for these 14 years, and I'm afraid a lot of people have come to take it for granted. I've probably contributed my share to that error, because I am rather well known for my assertion that nobody is going to raid it. We've been building the roads that the people of this country needed and wanted, and still need and still want, and we've tended to shrug off that highly vocal minority who are shouting "no more".

Well, we can't do that any longer. Everybody who has any genuine interest in the transportation system of this country, in industry and in government at every level, is going to have to accept responsibility for speaking up, because you, and we, are in fact the spokesmen for the vast majority of Americans who value their freedom of mobility and expect to keep it. Without enough highways, and good highways, they aren't going to keep it. So it's up to us, individually and collectively, to get off the defensive and start stating the facts—that the American people prefer to travel by automobile and need highways on which to do it.

What's more, we need to put some glamour, if you will, into the economic facts of life of this country. The commerce and prosperity of this Nation are absolutely dependent upon transportation, and the largest share of that transportation is on wheels. The opponents keep writing pretty stories about how other countries don't have to spend their money on miles and miles of highway, and don't have bumper-to-bumper traffic jams, and don't have to worry about air pollution from automobiles, and on and on and on. What they don't bother to tell their readers, and what we had better start getting across in some of this country's publications and on speaking platforms, is that in most of those countries you can get from border to border (assuming you're allowed to travel from border to border) in less time than it takes to cross a single State in this country. They also don't bother to point out that our standard of living makes it possible for a much greater percentage of our people to own and operate automobiles, and that a staggering degree of that standard of living derives from industrial and individual mobility.

Every State in this country is facing a substantial demand for more highway construction. The extent to which the States have been considering additional construction through toll financing is in itself a clear indication that, magnificent as the progress in the past 14 years has been, it isn't enough.

During the months ahead, we are going to have to start laying out the Federal aid highway program of the future. We are going to have to have the highway trust fund to finance it. There are a lot of serious proposals around to make the highway trust fund a transportation trust fund, with the money available for any form of transportation the current authorities think is desirable. I don't think that's the way for the Federal Government to operate. I think that when the Federal Government levies taxes, it ought to be prepared to tell the taxpayers what they're paying for.

And now I may surprise you. I think the trust fund should be expanded. I think we

should recognize, first, that the taxes going into it now are inadequate for future highway requirements, and that those funds should be increased. I also think that specific funds should be added to the trust fund for the specific purpose of financing mass transportation, both highway based and rapid rail. I also believe that specific funds should be added to the trust fund to finance highway safety. I am prepared to propose that kind of a program, provided we clearly estimate what each program is going to require and assign a statutory percentage of trust fund moneys to each of these categories.

Let me make it clear that in proposing this kind of program, I would intend that new money be added to the trust fund to cover these new programs administered from it. The present taxes going into the trust fund, and hopefully additional ones, would still be committed to the highway program.

I don't believe mass rail transit is going to solve all the social ills of the Nation's cities, as so many of its advocates would have the public believe. But I do believe that in selected very large cities, it is an essential development, and I don't believe that any of the legislative proposals that have been seriously advanced up to now is going to do the job simply because it isn't going to be possible for cities to sell bonds or otherwise finance their share of a capital program of this kind without an absolute commitment from the Federal Government as to the Federal share. Nothing short of a guaranteed arrangement like the trust fund can do that.

A lot of dedicated and hard-working people have given a lot of time and thought to the mass transportation problem, and I don't hold myself out as the fountain of wisdom, but I think to a considerable extent the effort has been misdirected, primarily because so far it has been too broad-brush. In addition, little or no thought has been given to integrating rapid rail system with related bus transportation. No rapid rail system is going to succeed unless means are planned and provided so that the customers can get from the transit system stations to where they are going. There are areas in which highly generalized legislation, which leaves the lion's share of decisionmaking to regulation rather than to law, is not sound, and I believe this is one of them.

Most of you are already well aware of several of the problems we will be considering in the Congress this session—the highway authorization bill, the groundwork for the future highway program, including decisions as to matching ratios and on what kinds of roads we will put the most emphasis, so I'm not going to take up a lot of time talking about those points. I do hope we will have the benefit of your thinking when we get into the hearings. It does seem to me a lot more of you should be knocking at the door to be heard instead of waiting to be asked to come in.

It would be extremely helpful, for example, in considering where to place highway emphasis, to have your thoughts on how we can use highways to relieve the population pressure on existing cities, by creating new cities of more manageable size across the enormous unpopulated breadth of this land. That, it seems to me, is a genuine challenge to new horizons for transportation, and particularly for highway transportation.

I think a lot of highway people have not been taking seriously enough the need for broadening the horizons, and if I can get that message across I will consider this time well spent, because unless we are prepared to do that, we may very well find ourselves in a fight for survival, not just the survival of highways, but the survival, ultimately, of the right not to have the Government telling

us when and how to go, and from there to what to do and when and how and where to do it.

CBW TREATY

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, the President has indicated his intention to submit for the consideration of the Senate the Geneva Protocol of 1925 which prohibits the first use of chemical and biological weapons. The 16 of us who, on November 3, presented to the House a study entitled CBW and National Security are heartened by the President's action.

The concern about CBW is not confined to the Congress, but has also been expressed by respected civic organizations. In October, the League of Women Voters of the United States began to prepare an article on CBW for its newsletter, *The National Voter*. This publication, released December 15, with a circulation of over 160,000, advocates ratification of the Geneva Protocol. I would like to bring the perspectives set forth by the League of Women Voters to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS—PRESSURE INTENSIFIES TO BAN THEIR USE OR MANUFACTURE, AND TO ABOLISH ALL STOCKPILES

There is a chance that 1970 will be the year the US joins some 65 other countries that have ratified the 1925 Geneva Protocol, which prohibits the first use in war of chemical and biological weapons. Ironically, although the US proposed and signed the Protocol—and in 1966 co-sponsored a UN resolution calling for the strict observance of its principles and objectives—the Senate has never ratified it. The US is the only nuclear power—and except for Japan, the only major industrial nation—that has not.

Concern about CBW has grown in the US during the past two years as the extent of CBW research and development has become known. Because the C and B arsenal includes mass-destruction weapons of a particularly insidious nature, other countries throughout the world are deeply disturbed by present C and B practices. The issue is expected by some to dominate the disarmament talks in Geneva this year, and it has high priority in administration and congressional circles. Hearings in the House Subcommittee on National Security Policy began on Nov. 18.

SCIENTIFIC REPORTS SEEM UNREAL

There is an air of unreality about CBW—"an eerie, creepy feeling," as Sen. Gale McGee said during Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings in April. To understand the distinctions between the two classes of weapons and the nature of CBW risks, it is necessary to overcome reactions of horror evoked by scientific reports.

By definition, chemical warfare uses toxic chemical agents—gas, liquid, or solid—to affect humans, animals, or plants. Chemical agents include nerve gases which are lethal, quick-acting, and hard to detect and may be dispensed in spray or liquid forms—a tiny drop of one type on the skin will cause death. This was the agent that killed 6000 sheep

in Utah in 1968. There are also blister gases, such as the mustard gas of World War I, which generally incapacitate rather than kill; temporarily incapacitating agents which interfere with normal mental processes; and so-called riot-control agents. These include ordinary tear gas, "super tear gas" (causes nausea as well as irritation to eyes, nose, lungs and throat), and even stronger riot-control agents—all of which may be lethal under certain conditions. Chemical agents are considered to be tactical weapons, especially for nuclear powers, because of their instantaneous effect on victims.

Biological weapons differ in several ways from chemical weapons. They employ living organisms and their toxic products to kill, damage, or incapacitate through disease. B weapons weigh less than C weapons and may be delivered over a wider area. While much specific information about B weapons is classified, the general principles of how they operate are known. Effective means of controlling and treating large-scale disease spread by them is not known. B weapons are considered to be strategic weapons because of the delay between application and effect—that is, because there is an incubation period before disease appears.

C and B weapons are unpredictable, unreliable and difficult to control. This is particularly true of biological aerosol-type weapons because their effectiveness—and the ability to control them—is affected by poorly understood factors of resistance to infection as well as uncertainties of meteorological and atmospheric conditions. The fact that some bacteriological agents can be carried by travelers, migratory birds or animals over great distances adds to the uncertainties about their use.

CBW can't destroy a factory

Unlike other agents of mass-destruction, C and B weapons attack only living matter; their ultimate targets are people. They cannot be used to destroy a factory or a missile, but they can conceivably affect the balance of nature in an irreparable way. Their chief human victims are likely to be civilians, who would not be provided with protective devices given to military forces.

For these and other reasons the value of C and B weapons as a deterrent—one of the arguments advanced in their favor—has been questioned. Since they would leave a nuclear retaliatory capability intact, they would be highly inappropriate, if not useless, as a major strategic threat among nuclear powers, for whom they would be an added expense and hazard. For non-nuclear nations, however, they have some appeal as strategic weapons despite the fact that C and B proliferation would inevitably reduce general security for all.

One argument that has been advanced by some who favor the use of C and B weapons is that they will make war more humane. This is a matter that has been debated by technical experts. Dr. Matthew Meselson, Harvard professor of biology and consultant to the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, refuted this claim in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last April. He contended instead that they risk making war more savage.

In the first place, he said, it is naive to think that only non-lethal agents would be used. Moreover, he asserted, non-lethal chemical weapons would be used to enhance the lethal capabilities of other weapons—a charge that has been made concerning the use of tear gas in the Vietnam war as well as in World War I. Above all, he is convinced that the use of non-lethal weapons would set the stage for—and probably trigger—the use in war of more deadly chemical and biological weapons, and therefore urged that all such agents be banned.

EXPERTS REPORT TO UN

A similar conclusion was reached by the international group of experts which—with US participation—prepared a report for UN Secretary-General U Thant in accordance with a General Assembly resolution of 1968. The UN report, issued in July 1969, called for "the earliest effective elimination of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons." Accordingly, when he issued the report the Secretary-General urged, 1) a renewal of the appeal to all states to accede to the 1925 Geneva Protocol; 2) an affirmation that all chemical and biological agents be prohibited; and 3) agreement by all countries to halt the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical and biological agents for purposes of war, and to eliminate them from the arsenal of weapons.

US policy on chemical and biological weapons was somewhat ambiguous in the 1950's and 1960's, and the use of chemical agents in Vietnam has increased the inconsistencies. In June, 1969, President Nixon appointed a special study group to undertake the most comprehensive review that has ever been made of this country's CBW policies. The urgency of the need for review was highlighted by congressional and other public inquiries following several accidents and alarms related to C and B research, development and training.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S STATEMENT

On the basis of the study group's recommendations, the President said on November 25.

"As to our chemical warfare program, the United States: Reaffirms its oft-repeated renunciation of the first use of lethal chemical weapons; extends this renunciation to the first use of incapacitating chemicals. . . .

"The US shall [also] renounce the use of lethal biological agents and weapons, and all methods of biological warfare. The US will confine its biological research to defensive measures such as immunization and safety measures. The DOD [Department of Defense] has been asked to make recommendations as to the disposal of existing stocks of bacteriological weapons."

A massive effort to inform the public and promote discussion on CBW matters is required after the years of secrecy that have shrouded the subject. The reported change by Secretary of Defense Laird from a position defending the value of both C and B deterrents to one which favors eliminating the production of biological agents will carry weight. It may also open the way to orderly debate of comprehensive CBW controls.

It is important that the US be able to present its new CBW position when the question comes up for discussion again in the UN. The debate will be shaped by earlier treaties, resolutions and working papers dating back to the Hague Gas Declaration of 1899 and including, of course, the 1925 Protocol and the Secretary-General's 1969 report.

Several new proposals have recently been offered. They are working papers only, representing negotiating positions which will probably be modified in the treaty-making process. Among the more recent international proposals is a British draft treaty aimed at "reinforcing" the 1925 Geneva Protocol by prohibiting biological methods of warfare and the production for hostile use of biological agents.

There is a Swedish proposal to declare that CBW is contrary to international law, and Canada has recommended further study of the subject as well as commendation for previous UN stands. The USSR has proposed a ban on development, production, and stockpiling of C and B weapons, but—like the British—the Soviets leave unsolved the problem of inspection. The British draft

treaty has raised other objections based on the fear that by separating the B-war and C-war issues it may strengthen the potential use of C weapons. The Canadian resolution does little substantially to advance CBW control and the Swedish proposal introduces legal complexities about the force of customary law.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL IS THE GOAL

Ratification of the Geneva Protocol is felt by legal and scientific experts to be the minimum and necessary first step for the US in moving toward international control of CBW. Then it can join other nations in considering the merits and weaknesses of other proposals, and in studying whatever technical and legal problems must be overcome.

William Foster, former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has urged US ratification as "the next logical step for us to take," and calls as well for full US support of the British proposal. This, he says, "would enable us to divest ourselves of a useless and pernicious liability." These are essential steps, in his view, to limiting the deadlines of the arsenals of the world.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL CARE FACING CRISIS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important matters which must receive priority attention during this session of Congress is the growing crisis facing our Veterans' Administration hospitals. Present funding and staffing policies, if allowed to stand, will wreck the VA hospital program.

Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Affairs Committee is making an in-depth study of these problems and the committee will soon begin hearings to determine if our Nation's veterans are, in fact, receiving prompt and proper medical care.

On Christmas Day 1969, there appeared in the Washington Post an article by Stuart Auerbach which pinpointed some of the problem areas in the VA hospital program. I believe this will be of interest to Members who are receiving complaints regarding VA hospitals in their areas. The article follows:

GI MEDICAL CARE COMPLAINTS RISE UNDER BUDGET SQUEEZE

(By Stuart Auerbach)

A doctor who specializes in the care of paraplegics says the Veterans Administration treated patients paralyzed by spinal cord injuries better in 1946 than it does now.

In Miami, young doctors at the VA hospital charge that veterans suffer a "tragic lack of care" there because the hospital is "grossly understaffed."

Psychiatric services at many VA hospitals, once considered very good, "have been falling steadily behind what is available elsewhere in the community," says Dr. Louis Jolyon West, chairman of the department of psychiatry at the University of California at Los Angeles and a VA consultant.

The statements reflect a growing concern in Congress, veterans' organizations and among doctors that the nation's 166 VA hospitals are so underfinanced that the quality

of medical care will begin slipping very shortly—if the slide has not already started.

DOOM FORESEEN

"I don't think we could last over a year" as a top-quality hospital without more money for staff and innovative new medical programs, says Dr. Arthur J. Klippen, director of the VA Hospital in Minneapolis, one of the best in the country.

A long-time doctor at his hospital, Dr. Lesley Zieve, says "we'll be doomed" if the budget squeeze continues next year.

"There is real danger that the Administration and Congress are about to see veterans' hospitals revert to the mediocre status of the 1920s and the 1930s, when tired physicians and political job holders provided the care for the defenders of our country," warns Dr. Stewart Wolf, a professor of medicine at the University of Oklahoma.

While admitting the VA hospitals could use more money, Donald E. Johnson, the Nixon appointee who heads the VA, insists that veterans still receive top quality care—"care second to none."

"They receive good care, compassionate care and good service. The doctors and nurses they have are top flight. We can handle the mission," says Johnson.

Rep. Olin E. Teague (D-Tex.), chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, disagrees. He accuses the Nixon Administration of reducing the medical care in VA hospitals "to a second class status." He asked for a meeting with President Nixon to discuss the VA hospitals.

Interviews and congressional testimony indicate that there is little wrong with the VA hospitals that more money wouldn't cure. The budget for VA hospitals is currently \$1.9 billion.

Dr. Ernest H. J. Bors, who is about to retire as head of the spinal cord injury center at the VA Hospital in Long Beach, Calif., blames lack of people for the deterioration over the past 20 years in the care of paraplegics.

MATTER OF BUDGET

"We don't have the hands to do the job," he says. "It boils down to a matter of the budget."

He calls the 1940s—after World War II—"the honeymoon time" because there were enough trained people to give patients physical therapy two or three times a day if needed. There were enough nurses to spend hours at the bedside providing tender loving care—"a sweetheart or mother image at the bedside."

Now, he says, patients get physical therapy once a day and nurses are too swamped to spend much time talking to patients. He estimates his center needs twice as many therapists and nurses "to get back to the good old days."

Dr. Douglas J. Stewart, a second year resident at Miami's VA hospital, says staff shortages there mean that patients with bleeding ulcers wait hours to get needed blood transfusions.

"It's a risk," he says. "You are walking a thin line."

He also says that expensive sophisticated lifesaving equipment bought for the year-old, \$22 million hospital is unused because there are not enough trained staff members available. Only 688 of the 1,020 beds in the hospital are currently open for use.

But Miami isn't in any worse shape than other VA hospitals scattered around the country. It has about 1.56 staff members for each patient—right about at the National average for VA hospitals.

This compares to the average of 2.72 employees for each patient in the Nation's community hospitals and three employees per patient in university and teaching hospitals.

Rep. Teague wants to increase the staff

patient ratio to two-to-one. This means adding 28,000 more employees at an annual cost of \$240 million.

"If we had a 2-to-1 ratio, I think we could compete in the quality of medical care with any hospital in the area, even though they have three or four employees for every patient," says Dr. R. M. Kaplan, chief of staff at the VA Hospital in Washington.

The VA hospitals have been hit by a triple financial crunch. The yearly increases in their budgets haven't kept up with either the Nation's inflationary trend or the rising cost of medical care—which leads the cost-of-living index.

COSTS SURGE

With 80 per cent of the budget going for salaries, the increases have barely matched four raises that Congress has voted for federal workers, says Oliver E. Meadows, the staff director of the House Veterans Affairs Committee.

And, with the cost of medical care in the private sector rising so high, more and more veterans are forced to go to VA hospitals because they can't afford to get treatment on the outside.

Added to all that, the Nixon Administration trimmed the budget for hospitals by \$70 million this year as part of its fight against inflation.

Congress, however, returned half of that to the VA and indications are that the Bureau of the Budget will allow that money to be spent. VA officials are counting on that money to open \$20 million in unused facilities in hospitals across the country.

Surprisingly, the Vietnam war with its 132,000 hospitalized casualties has had little effect on the VA hospitals.

About 5 per cent of the VA's 800,000 patients last year were Vietnam veterans. The number is growing, though; this year the VA expects to treat more than 60,000 Vietnam veterans.

Many of the Vietnam wounded never get to VA hospitals. They are treated and discharged directly from military hospitals. When casualties are high, however, the military moves patients out to the VA in order to open beds for newly wounded servicemen.

The Vietnam veterans are causing a special problem for the VA. They are young, impatient and demand speedy treatment. Capt. Max Cleland, a Silver Star winner who lost his right arm and both legs in Vietnam, complained that it took him twice as long as it should have to get artificial limbs.

Dr. Bors notes that paraplegics from Vietnam are rehabilitated in about half the time of his other patients.

This is important because as Sen. Alan Cranston (D-Calif.) points out Vietnam is the most crippling war America has fought.

Testimony before Cranston's Senate veterans affairs subcommittee shows that servicemen are being crippled in Vietnam at twice the rate of the Korean War and three times the rate of World War II.

Started after World War I to care for the war wounds of veterans, the VA hospitals' mission has gradually been increased until today only one-third of their patients suffer from service connected ailments.

MORE TRAINING URGED

Any veteran can be admitted to a VA hospital if he cannot afford medical care elsewhere—with the highest priority going to service connected cases.

The VA hospitals also play a large part in medical research and training. More than 90 of the hospitals are affiliated with medical schools and half the doctors in the country received some part of their training in VA hospitals.

Teague feels that the training element of the VA should be expanded—especially in the field of paramedical personnel who could help ease the nationwide shortage of doctors and nurses.

Drs. Philip Lee and Roger O. Egeberg, the past and present assistant secretaries of Health, Education and Welfare for health and scientific affairs agree. They both told Cranston's committee that the training potential of the VA should be increased.

All this, the experts say, requires money. Johnson, the VA administrator, says that it appears as if the veterans' hospitals will receive a hefty increase in the 1971 budget, currently in preparation.

"If the funds are low, the quality of medical care goes down," says Dr. Kaplan of Washington's VA Hospital. "That affects recruitment. It's a vicious cycle."

CONGRESSMAN OTIS G. PIKE REPORTS TO HIS CONSTITUENTS ON FIRST SESSION, 91st CONGRESS

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, because of the lateness of the adjournment of the first session of the 91st Congress I did not attempt to file my ninth annual report to my constituents of the First Congressional District of the State of New York at that time. With Christmas and New Year's preparations and celebration they had far better things to do than read about the activities of the first session of the 91st Congress.

The most prestigious and objective analyst of congressional affairs, the Congressional Quarterly, described it thus:

The First Session of the 91st Congress, the sixth longest in history, adjourned with the lowest legislative output in 36 years.

To put it more tersely, it was one of the biggest but not one of the best.

The Congress convened on January 3, 1969, and adjourned on December 23, 1969. The Senate was in session 176 days, the House 186 days, the Senate for 927 hours, the House for 747 hours, which demonstrates, if nothing else, that 100 Senators can talk longer than 435 Representatives can. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the year contained 30,927 pages of proceedings and 11,295 pages of extensions of remarks, which boil down to 190 new public laws, most of them minor, and 75 private bills enacted into law, all of them minor.

It is not particularly constructive to seek to find scapegoats for either the unnecessarily long session or the inexcusably low output. The Republican President will with some justification blame it on the Democratic Congress, and the Democratic Congress will with some justification blame it on the Republican President. There were, in fact, many requests from the President for legislation, which requests were delayed far beyond any reasonable submission date if it were really intended that Congress enact them last year. There were, on the other hand, other vital things which Congress could have been doing during the wasted time and did not. With this rather dour preamble, let us look at what the state of the Nation was, what Congress was asked

to do to improve the state of the Nation, and what it actually did.

For the first time in several years another issue equaled the war in Vietnam as perhaps the major issue in the Nation, and that issue was our economy and inflation. To a certain extent it was itself a part of the war in Vietnam as the expenses of that war—usually estimated at approximately \$30 billion a year—had made it very difficult for either the executive branch or the Congress to cut Government spending as an anti-inflation device, or to divert additional sums to other pressing domestic problems.

Nevertheless, the Congress and the President did try. On January 15, 1969, the outgoing Johnson administration submitted to the Congress a budget for fiscal 1970 calling for receipts of \$198,686,000,000 and outlays of \$195,272,000,000, with a projected surplus of \$3,414,000,000. On April 15 the Nixon administration, which had taken office on January 20, submitted a revised budget showing the same receipts but a cut of over \$2 billion in expenditures to \$192,899,000,000 and a projected surplus of \$5,787,090,000. It was on this budget that the Congress worked.

Much of the budget is not subject to congressional votes. Social security payments and the Federal highway system funds, for example, come out of trust funds on which Congress does not vote unless changes are required. Of the total budget set forth above Congress was asked by the President to vote on 14 bills appropriating a total of \$135 billion, 190 million. From this amount the Congress cut \$5 billion, 594 million. The House cut more than the Senate, almost \$9 billion, the Senate less than \$5 billion, and almost \$6 billion was the final figure.

On the other hand, Congress took other actions outside of those appropriations bills which either increased spending or lowered revenues. The social security increases and increases in veterans' benefits did the former, the tax bill did the latter. Finally, by not passing certain new revenue proposals made by the President—such as another postal rate increase and complete extension of the surtax—the Congress reduced revenues by failing to act.

The net result of all the cutting, adding, acting, and not acting by Congress was to leave the total budget picture almost exactly where President Nixon had placed it on April 15. The largest increase voted by the Congress was in social security benefits, the largest decrease was in defense spending.

The general concern over the economy and over the whole problem of national priorities, that is, where we should concentrate both our cutting and our spending, produced many close votes and some interesting fights in an otherwise dull session. In June, by the narrow margin of 210 to 205, the first major revenue bill of the year repealed the investment tax credit, continued the tax surcharge at a reduced rate, and continued certain excise taxes. The next close issue came on an effort to limit agricultural price supports to \$20,000 which lost on a procedural motion by a vote of 181 to 177 in October.

As the year drew to an end the close controversial votes on money bills became more frequent. On November 20, by a 6-vote margin, the House agreed to add \$54.5 million dollars to the foreign aid bill for military assistance to the Republic of China, and by a 13-vote margin authorized \$2.194 billion in both military and economic foreign aid. This narrow margin was reduced to only five votes—200 to 195—when the final appropriation was voted.

There were other close votes on controversial issues which had nothing to do with money, for example, changing the Voting Rights Act, which passed by a vote of 208 to 203, but most of the close votes came on spending issues.

The Congress and the Nation did see, in 1969, a real change in the direction our Nation was taking. For the first time in a decade we reduced our military spending somewhat and began taking substantial steps toward cleaning up our polluted environment. Most of our time, however, was occupied with matters less than earthshaking. We had 177 record votes in the House, of which 31 passed with 10 Members or less voting nay, 11 passed unanimously.

The state of the Nation was quite accurately reflected in the state of our own district. With one great exception we are quite representative of all America. We have high density population areas which share to some degree the problems of our urban centers. We have farms which share the problems of American agriculture. We have problems with crime and drugs—but less than most areas—and we have problems with mass transit—more than most areas. When defense spending is cut and when the space program is slowed down our industry is hurt

by it; when more money is spent for education and health our schools and hospitals are benefited by it.

The one respect in which we differ greatly from most of America is our tremendously rapid rate of growth. Our congressional district had a population of 393,585 in 1960. Its population today is approximately 700,000. This means many different things. It means that one of our largest industries is the housing construction industry and when that industry is hurt by lack of mortgage money and high interest rates—as it has been—we are hurt more than the rest of the country. It means we live with high school taxes, as we must continually pay, not only for the operation and maintenance of our schools, but for the construction of new ones. It means perhaps most of all, that we must wage a continual battle against the pollution of the air we must breathe and the water we drink and use for recreation and which are in critical danger of becoming unfit to breathe and drink and use. All of these major local concerns were affected to some degree by legislation in the Congress.

The Congressman's job is by no means limited to legislation. The workload of ordinary problems affecting ordinary people in all sorts of relations with the Federal Government has increased as the population of the district has increased. An outstanding staff of six full-time secretaries in Washington and Riverhead plus three part-time assistants in Islip, Mr. Aaron Donner; Smithtown, Mr. Joseph Quinn; and Brookhaven, Mr. Robert Waldbauer, has handled approximately 200 letters, postcards, phone calls, telegrams, and visits a day. The problems range from grave ones like obtaining information on a son wounded in Vietnam through serious ones like a missing social

security check for an elderly couple to incredible ones like being asked to find a parking place for a student attending college in Queens. Sometimes we can help, sometimes we cannot, but if it has to do with the Federal Government—we try.

The Congressman was as active as ever in his work in committee and more active in debate on the floor. Our Committee on Armed Services was deeply involved with overall questions involving defense strategy and defense spending, the draft, and many other issues concerning all Americans. Both in committee and in debate on the floor the Congressman worked to trim what he considered to be unjustified and wasteful amounts from the military procurement and military construction bills, and to reform the draft. At the same time he has spoken and voted for military programs which were necessary. His appointment as chairman of a subcommittee which investigated the loss of the *Pueblo* and the EC-121 aircraft to North Korea resulted in hearings which lasted 22 sessions, occupied 541 pages of hearings, and provided a scathing 77-page report which absolutely no one has called a whitewash.

On a more personal level, he continued to work hard and enjoy his work. Of the 177 record votes taken in the House last year, he missed only three—the best record of New York's 41 Congressmen. This requires not only interest in the job, but also health, with which he was blessed.

No one will agree with all of the positions he took, but he hopes the majority will agree with most of them. In any event, for the Record and for either brickbats or bouquets, praises or criticisms, here are the most important ones—he would be happy to hear your views on this record:

1969	Issue	Pike vote
Jan. 3	Election of Speaker (McCormack 241; Ford 187)	McCormack
	Seat Adam Clayton Powell, fine him \$25,000, and strip him of seniority (yea 254; nay 158)	Yea
Mar. 12	Increase U.S. participation in International Development Association (yea 247; nay 150)	Yea
19	Increase permanent debt ceiling (yea 313; nay 93)	Yea
Apr. 1	Provide \$400,000 for House Internal Security Committee (yea 305; nay 51)	Yea
16	Authorize \$348,000,000 for water pollution control and quality research grants (yea 392; nay 1)	Yea
23	Extend Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs through fiscal year 1972 (yea 400; nay 17)	Yea
May 6	Expand and make permanent special milk program for children (yea 384; nay 2)	Yea
21	Prohibit use of fiscal year 1969 funds for construction loan subsidies to colleges which had failed to cut off Federal aid to student rioters (yea 329; nay 61)	Yea
	Provide \$3,800,000,000 in supplementary appropriations for fiscal year 1969 and limit Federal spending in fiscal year 1970 to \$192,900,000,000 (yea 348; nay 40)	Yea
27	Appropriate \$6,800,000,000 for Department of Agriculture (yea 322; nay 50)	Nay
June 2	Provide improved benefits for veterans and their widows (yea 302; nay 3)	Yea
4	Authorize \$937,000,000 in grants for hospital construction over a 3-year period (yea 351; nay 0)	Yea
11	Prohibit camping, sit-ins, etc., on public property in District of Columbia (yea 327; nay 51)	Yea
18	Recommit (kill) bill which prohibited for 6 more years restrictions on cigarette advertising (yea 138; nay 252)	Yea
24	Appropriate \$14,909,809,000 for independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development (yea 388; nay 6)	Yea
25	Provide additional clerk for House Members (yea 204; nay 195)	Nay
	Establish uniform standards on power of States to tax small out-of-State firms doing business within their boundaries (yea 311; nay 87)	Yea
27	Repeal freeze on aid to families with dependent children (yea 269; nay 65)	Yea
30	Continue income tax surcharge and excise taxes on automobiles and communication services for temporary periods, terminate investment credit, and provide low-income allowance for individuals (yea 210; nay 205)	Yea
July 9	Appropriate \$4,352,357,644 in fiscal year 1969 supplementary appropriations and impose limit of \$191,900,000,000 on Federal expenditures for fiscal year 1970 (yea 348; nay 49)	Yea
15	Authorize \$250,000,000 for Appalachian Regional Commission and \$225,000,000 for 5 other regional commissions (yea 273; nay 103)	Nay
17	Permit States to tax national banks at same rate levied against State banks (yea 343; nay 4)	Yea
21	Provide additional \$100,000,000 for meals for needy schoolchildren (yea 352; nay 5)	Yea
23	Improve financing of Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (yea 358; nay 48)	Yea
24	Appropriate \$2,300,000,000 for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and 13 related agencies (yea 366; nay 31)	Yea
31	Add \$894,547,000 to Office of Education programs (yea 294; nay 119)	Yea
	Appropriate \$17,600,000,000 for Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare (yea 393; nay 16)	Yea
Aug. 4	Extend 10-percent surtax through Dec. 31 (yea 237; nay 170)	Yea
	Authorize funds for President's Council on Youth Opportunity (yea 396; nay 7)	Yea
	Establish National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped (yea 365; nay 22)	Yea
5	Recommit (kill) military construction authorization with instructions to strike section on preventing picketing at Pentagon (yea 87; nay 323)	Yea
	Authorize \$1,500,000,000 for military construction (yea 376; nay 30)	Nay
7	Approve Tax Reform Act of 1969 (yea 394; nay 30)	Yea
12	Authorize 15 members of House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to travel abroad (yea 196; nay 132)	Nay
Sept. 3	Authorize funds for 3 years for motor vehicle and tire safety programs (yea 322; nay 0)	Yea
4	Amend Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles hazardous to their safety (yea 327; nay 0)	Yea
	Amend Clean Air Act to extend fuel and vehicle research program (yea 322; nay 0)	Yea
8	Recommit (kill) Peace Corps Act with instructions to reduce funding by \$11,100,000 (yea 144; nay 186)	Yea
	Extend Peace Corps Act (yea 282; nay 52)	Nay
15	Amend Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide emergency student loan guarantees (yea 322; nay 60)	Yea

1969 Issue

Pike vote

Sept. 18	Recommit (kill) Electoral Reform bill with instructions to incorporate district plan whereby electors would be chosen in same manner as Representatives and Senators (yea 162; nay 246).....	Yea
	Amend Constitution by abolishing electoral college and electing President and Vice President by direct popular election (yea 338; nay 70).....	Yea
19	Appropriate \$284,871,057 for legislative branch activities (yea 178; nay 94).....	Nay
23	Establish 5-member Council on Environmental Quality (yea 372; nay 15).....	Yea
29	Extend for 2 additional years authority of Veterans' Administration to set interest rate necessary to meet the mortgage market for guaranteed and insured home loans to veterans (yea 340; nay 21).....	Yea
	Amend National Labor Relations Act of 1947 to permit employer contributions to trust funds for scholarships and child-care centers for dependents of employees (yea 341; nay 1).....	Yea
30	Amend Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and Railroad Tax Act to provide mandatory retirement by Jan. 1, 1976, of all railroad employees at age 65; and extend certain retirement benefits for railroad employees (yea 372; nay 17).....	Yea
Oct. 1	Limit debate on Defense Procurement Authorization to 4 hours (yea 324; nay 61).....	Nay
	Authorize \$21,300,000,000 for defense procurement (yea 311; nay 44).....	Nay
6	Accept recommendations Joint Commission on Coinage to mint nonsilver Eisenhower dollar coins, eliminate silver content from Kennedy half-dollars, and sell \$2,900,000 in rare silver dollars remaining in Treasury (yea 206; nay 148).....	Nay
	Approve educational aid to programs for gifted and talented children (yea 353; nay 0).....	Yea
	Approve educational assistance for programs for children with learning difficulties (yea 352; nay 0).....	Yea
8	Appropriate \$4,500,000,000 for Public Works-Atomic Energy Commission (yea 396; nay 3).....	Yea
9	Table motion to instruct House conferees on the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill to insist on a \$20,000 ceiling on individual farm subsidy payments (yea 181; nay 177).....	Nay
	Authorize \$15,000,000 annually in fiscal year 1971 through 1973 for construction of noncommercial radio and television stations and \$20,000,000 for Corporation for Public Broadcasting (yea 279; nay 21).....	Yea
14	Establish procedure for annual Federal salary comparability review (yea 310; nay 52).....	Yea
	Support motion to adjourn, thereby terminating evening floor debate on Vietnam moratorium (yea 99; nay 210).....	Nay
16	Adopt emergency student loan conference report to raise effective interest ceiling on guaranteed student loans to 10 percent (yea 326; nay 10).....	Yea
	Extend Export Control Act (yea 272; nay 7).....	Yea
23	Extend housing and urban programs for 1 year through fiscal year 1971 and authorize \$4,900,000,000 for Housing and Urban Development (yea 399; nay 9).....	Yea
30	Amend Selective Service Act to give President authority to institute a lottery system of selecting persons for induction into Armed Forces (yea 383; nay 12).....	Yea
	Authorize Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide education programs on drug use (yea 294; nay 0).....	Yea
Nov. 5	Amend Bank Holding Company Act to require 1-bank holding companies to sell either their banks or their nonrelated businesses (yea 352; nay 24).....	Yea
6	Provide Federal assistance for airports and airways of \$2,500,000,000 a year for each for 10 years (yea 337; nay 6).....	Yea
12	Establish potato research and promotion program upon approval of two-thirds of the producers of the producers (yea 171; nay 198).....	Nay
13	Appropriate \$1,450,559,000 for military construction (yea 343; nay 32).....	Yea
	Extend and improve Federal-State unemployment compensation system to cover an additional 4,500,000 workers and provide a system of compensation for periods of extended high unemployment (yea 337; nay 8).....	Yea
17	Authorize \$300,000 for National Council on Indian Opportunity (yea 317; nay 31).....	Yea
18	Appropriate \$2,095,019,630 for Department of Transportation and related agencies (yea 362; nay 25).....	Yea
19	Accept conference report on agricultural appropriations of \$7,488,903,150 (yea 214; nay 172).....	Nay
	Extend Interest Equalization Tax and repeal registration requirement of 1968 Gun Control Act on sales of shotgun and rifle ammunition (yea 334; nay 47).....	Yea
20	Add \$54,500,000 for military assistance to Republic of China to foreign aid (yea 175; nay 169).....	Nay
	Authorize \$2,194,000,000 in foreign aid (yea 176; nay 163).....	Yea
Nov. 24	Authorize \$1,100,000,000 for District of Columbia rapid transit system (yea 286; nay 23).....	Yea
Dec. 1	Adopt resolution supporting the President's efforts to bring a just peace to Vietnam (yea 334; nay 55).....	Yea
	Amend resolution to request the President to continue to press the Government of North Vietnam to abide by the Geneva Convention of 1949 in treatment of prisoners of war (yea 392; nay 0).....	Yea
8	Appropriate \$69,960,048,000 for Department of Defense (yea 330; nay 33).....	Yea
9	Appropriate \$1,194,000,000 for foreign economic assistance, \$454,500,000 for military assistance; \$95,000,000 for Peace Corps; \$480,000,000 for International Development Banks, \$275,000,000 for Foreign Military Credit Sales (yea 200; nay 195).....	Yea
10	Replace existing Export Control Act with new legislation (yea 157; nay 238).....	Yea
11	Amend Voting Rights Act by replacing it with new version (yea 208; nay 203).....	Nay
	Adopt new version Voting Rights Act (yea 234; nay 179).....	Nay
12	Recommit (kill) Office of Economic Opportunity authorization with instructions to report a substitute bill making program in effect State-controlled (yea 163; nay 231).....	Nay
15	Increase social security benefit payments by 15 percent (yea 399; nay 0).....	Yea
	Consent to Connecticut-New York railroad passenger transportation compact (yea 352; nay 49).....	Nay
	Adopt resolution calling for humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war held by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front (yea 405; nay 0).....	Yea
16	Establish Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-speaking people (yea 315; nay 81).....	Yea
17	Adopt mortgage credit bill to lower interest rates and to fight inflation, to help housing, small business and employment (yea 260; nay 136).....	Yea
	Authorize Education and Labor Committee to travel abroad to conduct certain studies and investigations (yea 224; nay 153).....	Nay

COLONEL CESSFORD ON VETERANS DAY

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very interesting speech that was delivered on Veterans Day, November 11, 1969, by a distinguished friend and constituent, Lt. Col. William E. Cessford, USAFR, Liaison Officer Candidate Advisory Service, U.S. Air Force Academy.

Colonel Cessford's remarks are very timely, well presented, and forceful and I believe they will be read appreciatively by many of the large number of people who regularly read the RECORD.

The speech follows:

VETERANS DAY

Veterans Day is a day for all Americans.

It is a day to pause—to acknowledge the respect and admiration we have for our veterans. It is a day to honor those veterans who died in struggle. It is a day to respect those who survive.

In a proclamation urging all Americans to join in commemorating today as Veterans Day, President Richard Nixon reminds us that "From Valley Forge to Vietnam, Amer-

ican servicemen have responded to their nation's call to duty.

"That call has often led to loneliness, hardship, danger—and, for some, death. In response to that call, American servicemen have acted with unsurpassed valor and devotion and have demonstrated to enemies of freedom all over the world that free men and women will defend the principles of a free society.

"After each war or conflict, these dedicated Americans who performed so valiantly as servicemen have returned to build a stronger country. . . . Their contribution to our nation, in war and peace, has been invaluable." There are today some twenty-seven million living American veterans. We carry in our memory about ten million more now resting in peace, more than a million of whom had their lives cut short while in military service.

We assemble, then, to honor forty-one million Americans—men and women of the Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps—living and dead—who have borne arms in defense of freedom.

Nearly five million Americans participated in World War One, "The War to End All Wars." Fighting ended at 11 a.m. on November 11, 1918, under an armistice signed between the Allies and Germany.

Two years later, France and England chose November 11, then known generally as Armistice Day, as the time for placing an unknown soldier of World War One in each Nation's highest place of honor. France chose the Arc de Triomphe. England selected Westminster Abbey. The next year, on November 11, 1921, an American soldier whose name

was "known only to God" was buried at Arlington National Cemetery.

Until 1954 Armistice Day was the occasion for tribute only to the dead of World War One. On June 1, 1954, Congress changed Armistice Day to "Veterans Day." Since then it has been a time for honoring the service of all veterans of all wars.

Significantly, in 1958, two more unidentified American war dead were brought to Arlington Cemetery from overseas and interred beside the World War One soldier. One was killed in World War Two, the other in Korea. To honor the three, symbolic of all Americans who gave their lives, an Army honor guard keeps day and night vigil.

We profit immediately from our observation that the common quality which led our veterans to the battlefield and which unites them today is patriotism, for there are influences in our society today which tend to erode that fundamental value, or civic virtue. Our veterans were motivated by patriotism: by a love of their country and a consequent desire to fulfill their duty to it. We must remember that they rendered their service for that reason, and not to enjoy the rewards and praises which their countrymen would later bestow.

They represent a cross section of the nation, in that they are found in all walks of life. They are American servicemen who served honorably and well, but who cannot consider their duty done. Some are still in active service, some are members of our reserve components; many, while pursuing their civilian employments, are active in our many fine veterans organizations. All of these organizations demonstrate that our service-

men do not shed their patriotism with their uniform—that patriotism is nothing less than good citizenship. Such organizations give vigorous support to the task of keeping America strong. Their actions, in concert with the continuing support of other conscientious citizens across the nation, reflect the national will to maintain and defend our way of life.

In addition to his primary mission of being ready to fight, the American soldier of today is frequently required to be a teacher, a humanitarian, a linguist, and a diplomat. He must understand the people among whom he lives around the world and must study their problems—especially in underdeveloped nations. He is required to perform service in all sorts of civic action programs, from assistance in agriculture and public health to riot control and flood relief. He must provide the people of those nations with an intelligent understanding of our way of life and of the reasons for our presence among them. He must be a worthy representative of our nation. And he is.

General Westmoreland says of the soldier: "I can confidently predict that from his ranks in the years ahead will come the confident, alert, intelligent citizens and leaders who will make this nation's future greater than its past. I say this, first of all, because I sincerely believe he will be much more willing and able to assume his role in his community than when he left."

No soldier in history has ever been given a more comprehensive and exacting mission than has the American soldier of today. By his resourcefulness, versatility, and courage, he continues to reflect the heritage of 194 years of service—a heritage that grows brighter each year. The men and women who are carrying the responsibility of military service today draw inspiration from the record of all Americans who have served our country before them—a record to which the veterans here today, and those who have died on a hundred battlefields, have made such a distinguished contribution.

It is therefore proper that we honor the veterans who have done so much to preserve our nation and to uphold her ideals. In doing so, we rightly express our appreciation for the great achievements of the past; but, moreover, we rededicate ourselves and renew our strength to meet successfully the responsibilities and dangers which lie before us.

We make this Veterans Day, then, a commemoration of the past, and acknowledgement of the present, and a pledge for the future, as we work together for world peace.

JAYCEES CONTRIBUTE MUCH TO NATION

HON. LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, U.S. Jaycees are celebrating their 50th anniversary this week.

I hasten to pay tribute to this outstanding organization of true "young men of action" and to their great ideals and dedication thereto.

Not only do these young men of high character and determined activity give much of themselves to the betterment of their community and their country but, by their personal example, they inspire other young men to do the same.

I recognize that some of my distinguished colleagues and members of their

staffs have moved to their positions of public service via service with the Jaycees.

To Jaycees everywhere, "Happy 50th anniversary, and many happy returns for many more half centuries to come."

HEW APPROPRIATION BILL

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the administration has offered several rationalizations for a vote to sustain the President's veto of the HEW appropriations bill. They are all specious. I would like to set out for the record the administration's rationalizations and respond to each of them:

ISSUE: INFLATION

ADMINISTRATION POSITION

"The bill would increase inflationary pressures by adding almost \$1.3 billion to the HEW budget proposed by President Nixon."

REBUTTAL

Although the bill would add some \$1.3 billion to the Health and Education budgets proposed by the President, that increase should not be taken in a vacuum. The whole truth is that Congress, overall, has reduced the Administration's budget for 1970 by \$5.6 billion. In other words, Congress has taken the initiative and gone beyond the Administration's requests for fiscal restraint. In cutting the Administration's budget, however, the Congress has exercised its own sense of priorities, excising some defense and foreign aid fat and stressing health and education.

As indicated in the Life-Harris poll, education spending by the Federal government enjoys the highest priority of any Federal investment. This means that if the President is successful in having his veto sustained, state and localities will, to the extent permitted by law, tax themselves to take up the slack. The suggestion, then, that this veto will help the fight against inflation is spurious: money is going to be provided for education, and it is difficult to understand the President's implicit logic that state and local dollars are less inflationary than Federal dollars.

The Administration's major argument to support a veto of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill, H.R. 13111, is that the \$1.3 billion which the bill would provide for health and education in excess of the President's budget requests would be inflationary.

In this context the remarks of Dr. Herbert Stein, a member of President Nixon's Council of Economic Advisors, are most appropriate. On November 21, 1969, Dr. Stein spoke to the Tax Institute of America Symposium at the Princeton Inn, Princeton, New Jersey. He stated:

I have the impression that many people now see a magical significance in a shift of a few billion dollars in the budget position, especially if the shift crosses the line between surplus and deficit. In a trillion dollar economy this is hard to understand, especially after our recent experience with the limited significance of the budget shift between a \$25 billion deficit in fiscal 1968 and a \$3 billion surplus in fiscal 1969. Preoccupation with small changes in the budget position leads to bad forecasts by the private economy and bad policy by the government.

Dr. Stein's observations have interesting ramifications:

1. It is extremely doubtful that a \$1.3 bil-

lion difference in government expenditures can have any significant economic impact in an economy with a trillion dollar GNP and a \$200 billion budget.

2. This "inflationary" \$1.3 billion is approximately only one-tenth of one per cent of a trillion dollar GNP.

3. \$1.3 billion is about one-half of one per cent of the \$200 billion budget.

Inflation is a big and serious problem. But sacrificing educational opportunities is not the way to fight it. There are other ways and the President has steadfastly refused to exercise them:

1. Seven days after his inauguration, Nixon announced that his Administration would not intervene in pricing and wage determinations.

2. The President has refused to use moral suasion and the great powers of the Presidency (including purchasing policies, stockpile, etc.), to stop price increases.

3. By passing P.L. 91-151, the Congress gave the President credit control authority to help stem inflation, slow interest rates and help homebuilders and small builders and small business. The President signed the bill but announced he will not use the authority granted him.

In sum, then, the President's justification for his attack on education in the name of inflation is fallacious.

Priorities

"Some in Congress . . . say that by making reductions in Defense and other appropriations, they have merely restructured budget priorities.

"This is simply not accurate. The facts are that all actions by the first session of the 91st Congress, when combined with the rapid rise in uncontrollable costs of government, have had the effect of increasing total Federal spending, not decreasing it."

One of the "uncontrollable" costs, cited by Presidential Counselor Bryce Harlow, is the \$800 million increase on interest on the public debt. The \$800 million increase is "a direct result of the high interest rate policy of the Administration."

Further, whether Congress had cut the \$5.6 billion from the Administration budget or not, the "uncontrollable" is "uncontrollable" by definition. Thus, absent the Congressional budget cutting the Administration would have been in even worse shape than it now depicts itself as suffering. But, to make a token increase for health and education programs a scapegoat for inflation is to work a deception on the Congress and the public. The fault lies with the Administration, both for fiscal mismanagement and for poor judgment as to the needs of the American people.

Additional funding comes too late to use

"By the time action is finally taken on the bill, there will be only three or four months left in the fiscal year, which ends June 30. It will be too late to hire teachers for the present term or to affect teaching programs in effective and preferred ways."

This argument is specious in four respects:

1. Like the Federal government school districts have to prepare their budgets in advance and make plans thereon. One factor which schools need to include in their budgets is a reasonable anticipation of Federal funds. Based on good faith judgments, in reliance on past performance of the Federal government, these budgets commit local school districts to a level of expenditure prior to final Congressional action. As a result, commitments for expenditure of anticipated Federal funds have already been made; schools in many instances are operating in the red. Programs are underway.

2. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a \$1.2 billion program as budgeted by the Administration (and \$1.4 billion as budgeted by the Congress) accounts for some \$200 million of the education increase. This program is permitted to

expend funds for summer programs through August—two months beyond the end of the fiscal year.

3. Following the Administration argument leads to the unsupportable conclusion that no funds should be appropriated—even those requested by the Administration; to argue to the contrary would be to say that, for instance, schools can spend \$1.2 billion for Title I ESEA, but cannot spend \$1.4 billion, or that although as in years past, this year they have budgeted funds for purchase of library books and films, they cannot purchase them now.

4. For the last three years, appropriations have come nearly as late as this year's:

Fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, Bureau of the Budget released education funds to the Office of Education the last week in December 1966.

Fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, Bureau of the Budget released education funds to the Office of Education on January 16, 1968.

Fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, Bureau of the Budget released education funds to the Office of Education on October 30, 1968.

VERRIDE THE VETO

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is scheduled to consider Wednesday Nixon's veto of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for fiscal 1970.

I shall vote to override the veto.

I believe that the President has made a mistake in imposing this additional delay on the funding of these two major departments.

The President's action is political—not practical.

He implied in his veto message that he would have to spend all of the allocated funds by June 30. This, of course, is not true. Indeed, it is the President who has full authority and responsibility for the expenditure of funds appropriated by Congress, a function he exercises through his Bureau of the Budget.

What the President has done by this veto—in addition to a dramatic display of television penmanship—is to penalize two areas of our economy which can least afford penalties. These are the areas of healthcare and education.

I do not for a minute contend that the finalized Labor-HEW money bill is perfect. Rarely is any compromise measure perfect. But it was good enough to justify presidential signature so the two departments could get about their business in an orderly fashion.

My feeling and conviction is that the President's reasoning to justify a veto was pretty weak and impractical.

I hope sincerely that the Congress will vote to override his veto.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks an editorial from the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express of January 25:

HEW BUDGET IS POLITICAL FOOTBALL

By its approval of the \$19.7-billion appropriation for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the U.S. Senate threw down the gauntlet to President Nixon who had threatened, before the 91st Congress recessed, to veto the measure if passed. That

threat was recently repeated by the president on the grounds that the bill was inflationary.

It's probably true that the HEW projects which the money would finance contain inflationary factors but those factors are present in most segments of the economy and have been for months. It's also true that the administration's anticipated \$1.8-billion increment in spending for the anti-ballistic missile project could add to the inflationary spiral, too. One might ask why Mr. Nixon made no mention of vetoing that item.

Reportedly, his specific objection to the HEW bill is that it contains \$1-billion more for education purposes than he requested. And that brings up the issue of national priorities again. Sen. Mike Mansfield, Democratic leader in the Senate, made the point well when he said that Senate Democrats were going to insist that the Republican administration strike a better balance among urgent needs at home and the unending demands made in the name of military security.

If the president were to veto the bill, it could place him in a most untenable situation for it is generally admitted that health research and education programs are in serious straits. But it is also unfortunate that the HEW bill has become a political football, that it is being used as a vehicle for campaign politics in a congressional election year.

Although the Senate vote—74-17, indicates that a veto could be overridden in that body, the House, which gets first crack at a possible conference committee version because of an amendment dealing with Office of Economic Opportunity programs, certainly might sustain the veto and thus kill the measure. It seems regrettable that the hopes and fears of millions of persons depending on HEW grants are being alternately raised and chilled by the present political power struggle.

MESSAGE OF PEACE IS HOPE FOR BETTER WORLD

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, although the Christmas season and its great spiritual message is now a month behind us, I recall the spirit of the season at this time to call attention to an editorial comment telecast over WMC-TV in Memphis on Christmas Eve last. The comment, the Norman Brewer Report, is a regular telecast of Norman Brewer, newsman and commentator for that station.

I insert this editorial at this time because the message is so clearly put and so vital to building the better world for which all of us strive. Perhaps, by extending our thinking about Christmas for an extra month, it will help many of us to make greater effort to apply these deep seated principles throughout the year and thus truly bring to full realization the hope that was brought to the world so long ago, and there will be peace for all men of good will everywhere.

Mr. Brewer's editorial follows:

THE NORMAN BREWER REPORT

Most of the guns of most of the armies of most of this world have fallen silent now, and Christmas Eve is again a night of uncommon peace. It will last at least for Christmas Day, but somehow this night has always had its

own special quality. Christmas Eve even more than Christmas Day has always seemed to work a kind of magic on people; or perhaps it is that people work a magic on Christmas Eve. In either event, it is a phenomenon peculiar to that annual period between sunset on December 24th and sunrise on December 25th. It is as though—in those dark and quiet hours—something steals into the human spirit; heals it, warms it, makes it whole and one. It could be that Dickens had it right when those ghosts came calling on Ebenezer Scrooge.

Fortunately, we have not been so frighteningly transformed, but transformed we are nevertheless. How else can we account for the cheer and goodwill with which we suddenly greet each other; the real charity that pours from us; the love that is re-kindled in us; the world peace we are able to impose for just a few hours. If it is not by some seasonal osmosis—if it is not by holiday magic—then could it be that we are capable of all this, all of the time? Could it be that Christmas Eve is the fulfillment of the human id—that cheer and goodwill and charity and love and peace are our instinctual needs, surfacing tonight because it is expected of us tonight? I don't know. Maybe we are all just pretending. But it is comforting to pause and to think that we are all really as we seem to be tonight—and to hope that someday we will build a world in that image.

THE COST TO EACH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT FOR SUPPORTING THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF EDUCATIONAL FUNDS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to vote to sustain or override President Nixon's veto of the education bill, I would like to call my colleagues attention to how much money their respective congressional districts would lose in impact funds if the veto is sustained.

The chart which I am inserting in the RECORD today shows how much money each congressional district received under the federally impacted areas law in fiscal 1968.

If members vote to sustain the President's veto, they will be voting to deprive the schools in their districts of the amounts of money listed as "B" money. This loss would occur because the President has only requested funding for "A" category children in his budget request.

In his veto message, President Nixon severely criticized expenditures for category "B" so it is highly unlikely he would sign any future continuing resolution to include category "B" even if Congress should vote such a resolution if the veto is sustained.

Let me remind the House that the existing continuing resolution which includes expenditures for category "B" students expires at the end of this month. The chairman of the appropriations committee in the other body said he would not permit continued funding of category "B" through any further continuing resolutions when this one expires.

I would urge my colleagues who are

considering voting against these funds to examine the losses which their congressional districts will suffer and ask themselves if they can inflict this crisis

on their financially beleaguered school districts. And I would caution those who believe they can vote to sustain the veto and then turn around and vote an in-

crease solely for impacted areas that they are mistaken if they believe such a maneuver will succeed.

The tables follow:

CHILDREN AND PAYMENTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW NO. 874, FISCAL YEAR 1968 DATA AS OF JUNE 30, 1968

Table with columns: State and congressional district numbers, Number of 'A' children, Number of 'B' children, 'A' amount, 'B' amount, 'A'+ 'B' amount, Number of district schools. Rows include states like Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, etc.

the Nation to Washington to study the workings of government.

Chambers of commerce are found throughout the world and are strongly entrenched in American life at many levels. It may be of interest that the first chamber of commerce was organized in New York City in 1768 with the purpose of encouraging commerce, supporting industry, adjusting disputes relative to trade and navigation, and proposing such laws and regulations as may be found necessary for the benefit of trade in general. The national chamber has a membership of over 3 million firms and individuals and is a vital factor in keeping America the great Nation it is.

Today's youth are tomorrow's men and women who will inherit the present and become tomorrow's leaders in business, the professions, industry, and Government. The Jaycees are a great factor in guiding and inspiring the youth of our land to truly become worthy citizens, patriotic and devoted to the highest ideals of service. May their second half century prove as successful as the first and I wish them the very best in the years ahead.

FIRST SESSION, 91ST CONGRESS NEWSLETTER TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. PATTEN, Mr. Speaker, periodically, I send a newsletter to some of my constituents in order to help them keep abreast of my congressional activities.

The contents of my January, 1970, newsletter, follow:

TAX REFORM-RELIEF BILL GREATEST IN HISTORY

The most comprehensive tax reform-relief program in the Nation's history highlighted the legislative achievements of the first session of the 91st Congress. It was the most significant accomplishment of all, for it will benefit virtually every taxpayer in the Nation.

I was pleased to be one of the sponsors of tax reform-relief legislation, because of the imperative need for revamping our antiquated and unfair system. Hundreds of my constituents also wrote to me, citing the importance of improving our inequitable system. The bill passed by Congress and signed by President Nixon was so broad and sweeping (the conference report was 346 pages long), it could not be covered in this newsletter. However, some of the provisions will:

Increase the personal exemption for each dependent from the present \$600 to \$750 over a 3-year period.

Increase by 1973 the present deduction from 10% of income, or \$1,000, whichever is lower, to 15%, or \$2,000. (Designed to help lower and middle income groups).

Eliminate 5.5 million poor from the tax rolls.

Tax those with "tax-free" income exceeding \$30,000 with a new "minimum tax" of at least 10%.

Decrease the oil depletion allowance from the present 27½%, to 22%.

Levy a 4% tax on foundation for the first time.

Increase Social Security benefits by 15% across-the-board.

OTHER IMPORTANT LEGISLATION PASSED

Among other important legislation approved by the House of Representatives, were (not all was approved by the Senate as this newsletter was printed): A draft lottery that will eliminate some of the inequities of the present system . . . extension of Federal, aid to elementary and secondary schools . . . the Insured Student Loan Emergency Act to assist college students in obtaining loans . . . water pollution control to attack one of the Nation's most challenging natural resource problems . . . extension of the anti-poverty program to provide victims of deprivation with help and hope . . . amending the Clean Air Act to broaden the battle against air pollution . . . extension of the Mental Health Centers Act in the fight to cure the mentally ill by treating them with new and more effective techniques, instead of dooming patients in custodial isolation . . . the Drug Abuse Education Act, which would educate students on the dangers and effects of drug abuse . . . a strong coal mine safety program to protect those who work in that hazardous occupation . . . a school lunch program to help needy children get the nutrition they require . . . electoral college reform that would abolish the present electoral method and have the President and Vice President elected by a direct popular vote . . . and many other progressive measures.

MEDICAL RESEARCH CUT DEPLORED

There were also disappointments in some of the House votes, the keenest being the one that reduced appropriations in the critical area of medical research. As one of the sponsors of the program to launch a massive attack against heart disease, cancer and stroke, I was especially disappointed in the Administration's recommendation that U.S. funds be cut from the budget on cancer research.

More than 325,000 Americans are expected to die of cancer this year and 35 million people now living and in good health, will eventually die of this disease. Although I realize what a difficult position the President is in due to mounting inflation, I firmly believe that medical research should have been spared from the cuts. Nothing is more precious than good health, so it was shocking to me that reductions were requested and made in medical research, which is mankind's hope for both better health, and longer life.

INFLATION A MAJOR DOMESTIC PROBLEM

Inflation continues to be a very serious domestic problem, hurting every person in the country. The increase in the 1969 cost of living (through November), was the highest since 1951. Despite the Administration's anti-inflation policies—lower Federal spending, high interest rates that have severely tightened the money supply, and extension of the income surtax—inflation keeps growing at an alarming rate. As your Congressman, I will continue to do what I can to curb inflation. The Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, cut the military budget by \$5.6 billion, and I want to assure my constituents that I am deeply concerned about inflation, and that I will vote to reduce non-essential items whenever possible.

THE 60'S—THE VIOLENT DECADE

The 60's were years of almost unbelievable violence and conflict. A popular and admired President, John F. Kennedy, was assassinated by a fanatic, depriving America and other free nations of the world of a leader with the promise of greatness. Two other talented and respected leaders were also victims of violence—the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and U.S. Sen. Robert F. Kennedy. Ironically, all three leaders were men who were dedicated to peace and justice.

Wide disturbances took place in several major cities and not even colleges and universities were spared. The war in Vietnam—

extremely costly in both manpower and funds—divided the Nation with a bitterness that stunned the world. And another conflict—between the Arabs and Israelis—is not only a threat to the Middle East, but to peace in the world—a powderkeg that could cause the explosion of another world war—one that would be so terrifying and destructive, it would be impossible to believe or survive.

THE 70'S—THE PEACEFUL DECADE?

However, there are also encouraging and gratifying signs. At Helsinki, the United States and Russia agreed to start and continue full-scale strategic arms limitation talks . . . President Nixon announced that development of chemical and biological warfare weapons will be banned by America . . . By April 15, 1970, an estimated 115,000 American troops are scheduled to be withdrawn from Vietnam, with the ultimate hope that only some American support and training personnel will be there . . . Dramatic advances are being made in science: Philip Blaiberg survived 19 months with another person's heart, giving encouragement to thousands of persons . . . The gene—the element that transmits man's hereditary characteristics—was isolated . . . and the greatest scientific achievement in man's long struggle for knowledge and progress—landing man on the moon and returning him safely to earth—opened the most fascinating frontier of all.

The tragedy of modern man is that even though he has accomplished scientific and technological miracles, advances in the vital field of "human engineering" have been slight. Clearly, the compassion of the human heart has failed to keep abreast with the brilliance of the mind. In the areas of brotherhood and understanding, progress seems to be notoriously slow. Yet, despite our serious domestic and foreign problems, the spirit of man is still unconquerable. Perhaps that is his greatest justification for hope.

LIVING AND WORKING TOGETHER IN PEACE

One day before his death—4 months before the first atomic bomb was exploded in war—President Franklin D. Roosevelt warned America and the world that, "Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together, in the same world, at peace." Since then, his admonition has taken on much greater meaning, because of the awesome power of modern military weapons.

The 60's are being called The Violent Decade—and it was far from a peaceful one—but let us all hope that in this decade, man finally acquires the wisdom and courage to ". . . live together and work together . . . in peace," so that future historians will label the 70's, The Peaceful Decade.

Man's quest for peace has always been the most elusive of all, but it is a goal worth striving for—his ultimate triumph. So let us hope that all Nations and their people begin that striving in 1970 with renewed fervency, remembering the exhortation of the prophet, "Come, now, let us reason together," for when Nations and people "reason together," peace not only prevails, it endures.

WORDS TO REMEMBER AND THINK ABOUT

"I look forward to a great future for America, a future in which our country will match its military strength with our moral restraint, its wealth with our wisdom, its power with our purpose. And I look forward to an America which commands respect throughout the world not only for its strength, but for its civilization as well."—Pres. John F. Kennedy, 10-26-63)

MAJORITY OF PUBLIC SUPPORTS
VOLUNTEER ARMY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues may have missed the results of a recent Harris survey published in the Washington Post, January 26. The survey reveals that 52 percent of the American public would like to see our present draft system abolished and replaced with a volunteer Army. I think it is particularly interesting to note that there does not appear to be a generation gap on this issue. While 54 percent of the young people under 30 favor a volunteer Armed Force, 51 percent of the 31-to-49 age group and 50 percent of those over 50 also favor the idea.

In addition, the argument that a volunteer force would create a threat in a democracy and would destroy the American tradition of civilians defending the country in time of war was strongly rejected by the public.

I urge my colleagues to study the results of the survey carefully, and include it at this point in my remarks along with a recent Christian Science Monitor editorial which speculates on the Gates Commission report:

FIFTY-TWO PERCENT FAVOR VOLUNTEER ARMY PLAN

(By Louis Harris)

Although three out of every four support the recent draft lottery plan instituted by the Nixon administration, by 52 to 38 percent the public would like to see the entire draft system scrapped and a volunteer army substituted for it.

Easily the most appealing argument made in behalf of a volunteer army is that then "only young men who want to serve in the armed forces will have to." This argument receives the support of 67 per cent of the American people.

Recently, a cross section of 1,625 households was asked:

"Would you favor a volunteer army as a substitute for the present draft lottery system or would you favor keeping the present draft system?"

VOLUNTEER ARMY
[In percent]

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure
Nationwide.....	52	38	10
By age:			
Under 30.....	54	37	9
31 to 49.....	51	41	9
50 plus.....	50	38	12
By education:			
Grade school or less.....	47	37	16
High school.....	49	41	10
College.....	59	34	7

Younger people, especially those subject to the draft, and the more affluent favor the volunteer army idea most. They most often observed that the trouble with the present system is that it compelled many young men not in sympathy with the war effort to be subject to the draft. They frequently volunteered that even the lottery was an improvement, the most equitable system would be to make the armed forces entirely voluntary.

The survey said to the cross section:

"Let me read you some statements which have been made about a volunteer army.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

For each, tell me if you tend to agree or disagree."

STATEMENTS ABOUT VOLUNTEER ARMY
[In percent]

	Agree	Disagree	Not sure
Positive:			
A volunteer army is good because only young men who want to serve will be in it.....	67	23	10
A volunteer army would make it easier for the United States to fight a war such as Vietnam, and that is good.....	42	40	18
Negative:			
A volunteer army would destroy the American tradition of civilians defending the country in time of war.....	29	56	15
A volunteer army would create a professional military force that would be a real threat in a democracy.....	24	55	21

Clearly, the appeal of a volunteer army is that it satisfies those who dislike military service as well as those who would like to see a professional army. Today, both groups make up a majority of the American public.

TOWARD A VOLUNTEER ARMY

The United States is inching toward reliance on an all-volunteer professional army. When the Vietnam war with its heavy manpower demands is finished, there is no compelling reason why the American armed forces, which are now more enlisted than drafted except in low echelons, should not be entirely volunteer.

A presidential commission headed by former Defense Secretary Thomas Gates has concluded that the armed forces can and should be all-volunteer. It estimates the additional cost—due mainly to making army pay more attractive—would run from \$2 to \$4 billion extra per year. Earlier estimates had put the additional expense at from \$7 to \$17 billion; total costs may need further scrutiny.

There are, of course, arguments against the volunteer concept: That it would produce a professional force, militaristic in concept, unleavened by an annual influx of ordinary civilians. That the concept of universal service, with everyone summoned to the defense of his country, would be gone. And that a volunteer army, attracting the underprivileged by reason of its pay scales and equality of treatment, would be composed largely of blacks.

There are answers to these objections. The presidential commission finds in its surveys (their procedure not yet disclosed) that the volunteer army would not attract more blacks than are now in the armed forces. The "civilian" leavening is held by some experts to be overrated; the Navy and Air Force are almost entirely volunteer and they don't suggest a "German general staff" mentality.

And as for the concept of universal obligation to one's country, this could still be maintained by a new kind of draft for non-military service—every young American summoned, except for valid excuse, to one or two year's service in such activities as conservation, slum clearance, child care, education—areas where needs are great and organizations are short staffed.

President Nixon endorsed the all-volunteer force in his election campaign. Now if a presidential commission which includes Negroes, NATO commanders, members of Congress, and the business community gives the proposal its full endorsement, the concept will be moved closer to enactment, once the Vietnam drain is ended. And one more step will have been taken which should help cool the college campuses—and, incidentally, ease the tensions between Mr. Nixon and American youth.

THE POPULATION BOMB

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, over the past year, the House Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, of which I am chairman, has been studying the effects of population growth. Through our research, we have become aware of the impending international population crisis, and the serious domestic implications of continuing population growth. This research led to the formation of our report on family planning that was released on December 22, 1969.

Recently, a series of four articles by Mr. Kemper Diehl appeared in the San Antonio Evening News concerning the population problem. These excellent articles clearly and cogently explain the facets of this problem, and I include them in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the San Antonio Evening News,
Dec. 27, 1969]

SAN ANTONIO FUTURE THREATENED
(By Kemper Diehl)

In 1968 Mrs. S., a black housewife in the Lincoln Courts area, had her 10th child. Mrs. S. was 41, the wife of a \$60-a-week janitor. She had never heard about family planning or birth control—much less population control.

In June, 1969, a young black social worker of Planned Parenthood of San Antonio met Mrs. S. during a house-to-house canvass of the neighborhood. Now Mrs. S. is on "The Pill". She definitely does not want any more children and the odds are good that she won't have them.

Instead of having a baby this winter she is earning \$30 a week, thus raising the family income 50 per cent.

Planned Parenthood reached Mrs. S. through a special Poverty War program, but it was too late to spare her family from the cycle of want.

Grim statistics disclose that the odds are nearly 50-50 that a family with six or more children will fall into the grip of poverty. The S. family is one which, not surprisingly, is far from the bright side of the poverty line.

Demographers—those students of population trends—are interested in more than the poverty of the S. family. They know that had Mrs. S. had a choice she probably would have limited her family to three children—the number viewed as ideal by the typical urban Negro woman.

Mrs. S. will hardly be missed at the R. B. Green Hospital, however. Through 11 months of 1969, physicians there delivered 3,327 babies and the Green may well eclipse the record of 3,645 infants delivered in 1962.

But it will be a new record filled with heartaches and feelings of guilt.

Reporting on a study of new mothers at the Green, Dr. Joseph Seitchik, chairman of obstetrics of the University of Texas Medical School, reveals that 18 per cent are identified as "unmarried." And he exclaims:

"The vast majority of our patients are having pregnancies they did not want."

A telltale record of pregnancies which have been cut short suggests the pervasiveness of a problem which San Antonians have long been reluctant to confront.

Seitchik reports bluntly that physicians at the Green each month complete 10 to 12

abortions "clearly identified as being induced."

The medical school physicians, of course, are dealing primarily with the poor.

But at what might be considered the opposite end of the scale of wealth and sophistication, the University of Texas Student Health Service in Austin reports it is seeing an "alarming number" of students who have experienced "a poor abortion."

Here in the world's most affluent and educated nation . . . during the second decade of "The Pill" which was supposed to emancipate women . . . in the enlightened age of the "New Morality" . . . clearly something is going wrong.

Statistical reports from the city, state and nation have begun to form a disturbing pattern:

The rate of illegitimate births in the United States, in Texas and in Bexar County has more than doubled in the past 15 years. In 1968, no less than 9.4 per cent of live births in Bexar County were illegitimate—or nearly one of every 10. And the sharp rise has been experienced within every segment of the population.

Last year 304 youngsters left junior high school or senior high school in the San Antonio Independent School District for reasons of illegitimate pregnancy or youthful marriage.

In 1967 a total of 671 illegitimate babies were born to girls under the age of 21 in Bexar County. Of these eight were born to children 13 years of age or younger. There were 17 mothers of illegitimate children who were only 14 years old. When one 19-year-old girl gave birth to an illegitimate child it marked her ninth pregnancy.

During the past decade there has been a resurgence of venereal disease in San Antonio and figures for gonorrhea and syphilis are appallingly high.

After bottoming-out for four years, the number of births recorded by the Metropolitan Health District is rising by 6 percent this year—as the "cohort" of girls born during the great postwar population surge reaches its decade of maximum fertility.

Yet a nationwide survey for the Office of Economic Opportunity has disclosed that—as of 1968—5.3 million medically indigent women were in need of family planning services and that 86 per cent, or about 4.6 million, were not being served. Within this picture, Bexar County ranked seventh in the U.S. in the number of indigent women not receiving service—28,081 out of 32,430 who were in need of family planning assistance.

And perhaps saddest of all, experts in the Office of Population Research at Princeton University have calculated that roughly between 750,000 and a million births in the U.S. each year are "unwanted"—and that this "unwanted fertility" accounts for between 35 and 45 per cent of the recent "natural increase" in population.

Some of the personal disasters viewed by doctors in emergency rooms can be traced to the effects of a time of revolutionary change—to the new hedonism, the crumbling of traditional controls.

But the tide they sense most clearly is the first wave of what has been aptly termed "The Population Bomb"—the great worldwide surge in human numbers which threatens to engulf civilization as we know it—and which lies at the heart of the much-discussed "Environmental Crisis" in the United States.

What has triggered this population bomb after centuries of underpopulation in some parts of the world?

The Agency for International Development points out that it took all of history up to the year 1830 for the world to reach a population of one billion.

Then, as public sanitation spread and scientific medicine developed, the world reached

its second billion in only an additional 100 years—in 1930.

With rapid medical advances—including the widespread use of antibiotics and new malaria control programs—the third billion was reached in a space of only 30 years—1960.

And at present rates of growth the fourth billion will have taken only 15 years when it is reached in 1975.

Today, in 1969, the world's population is about 3.5 billion. If present fertility rates cannot be reduced, the world's population will double to over 7 billion by the year 2000—and at the end of the century a 1-billion leap to 7 million will take only five years.

It is this prospect which has caused Dr. Philip Handler, president of the National Academy of Sciences, to say:

"The greatest threat to the human race is man's own procreation. Hunger; pollution; crime; overlarge, dirty cities—even the seething unrest that leads to international conflict and war—all derive from the unbridled growth of human populations. . . . As we look toward the end of this century, we get closer to the time when the total food supply becomes limiting. If we do not provide more food, we face worldwide famine."

The impact of high birth rates combined with lowered death rates can be devastating on the less-developed countries, especially when the rate of population growth approaches the rate of growth to the economy.

Much of the increased population in such countries consists of dependent children. Their topheavy numbers unbalance the economic system with growing demands for schools and health care, while they are unable to contribute to the gross national product.

It is estimated that in some countries with a swift population growth, fully two-thirds of U.S. aid is consumed simply in keeping up with needs of these additional human beings.

As the Queen said to Alice: "It takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that."

The impact of the population explosion on the United States is different in degree and much more complicated—and it also poses critical problems.

Recently Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, assistant secretary for health and scientific affairs, told the Republican task Force on Earth Resources and Population, headed by U.S. Rep. George Bush of Houston, that if he were "starting from scratch" he would have to list population as the most important health problem of today.

In a thoughtful message to Congress in July President Nixon assessed the U.S. situation. He noted that the nation gained its first 100 million people over a period of three centuries of growth ending in 1917. The second 100 million took only 50 years—to 1967.

The third 100 million, he related, will be added in roughly a 30-year period ending in the year 2000.

The President suggested that many of the nation's present social problems have resulted from the difficulty of absorbing 100 million people into the mainstream of society in 50 years, and he turned to the growth of the next 30 years with the warning:

"We can be sure that society will not be ready for this growth unless it begins planning immediately."

The President listed questions that have been haunting demographers: Where will the next 100 million Americans live? How will we house them? How will we educate and employ such a large number of people? Many of our institutions are already under tremendous strain, he warned, adding, "Will they be swamped by a growing flood of people in the next 30 years?"

Brought to a local level, the 30-year growth problem may come in sharper focus.

In Washington a subcommittee on urban growth of the House Banking Committee has already begun grappling with some of the problems that lie ahead.

In hearings last summer Dr. Jerome P. Pickard, director of the program analysis and evaluation staff of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, outlined a probable population distribution based on a projection of a population of 304 million in the conterminous United States in the year 2000 (this is the first 48 states and District of Columbia).

He made these projections regarding the large urban regions of Texas:

Houston-Galveston: A year 2000 population of 4.4 million—up from 2.1 million in 1970.

North Central Texas (Dallas-Fort Worth): A year 2000 population of 4.2 million—up from 2.2 million in 1970.

San Antonio: A year 2000 population of 1.7 million—up from 900,000 in 1970.

One hope of demographers is that a healthy percentage of the new population can be centered in "new communities".

Pickard expressed belief that 30 per cent of the new growth could go to such towns and he pinpointed 12 for Texas alone. He unveiled this possible "model":

Two new towns of 100,000 and four of 75,000 in the central Gulf Coast area (Houston).

Two towns of 150,000 and two of 100,000 in the North Central Texas area.

One town of 100,000 and one of 75,000 in the South Central Texas (San Antonio-Austin) region.

The problems of health, housing, schooling, transportation, water supply, utility services—and rewarding employment—facing San Antonio and the other urban complexes of Texas are truly staggering.

And President Nixon in his message to Congress also asked what to many Americans is the most crucial question of all:

"What of our natural resources and the quality of our environment?"

This is the issue—"The Environmental Crisis" or the "Ecological Crisis"—that many close observers believe is already replacing the war in Vietnam as the major issue of concerns for college students.

Typical of the new students movement was a University of Colorado geology major who told the New York Times recently: "I think environment is a bigger issue than the war, and I think people are beginning to sense its urgency."

An ecology student at the University of Minnesota told the Times: "Pollution and over population are like a web and pollution is just the symptom."

Observers of the mounting campus concern with environment feel that the recent demonstration at the University of Texas over the removal of oak trees to make way for expansion of the UT stadium was an example of this reaction against the pressure of an exploding student body.

At the Austin campus there are at least six environmental groups with interests ranging from water pollution to conservation law.

It's a movement that cuts across party lines and differing life styles. And the students of the conservation movement are in accord with the thinking of some of the highest officials of government, both in the administration and in Congress.

Dr. Lee DuBridg, science advisor to President Nixon, recently spoke on public policy aspects of "environmental movement" to the American Chemical Society.

Noting that the earth has provided "a very unusual environment" which has made possible human life, he added that "it now seems probable that it is the only planet in the solar system which can support life."

DuBridge warned that the number of living things has multiplied so rapidly that "it seems as though life itself is destined to despoil or render unusable the very things in the environment that have made life possible."

He then declared:

"Clearly, the human being is the one form of life that is making the greatest inroads on the environment. In the industrial society which man has built he uses the natural resources of the earth at a colossal rate, and to a large extent converts these resources to unusable forms, thus producing vast quantities of waste materials . . .

"In recent years the people of America have become keenly and somewhat belatedly aware of the inroads which our kind of living makes upon our environment.

"As we breathe polluted air, as we observe and use polluted water, as we observe colossal mountains of junk and waste, and as we see the rapid disappearance of open spaces and recreational areas, we have realized that the earth's environmental resources are limited, and that further deterioration of the environment must be brought to a halt."

As Dr. DuBridge suggests, the population problem is not centered with the poor alone. And Dr. Jean Mayer, the noted Harvard nutritionist who is a special advisor to the president, has observed that as disposable incomes increase, people consume more, and take up more space. He added:

"With increasing income people stop drinking water as much. As a result we spread 48 billion (rust proof) cans and 20 million (nondegradable) bottles over our landscape every year.

"We produce 800 million pounds of trash a day, a great deal of which ends up in our fields, or parks, and our forests. . . . Nine million cars, trucks and buses are abandoned every year. . . ."

The monumental job facing those attempting pollution control during the next 30 years can be measured on the local level by a single pertinent forecast: The San Antonio River Authority last week revealed that the flow of sewage effluent from metropolitan San Antonio which was at about 65,000 acre feet per year in 1960 has risen to 90,000 acre feet per year at present.

It will leap to about 210,000 acre feet per year in the year 2000.

Perhaps the most sobering statistic of all was hammered home by Dr. Paul R. Ehrlich, the Stanford University professor who coined the phrase 'Population Bomb', when he appeared before the Bush Committee.

Dr. Ehrlich explained that the government must realize that all of our environmental problems are directly related to population growth and urged that the U.S. authorities clearly "relate the national situation to the world situation." His warning:

"That in the year 2000, the United States will constitute 6 per cent of the world's population, but will be using at least one-half of the world's unrenewable resources!

Another eloquent crusader, Dr. Durward L. Allen, Purdue University Anthropologist, warned in the August publication of the Population Reference Bureau that "Americans would do well to reconsider their national obsession with growth."

In this he was anticipating the dash of cold water tossed at the San Antonio Chamber of Commerce Monday night at its annual meeting by none other than Jenkin Lloyd Jones, the Tulsa editor who is president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

As the local Chamber officials celebrated the city's booming growth, Jones, in his own words, "toted in a coffin."

"To make San Antonio bigger in the next decade is going to be a cinch," he warned. "The crunch will be to keep this city human."

And Jones went on to warn of the alienation that infects many elements of a society grown too big. "When man grows to where he is overwhelmed by his own kind, he becomes callous of his own kind," he said.

Warning against the "more-the-merrier" syndrome, Jones asserted: "Man is drowning in his own proliferation."

Can man meet the problems of proliferation and mass urbanization? In his article, Allen takes a gloomy view.

He cites scholarly studies which explore the geometrical increase in the complexity of individual relationships that results as more numbers are added. And he sums up:

"It seems evident that concentrations of people and, more generally, the growth of nations, produce great complexity that expands in geometric proportion in the build-up of population density."

He goes on to say that the uninitiated might think that a doubling of world (or local) population by the year 2000 would simply mean a doubling of the problems of government and society.

But this, he argues, would "fall far short of reality."

And he quotes a presidential commission on recreation as reporting:

"No major urban center in the world has yet demonstrated satisfactory ways to accommodate growth. In many areas, expanding population is outrunning the readily available supply of food, water, and other basic resources and threatens to aggravate beyond solution the staggering problems of the new urban society."

Too few political leaders, mourns Allen, have yet heard "the tramp of approaching millions."

Actually, the "tramp" is now being heard by many. One of them is Bush who spoke for a large group of congressional leaders recently in reporting on his task force hearings:

"The fact that at present growth rates we can expect another 100 million people in the next 30 years is certainly a shocker . . .

"In 22 hearings, we have learned that the deterioration of our physical environment as well as our social environment is a result of this fantastic rate of population growth.

"No one can yet honestly say how many people this earth of ours can accommodate. However, we do know that our inability to manage up to now has been our lack in understanding the significance of the population growth rate and the distribution of the population.

"We do need to act intelligently. We do need to rally public awareness so that government controls can be avoided."

Bush has also warned: "What we need in the next decade is some new thinking about our prevailing attitudes toward marriage and children. How we address ourselves to this problem is going to take an honest national debate. . . . I am confident that once the acts are well understood, the young people of the world, particularly here in America, will voluntarily contain the size of their families. . . ."

As yet there has been little discussion of what lies beyond the year 2000—when at present growth rates population will double in shorter and shorter periods of time. But the National Academy of Sciences has summed up the issue briefly:

"Either the birth rate of the world must come down or the death rate must go back up."

[From the San Antonio Evening News, Dec. 28, 1969]

ILLEGITIMACY IN A SEX-SATURATED WORLD (By Kemper Diehl)

These were the observations last week of two distinguished physicians who have been viewing from sharply contrasting vantage

points an alarming rise in the number of illegitimate babies being born in the United States.

The first was Dr. Joseph Seitchik, chairman of the Department of Obstetrics of the University of Texas Medical School in San Antonio, and he was speaking of teenage mothers from poverty areas whose illegitimate babies are delivered at the R. E. Green Hospital.

The second was Dr. Paul Trickett, director of the Student Health Center of the University of Texas at Austin, and he was speaking of typical middle class coeds who visit the center and find that they are pregnant, though unmarried.

The statistics which spell out soaring illegitimacy rates in the county, state and nation can only be described as appalling. Here is the picture in brief:

In the United States the illegitimacy rate per 1,000 live births rose from 39.9 in 1950 to 52.7 in 1960 and to 90.3 in 1967.

During the same 17-year span the illegitimacy rate for white infants rose from 17.5 per 1,000 live births in 1950 to 48.7 in 1967. The rate for black infants rose from 180.4 in 1950 to 293.8 in 1967.

In Texas the illegitimacy rate rose from 29.6 per 1,000 live births in 1940 to 35.2 in 1950 and to 52.2 in 1960. By 1968 it had soared to 87.9 per 1,000 live births. Between 1940 and 1968 the rate for white babies rose from 16.2 to 48.7. For black infants the jump was from 124.6 to 296.0.

In San Antonio the 1956 rate was 45.1 per 1,000 births. By 1968 it had jumped to 94.0 in Bexar County. Within the county last year one of every 13 babies of Spanish-speaking mothers was illegitimate. Nearly one of every 10 babies of the "other white" category was illegitimate and nearly one of every four black babies was illegitimate.

By 1967 there were approximately 4.5 million children under the age of 18 in the U.S. who were illegitimate and the national cost of 1.1 million illegitimate children on Aid for Dependent Children rolls was \$48,730,000 a year.

A 1967 survey disclosed that 41 per cent of the mothers of 1,298 illegitimate babies born in San Antonio that year were teen-agers.

It is clear that the growing problem of unwed mothers cuts across every stratum of modern society. Perhaps most significant is the effect of what has been called "the sexual revolution" on the nation's campuses.

Despite the fact that knowledge and use of "The Pill"—the most convenient contraceptive in human history—has been common for at least a decade, an increasing number of highly intelligent and educated young women are having babies out of wedlock.

Dr. Trickett, a calm and perceptive obstetrician, has spent 10 years in college health work, including assignments at the University of Michigan and Tulane University. He is well aware of the threat of unwanted pregnancy to the 13,743 coeds on the Austin campus.

"This situation has affected all colleges and universities," he observed recently, "and we are aware of a good number of pregnancies because we're tuned in to it."

He paused and then reported: "We diagnose approximately one unmarried pregnancy per day."

Trickett pointed out that unmarried pregnancy has been a long-standing problem on college campuses, but added soberly:

"It's difficult to understand the increase when birth control pills are readily available and there are other methods available."

The campus health chief then underlined two problems of an increasingly serious nature:

The health center is seeing "a marked increase of venereal disease" and "if other colleges say they are not, they just aren't looking for it." The rise in VD can only be seen

as a by-product of increased sexual activity and promiscuity.

The health center is seeing a "good number" of coeds who are coming back from experiences with illegal abortions to "see if they are all right."

Dr. Trickett reported:

"We see an alarming number who have had a poor abortion and are infected. If they come in here and have been poorly aborted, that's a medical problem."

Where do coeds obtain the ever-increasing number of abortions which are suggested by various indices? Trickett reported:

"There's a nurse in San Antonio who does a pretty lousy job . . . and some go to Mexico. They go all over."

Trickett made it clear that the college physicians have no specific idea where coeds have obtained abortions, but only see the results.

The Student Health Center has no written policy on "The Pill" or other birth control methods. Students who have prescriptions may obtain pills at the center pharmacy.

"I don't believe I should dictate to our physicians," Trickett related. "I'm certain some physicians do prescribe pills for unmarried coeds when they feel they are on a collision course."

At the same time Trickett is equally certain that other physicians at the center do not believe in "The Pill" on medical or religious grounds and do not prescribe the contraceptive.

What happens when a coed is found to be pregnant, though unmarried?

"We try to counsel the young ladies and see if there is a good solution," Trickett reported.

The young women receive not only medical counseling, but also the assistance of psychiatric social workers.

"We will, if they want us to, get hold of their parents," the physician related, adding:

"Many times—though the kids don't realize it—their parents are their best friends. But we don't seem to get this across to the kids."

At the same time Trickett has found disturbing instances which suggest the role played by the "generation gap" in some unmarried pregnancies.

All too often he reported, the first reaction of a girl in her pregnancy is to exclaim: "Oh how this will disappoint mom and dad!"

And a disturbingly familiar parental reaction is: "What will this do to my reputation?"

Trickett observed: "It kind of gives you insight into the difficulties these kids have with their parents."

The rise in the incidence of pre-marital sex activity among college youngsters is a trend that reaches far beyond a single campus. It is a national or even international development.

Results of a poll undertaken by Social Critic Vance Packard which were announced last year disclosed that college males are currently only slightly more sexually experienced than those interviewed by the Kinsey group in the 1940s.

However, the survey found that 43 per cent of the 21-year-old coeds in the sample were sexually experienced as contrasted to only 27 per cent during the Kinsey era—a 60 per cent increase.

While these results supported the contentions of those who say the level of sexual activity is rising on campuses, Packard pointed out that they did not show activity to be as rampant as claimed by some observers.

The study disclosed that girls in universities in Norway, Germany and England were all more experienced than their U.S. counterparts with, surprisingly, the most permissive attitudes reported in England.

Writing of the rising incidence of sexual activity among young people and its often

tragic consequences, Dr. Mary Calderone, a specialist in public health, has observed:

"The difficulty is of our own making. In the last 15 years we have lifted all forms of discipline and control and substituted nothing for them."

"We have given our children keys to cars, and money they can use to go to motels. Meanwhile, mother and father are off working or golfing or playing bridge. Few are the rules about anything, including sex."

Other authorities have warned against the crude and all-pervading eroticism with which the young are assaulted by various media of communication.

Dr. Trickett noted that many of the grandmothers of today's coeds were married by the time they were the age of the college students of 1969. He observed:

"We're asking these healthy females to wait . . . because we need them in college or in graduate school. We've given to wait or take a chance. But they are normal healthy individuals with normal drives."

Changes in the moral climate of society are also having considerable effect.

"The old ethic was that sex is so good that it should be waited for and experienced in the proper context," he observed.

This ethic, however, has been undermined by the "buy-now, pay-later credit card society," he explained.

The influence of the new hedonistic philosophy being promoted in many quarters has increased the impact of ever-present sexual stimuli in modern advertising.

Young people, Dr. Trickett warned, are "getting all mixed up between sex and love . . . and some of them are missing the part that love plays in this."

He worried:

"I feel we're going to have a bunch of sexual neurotics if we're not careful."

Pondering the rising trend of illegitimacy among young women in the San Antonio poverty areas, Dr. Seitchik explained recently:

"There is a biological phenomenon that people have to understand—it is that both boys and girls are coming into physical sexual maturity far earlier."

Seitchik reported that the girl of today reaches physical maturity two years earlier than did the girl of 40 years ago. A typical young lady now matures at 12.

The 16-year-old girl of 1969 is as physically mature as was her grandmother when she was 18 (and probably married).

At the same time Seitchik continued, the extended education system of 1969 delays the time when a boy "comes to grips with getting a job." He asserted:

"We have social and educational maturity later and physical maturity earlier and we're not facing up to this."

Putting it another way, Seitchik argued that 40 years ago a girl faced only about a four-year gap between menstruation and marriage, while today that gap often has been extended to 10 years or more.

Noting the heavy incidence of illegitimacy among babies born to teen-agers, Dr. Seitchik exclaimed:

"It isn't at all planned. They're ignorant . . . and even if they had information (about birth control) and wanted to plan, they can't get services."

"Because you have to have parental consent, I can't even do pelvic examinations in this state except in an emergency. And I can't prescribe drugs . . ."

Dr. C. E. Gibbs of the University of Texas Medical School has been in close touch with the problems of unwed mothers who are patients of the Green.

He is conducting a scientific survey of mothers of new babies at the hospital.

Though the survey will not be completed until next spring, early results indicate that 18 per cent of the mothers of infants born at the Green are unmarried.

Gibbs has already noted some unhappy patterns emerging in the study.

For example, it appears that a number of the unwed mothers avoided pre-natal care services because they were hiding their pregnancy.

Most physicians consider adequate pre-natal care to be five or more visits, with the first visit in the first half of the pregnancy.

"One of the really costly features of the illegitimacy problem is the dropout," Gibbs related recently. "By and large when a girl's pregnancy becomes known she is asked to leave school."

All too many do not return.

Records of the San Antonio Independent School District indicate that last year 64 girls dropped out of school because of pregnancy, while another 240 students (both boys and girls) dropped out because of early marriage.

Emphasizing a need for girls to continue their education, Gibbs counseled:

"It has been shown that if such girls have good educational care and good medical care, they can have a bright future. But without support, a girl who is pregnant and doesn't marry has a high rate of repetition."

One alternative for an unwed mother is to seek the help of a "home" such as the Methodist Mission Home of Texas on Whitby Road or the Salvation Army Home and Hospital.

At the Methodist home, supported by the Methodist Conferences of Texas and New Mexico, girls generally stay from three to four months. Their babies are delivered at Southwest Texas Methodist Hospital.

Most give their babies up for adoption, but a few choose to take them home. The infants remain in the Methodist Hospital nursery until the day they are placed for adoption or until the girl takes her baby home. Last year 322 girls came to the home and only 19 kept their babies.

"Our most frequent age of mothers is between 15 and 19," reported Dr. Spencer L. Stockwell, administrator, recently. "But we have had them as young as 9 and as old as 40."

Of the nine-year-old, he exclaimed:

"Can you imagine? She had her 10th birthday before she delivered. That was just three years ago."

Most of the girls at the Methodist Home are from middle class families and Stockwell's analysis of their problems is similar to those of Dr. Trickett and other authorities.

There is the mood of permissiveness throughout society and other influences and pressures are also at work.

"We're asking kids to postpone giving vent to their sex urges for a longer period than ever before," he declared. "But we're not getting them prepared for responsible marriage."

He continued:

"The pressures they are under today are almost unbelievable. There's the overemphasis on sexuality of a brash type and they are led to believe that it is unhealthy not to express oneself sexually as soon as possible—that's tommyrot."

Declaring there is a "large amount of downright ignorance on the part of youngsters as to their sexuality," he argued that parents, schools and churches are falling down in meeting the need to talk to youngsters frankly and help them understand basic values.

Statistical studies assign from 41 to 44 per cent of illegitimate births to teen-age mothers and their plight has caused some of those close to the poverty scene to call for legalization of abortion on a broad basis.

In 43 states abortion is permitted only if the pregnancy threatens the mother's life. The other seven states and the District of Columbia are somewhat more permissive. In 1967 and 1968 five states adopted liberalized laws.

In a frank statement to the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, U.S. Rep. Shirley Chisholm, the New York Democrat who was the first black woman elected to Congress, proposed outright "repeal" of abortion laws.

Speaking of the situation in one state, she declared:

"Nearly half of those seeking abortions are unmarried girls. Unless these girls have the \$600 or \$700 it takes to get a therapeutic abortion and are willing to swear to two psychiatrists that they are going to jump off a ledge, the only solution is to have the child.

"Society's attitude seems to be 'You've had your pleasure, now pay the price.' What is more immoral, granting an abortion or forcing a young girl—some of them as young as 14 and 15—to assume the responsibilities of an adult while she is still a child?"

"What are we doing to the mother? What are we doing to the child?"

"If a white girl gives up her child for adoption there is a pretty good chance that the child will be adopted. This is not the case for black and other minority group children. They spend their lives in orphanages and foster homes.

"This is one of the prime reasons why so many black girls keep their babies . . .

"Is it more humane for these children to grow up unwanted and unloved?"

Hitting at another aspect of the problem, she testified:

"By forcing a young girl to have an unwanted child, we are assigning her to society's trash heap. Young, confused, usually without skills or training, she will be cut off from avenues of opportunity. Widows and divorcees have a rough time in the marriage market. Unwed mothers have it even rougher.

"By punishing her to have the baby, have we solved any problems? I think not—I think we have created some."

In Texas no public official and few others who grapple with the problem of illegitimacy have so far indulged in such frank talk.

At the University of Texas, Dr. Trickett made the position of the Student Health Center clear:

"We don't do abortions and we don't recommend them."

But those charged with the health of students are not brushing the problem of illegitimacy aside.

"We're doing some informal health education on the campus," said Trickett, "and we've had some gratifying results."

Physicians and counselors of the health service have given a series of lectures to students and have reached around 4,000 coeds in class and groups usually ranging from 50 to 250.

"I gave a talk to some 750 kids a couple of weeks ago on birth control," reported Trickett with satisfaction.

The lack of knowledge about ways to control the size of families and the avenues open to those who seek help is not confined to youngsters.

Studies at the Green have shown that up to 80 per cent of all mothers of babies being delivered there are interested in finding some way of limiting their families.

In view of well-established links between family size and incidence of poverty, the provision of birth control services for women in poverty areas has become a major weapon in the War on Poverty.

[From the San Antonio Evening News, Dec. 29, 1969]

POPULATION BOMB (By Kemper Diehl)

A Christmas tree blinked merrily in the background in the waiting room of a Planned Parenthood Clinic deep in San Antonio's "poverty area" one day last week as a tired-

looking woman discussed her haunting fears with a social work aide.

The interview was taking place at the Wesley Community Center No. 2 at 1406 Fitch St. and the woman's fears concerned the possibility she might have another baby—or another miscarriage.

At 36 she had already borne eight living children and had suffered four miscarriages.

Some two hours later she left the clinic after having received a thorough physical examination. She had gained a month's supply of "The Pill" and a sense of relief that she needn't have any more children.

On that same afternoon, the physician attending the Planned Parenthood clinic at Wesley center saw 10 other women, including four other new patients.

At 23 years of age one other newcomer already had a houseful of children—six.

Even if these two new patients with large families never have another child, their chances of rearing their families outside of the poverty cycle are not bright.

Careful nationwide studies have disclosed that 42.1 per cent of families with six or more children fall into the poverty category—and the figures include such large, but wealthy families as the Kennedys.

A better economic chance can be expected by another of last week's clinic visitors. She was a 32-year-old housewife who was coming in for an annual physical examination after participating in the family planning program for 12 months.

She has had four children and probably won't have any more.

The Planned Parenthood Center at Wesley is currently reaching some 633 active patients and is a link in one of the most successful anti-poverty programs yet initiated by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

It is interesting to note that OEO entered the area of family planning with considerable trepidation with a small \$8,000 grant to Corpus Christi in 1964.

Gary D. Londou, until recently the director of health services in OEO's Community Action Program, recently recalled:

"Many people in the federal government were worried about possible repercussions. The only thing that happened, however, was that the local family planning program was swamped with eager applicants for service.

"OEO had to double its grant within the first year in an attempt to keep up with that demand, and we found that this was one of OEO's most popular programs among the poor."

A top OEO research official, Joseph A. Ker-shaw, has reported:

"We looked into the family planning with some care and were amazed to discover that here is probably the single most cost-effective antipoverty measure."

As public opinion moved into support of family planning, Congress emphasized its priority by designating it as a "national emphasis" program.

Detailed studies on the link between family size and poverty in San Antonio are not easily available but there are strong indications that the national trend holds good here. Samples:

In several of the hard-core poverty tracts of the Model Cities area ongoing birth rates appear to be running above 40 per 1,000 population—a figure comparable to parts of Asia and Latin America where poverty is endemic.

A recent study of families within the Model Cities area delved into their money problems. More than 60 per cent of heads of households of more than six persons reported they couldn't make ends meet. A majority of those with smaller households reported they could break even and in many cases have money left for small luxuries or savings.

Studies of the poor have given clear answers to the popularity of the family planning program.

Arthur A. Campbell of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and a former chief of birth statistics of the U.S. Public Health Service, has summed up these findings this way:

"It is evident that most Americans, regardless of color or socio-economic status, share a common preference for an average of three children.

"The major exceptions are Catholic wives (who want an average of four children), better educated non-white wives (who tend to want fewer than three children) and a small group of non-white wives living on farms in the South (who want between four and five children)."

However, Campbell has found that the difference between actual fertility of the poor and near poor and the fertility of the non-poor is striking. There are 55 more births per year per 1,000 women (between the ages of 15 and 44) among the poorer group than among the non-poor.

Such "excess fertility" or "unwanted fertility" has had a major impact on population growth in the United States as well as upon poverty problems.

A close student of unwanted fertility is Dr. Charles F. Westoff of the Princeton University Office of Population Research.

He recently reported these findings after a detailed review of data in a 1965 national fertility study:

17 per cent of births to the non-poor were unwanted, while 26 per cent of births among the near-poor were unwanted and 42 per cent of births among the poor were unwanted.

For the six years from 1960 through 1965 there were between 4.7 million and 5.9 million unwanted births in all socio-economic groups.

Of these the poor and near-poor had between 2.2 and 2.7 million unwanted births, while the non-poor had between 2.5 and 3.2 million unwanted births.

For the nine years from 1960 through 1968, it was estimated that between 35 and 45 per cent of the natural population increase in the U.S. could be attributed to unwanted fertility.

At the Robert B. Green Hospital which is the prime vehicle for delivering hospital care to mothers from the San Antonio poverty area, Dr. Joseph Seitchik, chairman of the Department of Obstetrics of the University of Texas Medical School in San Antonio, reported recently:

"The vast majority of our patients are having pregnancies they did not want."

Seitchik noted that family planning information is currently being provided mothers of new babies at the Green through a cooperative program with Planned Parenthood. He commented:

"When our survey shows 80 per cent of our patients express an interest in planning I say the question is, 'Are we going to fulfill a patient need?'"

The need is demonstrably large.

A comprehensive study done for OEO in 1968 disclosed that approximately 5.4 million "medically indigent" women in the United States were in need of subsidized family planning services.

Of these, 773,000 were reported to be patients of public or private sector health agencies which offered family planning. In short, 85 per cent were not receiving help.

The OEO study was carried to a community level and found that there were 32,430 indigent women between the ages of 15 and 44 in the San Antonio area who needed family planning assistance. Of these, 4,349 were receiving service.

The San Antonio area ranked seventh in the United States in the number of women not receiving planning help—ahead of such major urban areas as Dallas, St. Louis, New Orleans, Baltimore, Milwaukee and Pittsburgh.

The San Antonio area "fertility rate," based on births per 1,000 women in the 15-44 year age bracket, was 101 in 1966 as opposed to a national average of 91.

Also disclosed by the study was the fact that 21 per cent of births in the San Antonio area in 1966 were "fifth or higher" births as opposed to a national figure of 15 per cent.

Seitchik has stressed the link between poverty, large families, failure to obtain sufficient pre-natal care, and infant mortality.

This was dramatized by an OEO finding that between 1961 and 1965 there was an "excess" of 770 infant deaths in the San Antonio area. This represents the difference between the actual number of deaths during the period and the number which could have been expected if an achievable death rate of 17.8 per 1,000 live births had been attained.

In its total of "excess" infant deaths, the San Antonio area ranked twenty-first in the nation.

Despite the generally wide acceptance of family planning by poverty area couples, there have been complaints by black militants—and in some cases "Chicano" militants—that the program amounts to "genocide" of an ethnic or racial minority.

London has answered that the actual OEO family planning programs have shown "this charge to be utterly without foundation." Emphasizing the voluntary nature of the involvement of the poor in family planning and its support among them, he reported:

"When a small extremist group tried to shut down the OEO family planning centers in Pittsburgh's black neighborhoods, black community mothers led the successful battle for their retention."

Last month U.S. Rep. Shirley Chisholm, a black woman who is the Democratic congresswoman from the Bedford-Stuyvesant ghetto in Brooklyn, testified frankly regarding the "genocide" theory before a Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population headed by Houston's Rep. George Bush.

She declared:

"One hears talk about 'genocide' from black militants. I think the principal things in operation here are the feeling of blacks that they want to control their lives and of the black man's pride and ego. Most of those who raise the genocide issue are black men not black women."

Mrs. Chisholm went on to point out that "a significantly higher percentage of non-whites prefer a family of two children or less as opposed to the white desire for three children. This I think relates to an awareness of the connection between poverty and the number of children one can afford to support."

Why aren't more women in poverty areas being reached by the San Antonio program?

An ongoing survey by Dr. C. E. Gibbs of the University of Texas Medical School among mothers of babies at the Green Hospital indicates that the prime obstacles are ignorance of the possibility of family planning and difficulty of reaching family planning clinics.

Working to overcome such problems is the Planned Parenthood Center of San Antonio which has operated its own program for 31 years and which now operates an additional 12 OEO funded clinics plus the information center at the Green.

The program has come a long way in a relatively brief time in San Antonio. Mrs. Sarah Prero, director of Planned Parenthood here, recently recalled:

"When we started the poverty program in 1967 we had 828 patients funded by OEO. As of now we have 7,714 patients in the poverty areas.

"In this past year it really has been snowballing. We have been getting an average increase of 250 patients monthly. In fact, that's

one of the problems facing Planned Parenthood throughout the country. It is now snowballing so fast that we can't keep up with it in terms of funds."

The local program has been receiving \$142,588 per year from OEO and is now seeking an additional \$33,985 for the final four months of the current program year as well as an additional \$76,390 for the next program year.

It is hoped that five new poverty area clinics can be added to the existing 12.

In addition, the center is seeking a smaller grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to fund a follow-up program for mothers of infants born at the Green and for a mobile unit to offer services to migrants.

There is a great need for additional clinics, Mrs. Prero related, pointing out:

"It is very difficult to get a patient to take two or three buses in order to get a supply of pills."

Planned Parenthood, she emphasized, looks upon its job as "first one of education—to let people know what planning is and that it is available at a low cost or nothing at all."

She stressed once again the fact that under the OEO and Planned Parenthood programs "there is no coercion," and she underlined the fact that the concern of Planned Parenthood is not limited to the poor. Mrs. Prero declared:

"We are just as concerned with the number of children affluent people have. The overpopulation problem is also related to affluence."

Those in higher income brackets, she pointed out, are likely to consume more products that lead to pollution and waste.

But Mrs. Prero emphasized that progress in meeting the goals of family planning is slow. Since the OEO study of the number of women in need of help in the San Antonio area, the great wave of postwar babies has begun to move into the most fertile child-bearing years.

In addition, local Planned Parenthood officials believe the original OEO estimates were conservative.

"We feel," said Mrs. Prero, "that there are many women who don't fall strictly within the poverty level, but who still can't afford to go to a private physician for family planning help."

Mrs. Prero has set the target population for subsidized family planning locally at 40,000 women and reports that "we are currently reaching about 10,000—that includes those at the OEO clinics and those visiting our downtown clinic which is not included in the poverty programs."

[From the San Antonio Evening News, Dec. 30, 1969]

POPULATION BOMB (By Kemper Diehl)

During the next 30 years the population of the world will double, leaping from a present 3.5 billion to 7 billion at the turn of the century; the population of the United States will rise from 200 million to 300 million by the year 2000.

Unless this growth rate moderates, world population will multiply ever more swiftly—reaching 14 billion by 2015.

These geometrical surges in numbers will load inhuman strains on government, society and our total environment.

Already problems of overcrowding, strife and pollution have raised storm signals. How is the United States moving to meet this unprecedented challenge?

A part of the answer came this week from U.S. Rep. George Bush of Houston who has become one of the handful of Congressional experts on the threat posed by the "population explosion."

Back in Texas for the holiday recess, he appraised the progress that an alliance of concerned Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals has made in recent months.

"We're beginning to get the problem in focus," he said. "For a change, people have stopped whispering about it."

Open discussion about the population problem has been traditionally shunned in the political world. The solution to the threat of what has been called "The Population Bomb" is, of course, the stabilization of population growth at a manageable or even "zero" level. This clearly calls for family planning on a broad scale and most politicians have feared to talk about birth control.

However, 1969 proved to be a year in which members of the academic community, medical authorities and public officials began to speak out with blunt frankness about such subjects as "unwanted pregnancies," the links between poverty and large families, and the direct connection between population growth and the deterioration of the environment.

Congressional interest in the growing problem has centered around such leaders as Bush, Rep. Robert Taft, Rep. Ogden Reid and Sen. Cliff Hansen on the Republican side and Sen. Joseph Tydings and Reps. Shirley Chisholm, Jim Scheuer and Mo Udall on the Democratic side.

Appraising the changing tide of public opinion, Bush declared:

"When I go to the universities I find students are vitally interested. Older politicians say we can't talk about it, but the whole idea of population control, family planning and the unwanted child is very much 'au courant.'"

"People are darned interested and want to do something about it."

The growing momentum for population study was underlined dramatically on July 18 when President Nixon sent a landmark message to Congress on "population and family planning."

In his message the president established this national goal:

"The provision of adequate family planning services within the next five years to all those who want them but cannot afford them."

A Republican task force headed by Bush reported last week that only 700,000 women out of 5.3 million who need subsidized family planning assistance are now receiving effective help.

The president also proposed the creation of a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future to inquire into the patterns which may emerge from the expected swift increase in U.S. population.

And he urged increased research into birth control methods and the effects of population growth on our environment.

A eminent authority, Director Joe Stycos of Cornell University's Population Program, has asserted that major social changes pass through four stages: "No Talk-No Do; Talk-No Do; Talk-Do, and No Talk-Do."

It has been agreed by those close to the population problem that the United States is at the close of Stage II and nearing Stage III.

Recent months have developed increasing public debate as the Bush committee held 23 public hearings and Sen. Joseph Tydings (D-Md.) developed outspoken testimony for his bill to create a National Center for Population and Family Planning in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Bush has introduced a companion bill in the House).

Typical of the new "Talk" stage was a statement by Bush as he and members of his task force introduced a bill requiring the federal government to use space age systems techniques to solve problems of environmental pollution, natural resource development and population. He declared:

"The federal government can no longer blind itself to the reality that our crucial problems of environment, resources and population are closely related and therefore re-

quire concerted, coordinated and systematic approaches to their solution . . . Any attempt to deal with our resources and environment as well as problems of crime, urban blight, transportation, education, unemployment, and all others, without dealing with the population factor, is simply unrealistic."

Still, there is evidence of resistance to change by powerful Congressional elements. None of several bills which would move the federal government into a coordinated attack on population and environmental problems has yet passed—including the bill to create the president's widely-praised Population Commission.

"It never got out on the floor," remarked Bush. "It was on the special consent calendar but then was mysteriously taken off of the calendar."

Washington Columnists Novak and Evans last week blamed the blocking of the Population Commission on Speaker John McCormack and other big city Democrats with conservative views in the area of population planning.

In spite of set backs there is evidence that the federal government will soon be taking a much more expansive role in the area of family planning. A series of recommendations released last week by the Bush task force point to probable administration aims. These include:

Proposals for increasing HEW's family planning grants from a present level of \$30 million a year to \$150 million annually by 1975.

A proposal to increase grants for contraceptive research from \$30 million a year to \$100 million a year within five years.

Encouragement of the states to develop improved "delivery systems" for family planning programs.

Massive dollar support of family planning programs of the Agency for International Development and fiscal support for the United Nations Trust Fund for Population Activities.

Family planning is similarly moving from talk to action in San Antonio and Texas.

In Houston, the city health department last year received \$248,500 from HEW for a family planning project and in Dallas the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School received a similar grant of \$236,000.

In San Antonio, acceptance of OEO-financed clinics operated by Planned Parenthood in the poverty area has been so great that the organization has asked for a grant of \$33,985 to add to its OEO budget of \$142,588 to meet the patient explosion during the final four months of its project year. It will need an additional \$76,390 next year.

Planned Parenthood has undergone a 168 per cent increase in its poverty clinic patient load over last year, Mrs. Sarah Prero, director, reported.

In 1967 the program served only 828 patients. "Now, we're up to about 8,000 and have an average of 250 new patients each month," she exclaimed.

Pondering the acceptance of the poverty area family planning clinics as well as the discovery by Planned Parenthood workers at the R. B. Green Hospital that 80 per cent of new mothers are interested in birth control, Dr. Joseph Seitchik, chairman of the Department of Obstetrics of the University of Texas Medical School, observed recently:

"You have census tracts here with birth rates above 40 (comparable to India or Latin American). It's just incredible.

"Maybe TV does a lot of bad things, but in this case it has done good things, too.

"People in the poverty area watch TV and they find out you can have money and don't have to have nine or ten kids."

As on the national level, the local movement toward family planning has met setbacks, despite the Nixon Administration's priority on attempting to reach all women in need of planning assistance.

The Office of Economic Opportunity last

year calculated that there were 28,000 medically indigent women in San Antonio poverty pockets who were in need of subsidized family planning service and not receiving it.

The need in San Antonio was calculated to be the seventh largest of any U.S. community.

In view of this, Seitchik has been disappointed at the failure of local leaders to work out a plan for inclusion of family planning among first year priority items of San Antonio's Model Cities program.

Despite city council interest and recommendations of the Model Cities staff, the Model Cities citizens committee has twice sidetracked a \$143,000 family planning proposal submitted by Planned Parenthood.

Seitchik is inclined to believe that the Model Cities proposal should be taken over by the Metropolitan Health District since it could be integrated with existing pre-natal and post-natal care clinics.

But he is most concerned that the opportunity not be lost, since he feels it offers a chance for the massive expansion of family planning activity.

He explained:

"HEW will match \$3 for every local dollar and we can use the Model Cities money as local money. We could have a half million dollars in San Antonio for family planning if we could get this Model Cities Money."

Ultimately the decision may come down to the city council which alone has the power to override the Model Cities citizens committee and which could give a definite green light to the Metropolitan Health District to move into family planning.

Seitchik has emphasized that provision of family planning services is only part of the answer to problems facing the U.S. in the area of population growth.

Turning to fertility charts, he noted recently that the average U.S. family has had 3.1 children since the first quarter of the century. He added:

"The one great problem we have to come to grips with is that to maintain a constant population you need only 2.2 children per family. There's no reason to believe that the kids of today are going to do anything differently.

"I don't see any trend to smaller families and, assuming this is the way it is, then there are just going to be more births."

On the national level, scientific spokesmen have recently taken a more urgent note in their discussion of the population problem.

At a meeting of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural organization last month, Dr. Lee DuBridg, President Nixon's chief science advisor, went beyond the president's population message.

In his keynote address, DuBridg termed the reduction of the earth's population growth rate to zero as "the first great challenge in our time."

He challenged:

"Can we not invent a way to reduce our population growth rate to zero? Every human institution—school, university, church, family, government and international agencies such as Unesco—should set this as their prime task."

The need for Americans to examine openly all aspects of the population problem was eloquently expressed earlier this year by Robert McNamara, president of the World Bank, upon receiving an honorary degree from the University of Notre Dame.

In a message that spoke the concern of those who have grappled with "The Population Bomb," McNamara compared its threat to that of nuclear war. And he warned:

"Human dignity is severely threatened by the population explosion—more severely, more completely, more certainly threatened than it has been by any catastrophe the world has yet endured."

He concluded:

"Providence has placed you and me—and all of us—at that fulcrum-point in history where a rational, responsible, moral solution to the population problem must be found.

"You and I—and all of us—share the responsibility to find and apply that solution.

"If we shirk that responsibility, we will have committed the crime.

"But it will be those who come after us who will pay the undeserved . . . and the unspeakable . . . penalties."

INTRODUCTION OF SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1970

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have sponsored the School Construction Act of 1970. This bill will, over the next 3 school years, provide almost \$12 billion for the construction of elementary and secondary school classrooms. This bill provides a two-pronged approach to meeting the enormous classroom backlog which school districts across the Nation are facing. First, it would initiate a program of direct loans by the Federal Government to local school districts at low rates of interest. The amount provided by my bill for this program is \$750 million for 3 years, or \$2.25 billion. Second, my bill provides for a federally-financed program of interest subsidy grants to local school districts, for school construction. As you all know, the interest subsidy approach allows us to utilize the private sector lending institutions with the Federal Government helping the local school districts lower their interest charges on loans. The amount provided in the School Construction Act of 1970 for this program is \$750 million for 3 years and it is estimated that the \$2.25 billion in Federal dollars spent on this program would allow school districts to borrow up to \$9 billion for school construction from local banks.

Years ago, the cry we all heard was, "Johnny can't read or Johnny can't write." Now that we have educated Johnny and graduated him with honors and without rioting, Johnny Jr. threatens to become the newest addition to the Johnny series. Unless a major effort such as that proposed by the School Construction Act of 1970 is implemented, and soon, the next cry we can expect to hear is, "Johnny Jr. can't find a seat; Johnny Jr. can't find a schoolroom."

In 1966 the backlog of classrooms needed versus classrooms constructed was 193,500. Despite the fact that local school districts are building classrooms at the rate of 70,000 per year, it is estimated that there will still be a 163,000 backlog in 1975. Yet, it is in 1975 when the next substantial crunch of new elementary school students is expected and it is a simple fact of economic life that most school districts will find it difficult to build their share of the 70,000 room per year estimate unless the tight money situation is alleviated and local residents get some tax relief.

The school district of Philadelphia estimates that it costs about \$2 million to build a 25-classroom school. Taking into consideration the fact that building and material costs are higher in the Philadelphia area than they are in other sections of the Nation, the money which the School Construction Act of 1970 provides would be enough to build almost 6,000 new 25-room schools; and this would add more than 150,000 new classrooms to our public school system nationally.

In addition to the classroom shortage we face in this Nation, we have another related problem which is best dramatized by the fact that three out of every four elementary and secondary school students are now receiving their educations in buildings with at least two of nine building deficiencies. The nine most prevalent types of building deficiencies found in schools across the country and more particularly in the large cities of the Nation are: first, structural defects; second, inadequate heating; third, inaudible fire alarms; fourth, nonfire resistant stairways; fifth, nonenclosed stairways; sixth, insufficient exits; seventh, no sprinkler or fire detection systems; eighth, insufficient electrical service; and ninth, lighting below 30 foot-candles.

In the city of Philadelphia, part of which I represent, there are at least 818 classrooms which are not fire resistant and this means that over 20,000 schoolchildren in the city are going to school everyday in unsafe classrooms. In northeast Philadelphia, which I represent, there are some 45 nonfire resistant classrooms.

In addition to increased enrollments and unsafe classrooms there are other forces which will over the next several years make the classroom shortage faced by the local school districts of the Nation more severe. There are an enormous number of temporary classrooms especially in the urban fringe areas of this Nation which should be replaced with permanent classrooms; and, in most of our larger cities and their suburbs, pupil-teacher ratios are way above the national average and far above the optimum level of one teacher for every 25 elementary schoolchildren and one for every 20 secondary schoolchildren. The present national average of teachers to pupils is over 27 pupils per teacher in elementary school classes and also over 27 per secondary school classroom.

The northeast Philadelphia area, which I represent, is what I would characterize as the urban fringe of the city. Here we have a situation where the elementary school population has increased by some 51 percent since 1961, the junior high enrollment by some 19 percent, and the senior enrollment by 52 percent. The overall increase has been 44 percent.

As a result of these dramatic pupil enrollment increases in the northeast, there has been and continues to be a crying need for more classrooms. This need has not been met. The northeast has over 50 percent of all rented classrooms in the city and the churches and synagogues being used as classrooms have created physical problems for both pupils and

teachers. These facilities are often makeshift and parents often cannot rely on older children to take younger ones to school because of the different locations. Financially this rented space is very expensive, and, according to the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers, the rents which the city school district pays for these rented facilities are exorbitant. Often, in addition to these exorbitant rents, the Philadelphia School District has been forced to make a considerable investment in repairs to make the rented space habitable.

Pupil-teacher ratios in most major cities are nowhere near the national average and the city of Philadelphia is no exception to that rule. While the optimum pupil-teacher ratio for elementary schools is 25 pupils per teacher, the national average is over 27 pupils per teacher and in Philadelphia the average is over 31 students per teacher. In the northeast, the situation is even worse with an elementary school pupil-teacher ratio of over 32 students per teacher. While the optimum pupil-teacher ratio for secondary schools is 20 students per teacher, the national average is over 27. In Philadelphia the ratio is about 30-31 and in the northeast a little more than that. Based upon these figures alone, the need for additional Federal assistance to help local school districts build classrooms is evident.

The present situation faced by our school districts nationally is bad enough, but there are other factors which will contribute to making the classroom shortage even more acute. There are, for instance, increased demands for specialized programs and, if the city of Philadelphia is any indication of a national trend, urban fringe schools such as those located in my district in northeast Philadelphia are being short-changed. The facts speak for themselves. In the city there are some 157 special classrooms and not one of these is located in the northeast. This situation coupled with the increased demands for programs to keep our youngsters in school will make the classroom shortage more acute than current estimates indicate.

It is my feeling that pupil-teacher ratio figures are false and misleading, and that if the truth were known national figures would be higher than the 27-pupil-per-teacher ratio which is now the norm. In Philadelphia, where the pupil-teacher ratio is much higher than the national average, by law there cannot be more than 24 pupils in any shop and home economics classes and as a result other classes are excessively large to make up the difference.

The need is there and the fact that school districts and local governments have had an increasingly difficult time getting voters to approve increased taxes for school construction makes passage of the School Facilities Construction Act all the more necessary. The two-pronged approach which my bill takes to alleviating the classroom backlog follows:

First, my bill provides for a program of direct low-interest Federal loans to local school districts for the construction of elementary and secondary school class-

rooms. These loans would be for up to 50 years and, over the life of the bill, over \$2.25 billion could be loaned at interest rates of just under 6 percent. My bill provides that the interest rates on these loans would be not less than 1 percent above the rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the national debt as computed at the end of the preceding fiscal year. The only stipulations which the bill makes with respect to the eligibility of school districts to receive the loans is that they must be unable to get such loans at comparable rates from private sources and that one-fourth of the development money for the project must come from local funds.

Second, my bill provides for a program of annual interest subsidy grants to local school districts so that they can borrow the funds they need from commercial banking outlets. My bill provides \$2.25 billion over 3 years for this program and this means that over \$9 billion of loans could be secured by local school districts for school facility construction during this period.

I believe you all will agree that the need for this bill is evident. In closing let me quote you from a letter I received a short time ago from Michael P. Marcuse, associate superintendent of the Philadelphia School District:

One big problem is that the school district has been unable to borrow money at reasonable rates of interest. The present limit is 6% interest on bonds. Because of this limit, the school district has been unable to sell bonds. The General Assembly has before it a bill which would raise the limit to 7%. Even at this increased limit, it is doubtful that the school district will be able to sell their bonds. The School District of Philadelphia, as well as other large metropolitan school districts, needs assistance from the Federal Government in the form of either outright loans of construction funds at low interest rates or subsidizing the present interest rates which are over legal limitations.

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while it is nice to hear some of the things that are right with America. This is especially so when the media report in a way as to emphasize the disobedient, the anarchists, the violent, and the malcontents. Perhaps this is not the fault of the media as much as that of analyses of public interest which seems always to stress the sensational.

It is still news when citizens break the rules or disregard the precepts of our society. Nevertheless most citizens favor these precepts and yearn for an orderly life with protection for themselves, their families, and their property.

The Warner & Swasey Co. performs a useful public service by advertisements such as the following which appeared recently in an issue of U.S. News & World Report:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

Yes, there are dirty plays, but not one has even approached the performance record of homey "Oklahoma" or "Fiddler on the Roof."

Foreigners are scornful of our ghettos. Yet tens of millions are being spent by businesses to rebuild slums with modern homes, and the median Negro family income has risen to \$5360 a year and the number earning \$7000 has doubled in ten years.

45 percent of Americans attend church and 70 percent consider religion very important.

More Americans finish high school than is true of any other nation, and we're getting ready to improve that even more by special programs (developed in America) for pre-school children. And the number of American adults who continue their schooling even into old age is the wonder of the world.

Book buying has doubled in 10 years—good books.

50 million Americans donate time and 14 billion dollars every year to charity.

And you can add paragraphs of what else is good from your own experience.

All of which makes a pretty good national anthem, doesn't it—a lot healthier than the sorry blues which too many love to sing.

SEX ENLIGHTENMENT

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the recent editorial on sex education in the school, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on Saturday, January 24, 1970, is extremely well written. This problem is causing heated discussion in many cities and towns in the Fifth Congressional District of Kentucky, which I represent.

It is my feeling that the editorial takes the correct attitude. I submit it for your perusal:

SEX EDUCATION IN SCHOOL

Sex has been described as being, at one and the same time, the most personal and the most explosive force in the world. For as far back into recorded history as we can go, mankind has always shown great care about approaching this matter. There are few societies of any distinction which did not early recognize the need to surround this force with both legal and moral curbs for humanity's own protection and highest good. The need for such care is as great today as it ever was.

Because this issue is so deep and so emotionally charged, the United States today sees an increasingly bitter and divisive debate over the question of sex education in the schools, a debate whose many pros and cons will be discussed in a series of weekly articles beginning in today's issue of this newspaper. For the country is being called upon to decide whether explicit sex education should be part of a school curriculum and, if so, under what circumstances and under what limitations.

Those advocating such education say that information on sex is too important to the individual and to society to be left to haphazard knowledge. They say that parents neglect giving adequate instruction and that children therefore encounter problems and crises ill-informed. This results in rising crime, illegitimacy, venereal infection, divorce rates, and maladjusted people.

Against these arguments are marshaled the charges that the too-graphic teaching

tends to stimulate the children physically, makes them preoccupied with sex, and weakens acceptance of that fact upon which orderly society is based—that sexual relations belong within marriage. There is also rising criticism of the failure of much such education to emphasize the moral aspects of sex. Finally, many parents have been horrified not only at the unabashed literalness of much of the teaching but at the startlingly low age (sometimes at no more than five years) at which such instruction begins.

The single great question to be answered is in which direction does sex education lead the young. Does it encourage a more reasoned outlook, better self-control, a stronger moral sense, all elements essential to the progress and preservation of a worthwhile society? Or does it bring about the opposite qualities with their great and ever-present threat to both society and the individual?

We strongly believe that the best place for sex enlightenment is in the home and at the hands of parents. Nothing can be an adequate substitute, and the theory that parents on the whole are inadequate to the task is scholastic arrogance. Yet, where parents do not meet this obligation, there may be limited room for sex education of the right kind in schools. But the excesses in such education must be removed. Such instruction must not begin at ages which are patently ridiculous. Furthermore, sex education must be related to the great ethical truths without which life, in any of its aspects, is little more than an animal existence. And, finally, sex education in the schools makes it doubly important for parents to develop that rapport with their children which makes communicating on moral and spiritual matters an easy and natural family affair.

POLITICS, SCHOOLS, AND INFLATION

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's press, which does not always agree with the President, is overwhelmingly in his corner in the matter of the HEW veto.

Newspapers, like the rest of us, have a vested interest in teaching Johnny to read. But they also have a vital interest in the cost of living and the cost of doing business.

Under policies adopted by the previous administration, inflation has sent those costs soaring.

President Nixon has reversed those policies and is fighting valiantly to reverse the cost of living spiral.

If he succeeds all of us will benefit. If he fails even those who vote for inflation will suffer.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times recently ran an editorial supporting the President's stand.

I insert it in the RECORD for the edification of my colleagues:

POLITICS, SCHOOLS AND INFLATION

There's a good deal of politics involved in the argument over the health and education appropriations bill that Congress has passed and that President Nixon has said that he will veto.

The bill is \$1.26 billion higher than the \$18.14 billion that the White House pro-

posed be spent by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and other agencies. The increase is largely for aid to local schools and for other educational and health projects. When the President vetoes the bill the Democrats will say he's against health and educational programs; this could furnish them with an effective election-year issue.

In politics issues are usually presented in black or white, good or bad. There are many gray areas, however, that bear examination and the HEW budget is one of these.

Mr. Nixon is opposed to the excessive spending proposals because he is trying to keep his budget tight in order to fight inflation. If he cannot hold the line on this big item, he may find his budget riddled on other matters and his efforts to fight the rising cost of living could be seriously handicapped.

If the line against inflation cannot be strengthened, all costs—including those of all schools and health services—will go higher, burdening the taxpayers and the medical profession still more. Mr. Nixon has attempted to set up some priorities; if, for example, increased spending on education and hospital construction is mandatory, as it is under the bill, less can be spent on such programs as medical research and pollution.

Moreover, the White House questions the wisdom and efficacy of some of the programs for which more money would be spent. The largest increase is for aid for school districts that have high concentrations of persons living or working on federal property. The current figure would be upped from \$202,000,000 to \$600,000,000.

In some districts, according to a White House statement, federal payments exceed actual needs. As a consequence, some wealthy districts operate at a lower cost to local taxpayers than poorer districts. Montgomery County, Md., next to the capital, is the nation's richest in per capita income. Yet its schools draw \$5,800,000 in federal aid while the 100 poorest counties got \$3,200,000.

When Mr. Nixon vetoes the bill we expect that he will delineate his reasons. He is well aware that he will be subject to political charges that he is undermining education and health. But we hope congressmen of both parties and the general public will look below these election-year generalities and support him in his battle against inflation which, if lost, will cost far more than the expenditures at issue.

JAYCEE WEEK

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend and congratulate the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce during, this, their 50th anniversary.

Jaycee week has been proclaimed for January 18 to 24 and it is fitting and proper that we in the House of Representatives take time to recognize this great service organization and its more than 300,000 members.

I particularly want to pay tribute to the hundreds of Jaycee members in my district, the Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee. I have followed their work closely throughout the years and

they have demonstrated great leadership and civic performance.

The Jaycees and their program of leadership training, youth welfare, and community service have indeed benefited us all.

I wish them well on their 50th birthday and look forward to their continued public service.

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in the RECORD the text of my 21st report from Washington to the residents of California's 30th Congressional District, highlighting some of the major accomplishments and significant legislative issues considered by Congress during 1969.

In addition to this series of regular reports, I have also sent out 14 special reports to cover topics and events in the Nation's Capital of particular interest to the citizens of our Metropolitan Los Angeles area.

The report follows:

CONGRESSMAN ED ROYBAL REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

THE 91ST CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION

I am happy to send you this Report from Washington, highlighting some of the major accomplishments and significant legislative issues considered by Congress during 1969—which are of particular interest to citizens of our Metropolitan Los Angeles area.

TAX CUT

I voted for the landmark Tax Reform Act of 1969, the most far-reaching and comprehensive revision in the 56-year history of the U.S. income tax law, providing substantial across-the-board rate reductions for all individual taxpayers, while making a start toward closing some of the major loopholes which allow special interests and the wealthy to avoid paying their fair share of the nation's tax burden.

Although it falls short of doing all that needs to be done, both in terms of easing the overall tax load, and in making the tax system more equitable, the Tax Reform Act is a good beginning, and for this reason I supported it—especially after the measure was amended to assure a tax cut for all taxpayers.

While reducing the financial burden for everyone, the legislation concentrates its relief provisions to benefit the average middle and lower income taxpayer, removes completely from the tax rolls millions of poverty-level wage earners, and greatly reduces tax liability for other low-income families.

Other sections of the Act increase both the personal exemption and the standard deduction; attempt to plug loopholes and generally tighten-up provisions relating to the oil and gas depletion allowance, capital gains, tax-exempt foundations, charitable contributions, the business investment tax credit; as well as adopt a new "minimum tax" to make sure that, regardless of any tax breaks still in the law, every citizen who is able bears at least some share of the country's tax load.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

Spurred by a rampant inflation that has raised prices nearly 10% since the last increase in Social Security benefits, Congress

approved a 15% across-the-board hike in retirement income for the nation's 25 million elderly citizens—including over 2 million California residents.

In addition to higher monthly benefits for Social Security recipients, however, I believe the program must be revised to assure more realistic minimum payments, as well as providing a built-in system of automatic benefit increases—tied to the consumer price index—to reflect and keep pace with the rising cost-of-living.

Such fiscally sound Social Security expansion—plus long overdue improvements and reforms in broadening the taxable wage base, increasing the amount a retiree may earn without a cut in benefits, permitting earlier retirement, and extending wider health care coverage for both older and disabled persons—will go a long way toward offering an adequate level of economic protection for our senior citizens, disabled workers, widows, children and other dependents—worthy of a dynamic, confident America capable of providing for at least the basic needs of all members of society.

EDUCATION APPROPRIATION

Congress also assumed a leadership role in beginning the process of re-ordering our national priorities by adopting an appropriation measure for public education and health care programs that would mean more than \$150 million in urgently needed additional funds for the State of California alone.

Our financially hard-pressed Los Angeles Unified School District would also benefit from some \$15 million included in this Congressional appropriation—a real help to the overburdened property taxpayers of the community.

I intend to continue this legislative effort to obtain adequate federal assistance to meet the growing domestic needs of 20th Century Urban America.

CABINET COMMITTEE

Congressional enactment of my bill to establish a Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People shows the nationwide support we have been able to achieve for the goal of increased jobs, better housing, improved health care, and wider educational opportunities for America's 10 million Spanish-speaking citizens.

As the original sponsor of this measure in the House of Representatives, I was, of course, extremely pleased at the overwhelming 314-81 bipartisan vote of approval we received and I was delighted at the Senate's prompt action in accepting the House version of the bill without further delay—sending it directly to the President for signature into law.

The proposal's resounding endorsement from such a broad cross-section of the Congress is certainly an encouraging indication of a desire for stronger federal leadership in identifying and meeting the unique needs of the country's second largest minority group.

Spanish-surnamed Americans, along with all other citizens, must be offered a real chance to enter into the mainstream of every aspect of our nation's life—to obtain a full share of the great economic, social, and educational benefits of this land.

By establishing a statutory Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People as a Cabinet-level voice within the Executive Branch—designed specifically to represent this significant segment of the population in the highest government councils—we are going a long way toward realizing these worthwhile goals.

EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT REPEAL

Prospects for enactment of my bill, H.R. 12609, to repeal the Emergency Detention Act—Title II of the Internal Security Act of

1950—have significantly improved due to the Justice Department's recent indication that it no longer opposes the measure, and Senate passage of a similar bill just prior to adjournment.

There has been an increased recognition throughout the country that this 20-year-old provision of law—which authorizes the government to put suspected subversives in detention camps, without due process of law, and for an indefinite period of time—is clearly contrary to every principle of traditional American justice and constitutional rights.

Originally passed over President Truman's veto, this so-called "concentration camp" law provides that upon the President's declaration that a state of "internal security emergency" exists, the Attorney General may apprehend and detain any person as to whom "there is a reasonable ground to believe that such person probably will engage in, or probably will conspire with others to engage in, acts of espionage and sabotage."

Though the law has never been used, and camps initially established to detain subversives have long since been closed, it is uncomfortably reminiscent of the notorious era of massive "relocations" of persons of Japanese ancestry during World War II. And, the very fact that the law and the camps exist, has lent credence to the charge that they may someday be used for members of minority groups or for those who hold unpopular beliefs.

I have now been assured of early House Committee hearings, and with bi-partisan support now growing for repeal of the Emergency Detention Act, I am hopeful of obtaining favorable action on this legislation.

"SESAME STREET" SWINGS

An impromptu street dance begins on the set of the newest educational TV series, "Sesame Street", designed to help prepare some 12 million pre-school children between the ages of 3 and 5 for formal classroom work in elementary school.

Funded by the U.S. Office of Education and Project Head Start, in cooperation with the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation, "Sesame Street" is a 26-week series of daily hour-long color programs carried on the nation's 170 public TV stations (including KCET, Channel 28 in Los Angeles), and has been described as perhaps the most ambitious single effort ever attempted to employ television as an educational tool for the benefit of smaller children.

This unique project, by teaching youngsters in an entertaining fashion, sustaining their interest by utilizing many popular elements from commercial children's television—puppets, animated cartoons, live-action films, other children, and appearances by guest celebrities—illustrates an imaginative combination of government and private funds to use the tremendous potential of modern communications techniques for worthwhile educational purposes.

ANTISMOG CAMPAIGN

California advanced design engineer Howard Wilcox demonstrates a new, nearly smog-free experimental automobile developed in the Golden State under a federal research grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Much more needs to be done in this critical area, because of the urgent public health and environmental dangers posed by continued pollution of our atmosphere by deadly automobile exhaust fumes—particularly in America's major metropolitan centers like Los Angeles.

On the legal front, I was successful in organizing a group of 46 members of Congress, representing more than 20,000,000 citizens across the country, in filing suit in U.S. District Court in Los Angeles opposing the federal government's out-of-court settlement offer in the recent anti-trust conspiracy case

against the Big 4 automakers and the Automobile Manufacturers Association.

Though we were deeply disappointed that the Court approved the proposed consent decree, we are continuing our legal efforts in conjunction with Los Angeles County and California State officials.

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT

Drug abuse is acknowledged to be the No. 1 public health problem in the United States today.

By conservative estimate, 8 million Americans have experimented with some form of illegal drug, including about a third of the present college generation, and 16 percent of the high school population.

Congressional testimony taken during consideration of my bill, H.R. 13330, the Drug Abuse Education Act, indicates that the use of marijuana, hallucinogens, barbiturates and amphetamines by persons of all ages and economic and social backgrounds—but especially by young people—has reached "epidemic" proportions in many parts of the country.

In Los Angeles County, statistics show a more than 500 percent increase in drug offenses in the last few years—and experts predict that some 18 percent—or roughly 1 in 6—of the initial offenders will ultimately be arrested for hard core narcotic use in the future.

Such a national problem urgently demands a comprehensive, nationwide program, enlisting the support of all of us—private citizens, public officials, parents, teachers, students, community organizations, and local, state, and federal governments—in a determined effort to understand the nature and seriousness of drug abuse, and deal effectively with this threat which the President has warned is endangering the spirit of America.

So, I was naturally delighted when the House unanimously approved the Drug Abuse Education Act, and sent it on for action in the Senate, where favorable consideration is virtually assured by the Administration's recent endorsement of the educational approach to combating drug abuse.

DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

One of the most historic measures passed by the House this session is the proposed constitutional amendment to abolish the present electoral college system and provide for direct popular election of the President and Vice President.

As the co-sponsor of this one-man-one-vote national election plan, I was greatly encouraged by the overwhelming 339-70 House vote of approval, and am hopeful that the Senate will take similar affirmative action in the near future. Before becoming the law of the land, of course, it must be ratified by three-fourths of the states.

The proposal would provide simply that the candidate getting the most popular votes throughout the country would be elected President, as long as he had at least 40 percent of the vote. If no candidate received 40 percent of the vote, a runoff election between the two leading candidates would be held.

By recognizing the basic justice of assuring that each citizen's choice is given equal weight, and the candidate with the most popular votes wins the election, I believe we will be adopting a long overdue reform in America's electoral system, and at the same time guaranteeing that every member of our society will have a full opportunity to participate directly and personally in the selection of our national leadership.

LAW ENFORCEMENT CAREERS

The Latin American Law Enforcement Association informs me that there is an urgent need for qualified men to fill the ranks of our local police forces.

For a rewarding and satisfying career opportunity they ask interested persons to contact the Los Angeles Police Department at 624-5211, ext. 4051, or the Los Angeles

Sheriff's Department at 624-9511, ext. 8-2846. There are immediate openings.

SUMMER INTERN PROGRAM

University students Jesse Arenas, Mary Grove, and Jaime Cagigas from Los Angeles—plus Pete Piness, not shown in photo—spent part of the summer in our Washington office as Congressional Interns (Jaime, a recent Vietnam veteran, is now my appointee working as a Capitol policeman while continuing his undergraduate education full-time under the GI Bill).

1969 is the seventh year in a row I have participated in the College Intern Program, which I believe is extremely valuable as a fascinating way for young people to gain a personal understanding of how their government operates.

Students interested in coming to Washington in future years, should contact their school's intern director for information on this excellent program.

DRAFT REFORM

Congress has also taken a first step toward meaningful reform of our national selective service system, by authorizing a more equitable, random-selection draft lottery, with the prospect that an individual's period of vulnerability for induction will be reduced to one year under the "youngest-first" procedure to be started by 1971.

While I joined in supporting this worthwhile legislation, I firmly believe that Congress has a responsibility to make a much more comprehensive review of the entire draft law, including such topics as the composition and reorganization of local draft boards, continuation of student and occupational deferments, establishment of uniform national guidelines for administering the draft, provision of due process for potential inductees, revision and clarification of the conscientious objector system, consideration of the possibility of national service alternatives, and a thorough-going exploration of the concept of an all-volunteer army.

The 1970 session of Congress should bring a long-needed and in-depth review of our nation's selective service machinery, and a fundamental reform of the many inequities that have grown up over the years.

BANNING GAS AND GERM WARFARE

As co-author of House Resolution 490 which urged the President to resubmit for ratification the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning the first use of gas and bacteriological warfare, as well as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee which held extensive hearings on the Resolution earlier this year, I was pleased with the President's announcement responding to our Congressional initiative in a positive way.

The historic decision to renounce germ warfare, destroy our present stockpiles of biological weapons, pledge never to be the first to use chemical weapons, and request prompt Senate ratification of the 44-year-old Geneva Protocol, represents a major step forward in reducing the threat posed by these lethal and potentially uncontrollable agents of modern warfare.

While in no way adversely affecting America's military defense capability, this new arms control initiative may encourage the world to turn away from at least one avenue of future annihilation, and help make the earth a little safer place in which to live.

I agree with the President that, "Mankind already carries in its own hands too many of the seeds of its own destruction."

LOS ANGELES COUNTY YOUTH CAMP

I was happy to announce federal approval of a plan for conversion of the former Angeles National Forest Job Corps Center at Fenner Canyon into a multi-purpose juvenile rehabilitation facility to be operated by the Los Angeles County Probation Department.

County and federal officials are currently working out detailed arrangements for use of this now de-activated, but virtually new, \$2 million camp to provide a 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week residential training program for 16- to 17-year-old youths—to help solve one of Los Angeles' most pressing problems: an acute shortage of adequate space and properly equipped facilities to handle the County's rapidly rising juvenile delinquency case load.

Expected to phase into full operation by late 1970, the 40-acre San Gabriel Mountain site will accommodate some 100 youths, on a year-round basis, with the rehabilitation program's emphasis on remedial education, vocational training, forest conservation work, camp maintenance, individual and group counseling, and job placement after release.

YOUTHFUL CITY HERO SAVES FOUR CHILDREN

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Congress the heroism of a young man in my district who on Saturday, January 3, saved the lives of four children when a Christmas tree fire at the home in which he was babysitting endangered the youngsters. All too often today we hear of the undesirable acts attributed to our young people. Lost in the clamor are the good deeds of our Nation's fine younger citizens.

Albert Estock, age 15, of 500 South 18th Street, in Springfield, was babysitting at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest L. Hart in Springfield. At 11:30 p.m. he went into the living room and discovered the Christmas tree ablaze and fire rapidly spreading across the ceiling. He immediately thought to awaken the kids and get them out of the house. Young Estock rushed into the bedroom and roused the Hart children; Amy, 12; Michael, 10; Bradley, 8; and Tracy, 3; and escorted them from the smoke-filled house. He then ran back into the house and called the Springfield Fire Department and returned outside to the children. After a few moments passed, one of the children remembered the family dog, "Toby" was locked in the basement. Estock tried to open the back door and finding it locked, smashed the glass and broke it open. He entered the blazing home again and came out with the dog. The boy sustained a gash to his left wrist while breaking in the door but otherwise sustained no serious injury.

This fine young man is a sophomore at Southeast High School in Springfield, Ill., and is the son of Mr. and Mrs. George Estock. Albert is a good student at his school and has already demonstrated those qualities which will, I am sure, make him a leader in that generation which will soon be assuming the responsibilities of adulthood. Albert has already shown those qualities.

I know that the Congress of the United States joins with me and the city of Springfield, Ill., in congratulating Albert Estock on his fast thinking and bravery which saved the lives of these four children and their family dog.

A BOLD NEW PLAN FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, in the October 1969 issue of Reader's Digest there appeared an article entitled, "A Bold New Plan for National Defense." This article sets forth the conception of plans for increased use of the seas in our strategic offense and our strategic defense.

At a time when the plans for our national security are undergoing such close scrutiny we should pay special attention to the concepts that can provide increased security for our country while taking the front line for any future wars away from our land and our skies.

The ideas formulated by Rear Adm. George H. Miller and advocated by Adm. Thomas H. Moorer merit strong congressional support. I call attention to paragraphs 603, 604, and 605 of the report by the Seapower Subcommittee of last March 19 entitled "Status of Naval Ships" which says:

The U.S. Navy can make a greater contribution toward security from nuclear attack, and from surprise attack, by more utilization of the seas of the world for the dispersal of nuclear weapons. More missiles at sea, utilizing missile-age geography, would place additional and expensive burdens upon the Soviet Union's effort to cope with our retaliatory force. The survivability of sea-based systems greatly inhibits the will to strike and the feasibility of striking first in a surprise nuclear attack upon the United States. Thus it can be one of the greatest opportunities we have to deter attack and to secure and maintain world peace.

A decision to put greater emphasis on sea-environment weapons, after a judicious reallocation of national resources to implement it, might be less expensive in the long run and more effective than present approaches to strategic problems. It has the element in it of being more likely to secure peace because the ability to move about at sea with weaponry capable of attacking major land targets makes it extremely difficult for any potential aggressor to win.

Concurrently, by emphasizing the coordinated use of all elements of seapower in support of foreign policy in peace and war, the United States may be able to enhance its position as a world power. Without a strong and modern Navy, which permits many additional choices in international affairs, the United States could find itself in a position of being unable to carry out commitments or of paying too high a price to do so.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert in the RECORD the full story from the Reader's Digest:

A BOLD NEW PLAN FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE—U.S. NAVY STRATEGISTS HAVE DEVELOPED A CONCEPT THAT COULD STRENGTHEN OUR HAND AGAINST ANY ENEMY—AND AT THE SAME TIME REMOVE OUR CITIES AND MILITARY INSTALLATIONS FROM THE LINE OF NUCLEAR FIRE

(By John G. Hubbell)

In the prolonged national debate over the best way to defend this country and prevent nuclear war, a bold new plan has taken shape. The proposal has been evolving for more

than two years in the U.S. Navy's Office of Strategic Offensive and Defensive Systems under Rear Adm. George H. Miller. It has been advocated strongly before Congress by the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Thomas H. Moorer. Unfortunately, in the often emotional furor surrounding the issue of national defense, the Navy's plan has gone largely unnoticed.

The proposal, simply put, is that the continental United States be removed from the Soviet Union's line of fire. Russia's prime targets in the United States are our ICBM (Intercontinental Ballistic Missile) sites, which the Kremlin planners know they must first destroy if they are to mount a successful attack.

Remove these targets, says the Navy. Put at least 75 percent of our nuclear striking power out to sea, and there will be no payoff for a nuclear attack on this country. The enemy would still know that our retaliatory power was intact and that a nuclear move against this country would result in the certain destruction of the Soviet Union. But our cities and military installations would no longer be prime targets.

At present, the United States has 25 of its 41 nuclear-powered Polaris submarines at sea at all times (of the total fleet, 16 are usually in port for refitting). Each submarine carries 16 nuclear missiles—for a total of 400 at sea. (Six Polaris missiles represent as much destructive power as all the bombs dropped by the United States in World War II, the Korean War and in Vietnam to date.)

The Navy calculates that with 600 more missiles at sea, aboard widely dispersed, constantly moving ships, the United States would be in the strongest possible position to deter nuclear war. The additional missiles, of the Poseidon or Minuteman type, would be installed aboard 20 to 30 surface warships, which would have the outward dimensions of Naval auxiliary or modern merchant-ship types.* They could sail with or without protective escorts, depending on how noticeable or unobtrusive the diplomacy of the moment required them to be. They would roam distant seas, scattered widely over the world's oceans within striking range of prime enemy targets.

Think of the problems such a force would impose on an aggressor! Before deciding to deliver a surprise nuclear attack, an enemy must be certain that he can destroy a huge proportion of our retaliatory nuclear firepower with his first blows. Otherwise he would be inviting his own destruction. The most searching analysis shows that a global missile-ship force could not be put out of action in less than eight to ten hours. In fact, significant numbers of ships would survive for days, weeks or even months. Facing such a prospect, an aggressor would have to conclude that a first strike on his part would lead to national suicide.

Putting our missiles out to sea would also complicate the enemy's defensive problem. At present, the Soviets know that the major weight of a retaliatory strike from the United States must come through a narrow northern corridor that forms an arc of 32 degrees—only nine percent of their total defense perimeter. They can thus concentrate their ABMs and other defensive systems against a relatively limited sector. A full-fledged American nuclear-armed sea force would require the Soviets to distribute their defenses and attention around the full 360 degrees of the compass.

The Navy plan calls for no expensive, time-consuming research and development. The technologies for building such ships

*The Navy estimates that such ships, with their missiles, could be bought for little more than half the cost and produced in less time than either a submarine-based or land-based ICBM force of equivalent firepower.

have long been in hand, and the Polaris and Poseidon missiles, developed for undersea launch, are readily fired from the surface. In fact, test-firings are frequently made from surface ships. Thus, the Navy affirms that missile ships could be at sea about four years after the go-ahead decision.

CREATING CREDIBILITY

Effective as a strategic sea force would be, it also would be unprovocative militarily. The Soviet strategist now sees in the continental United States the majority of the nuclear firepower in the world that can hurt his country. Most of it is on a 15-minute, "cocked-pistol" alert. Hence, the Soviet planner pays little attention to our pledge never to strike first. He is required to fear that someday, either by design or accident, the American nuclear pistol will be fired. He cannot tolerate this situation forever, so he develops the means for pouring nuclear firepower into the United States, and begins thinking in terms of striking first himself.

Thus, we are witnessing in the Soviet Union today the most enormous nuclear-arms buildup in history, employing a wide spectrum of weaponry, ranging from space to the depths of the sea. The primary target of such weapons is the nuclear firepower based in this country.

Move the majority of our nuclear firepower to sea, however, where the Kremlin planner knows he cannot destroy it with a surprise attack; where he knows its survivability would be measured in hours or days instead of minutes—and our pledge not to strike first becomes credible.

A flexible striking force would thus enable us to step down from the unstable, cocked-pistol alert. Under such conditions, we have no reason to strike first, because we know that our ability to retaliate would survive any first strike. The Soviet planner knows this, too, and this mutual awareness is the basis for a true balance of power. Ultimately, if he is rational, the Soviet planner's mind is eased, and the climate for reduction of tension and worthwhile arms-control measures is brightened.

HIDE AND SEEK

The major objection to the Navy's dramatic idea has been that surface ships can be found and attacked—by space satellites, aircraft, other surface ships and submarines. But how much easier to target and destroy fixed, land-based missiles—in the kind of attack that would take many millions of American lives. Further, the Navy has analyzed the survivability aspect of missile ships to the hilt. The conclusions of its studies, and of similar ones conducted under the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are unanimous: a surface-ship force dispersed at sea, even with no defense save its own mobility, would be expected to remain effective over many hours—certainly long enough to perform its task. It has been found that no significant portion of such a force could be destroyed immediately in a first strike.

For one thing, there are many ways to prevent or deal with detection. Space satellites, of course, could not know what kinds of ships they were looking at, or even whose ships they were. The missile ships could hide themselves among the many other ships that ply the regular traffic lanes, or they could hide alone in fog, under thick cloud cover, in darkness, in heavy seas and in the inlets, bays and coves of remote, uninhabited islands. If enemy naval elements were known to be nearby, a missile ship could keep radio and electronic silence, leaving open only the receiving circuits on which the President would transmit the go-to-war code. The numbers of missiles the ships carried could be varied, so that the enemy never would know which ships packed the most nuclear wallop, hence required his most intensive track-

ing efforts. And the enemy's targeting problem could be compounded to the point of insolubility by the addition of decoy ballistic-missile ships, roaming the seas without missiles. The problem would then be like that faced by regular army forces in tracking down guerrillas—each guerrilla in the field requires the attention of many regulars; depending on circumstances, the ratio can vary from four to as many as one hundred to one. In short, it is always much easier to hide than to seek. The most exacting studies show that a ballistic-missile-ship fleet would be second in survivability only to a submerged submarine force.

TIME OF DANGER

There is nothing really new about the Navy's proposal. Our defense planners long ago recognized the sea's value as a strategic base. Thus, the Polaris missile-firing-submarine concept was developed, and air-deliverable nuclear weapons were developed for aircraft carriers.

Nevertheless, early in this decade, our heaviest investment was made in a force of slightly more than 1000 land-based ICBMs, which were "hardened"—encased in underground steel and concrete silos—to the point where it would take a near-direct nuclear hit to destroy one. The reasoning behind this decision was that land-based missile technology was well advanced, and that the Soviets did not have the numbers of missiles they would need even to consider attacking. Furthermore, their missiles were not accurate enough to do the job, and it would be many years before they seriously could threaten our land-based ICBM force. Meanwhile, they might be induced to enter into effective arms-control agreements.

Nearly ten years have passed. There have been no worthwhile arms-control agreements. The Soviet Union now confronts the United States with a fast-growing military threat of unprecedented magnitude. The Soviets are expected to exceed us this year in numbers of ICBMs, and their big SS-9 missiles pack substantially greater megatonnage than ours. The power and accuracy of their missiles have made our big, land-based ICBM force increasingly vulnerable.

We need not and should not tolerate this any longer. Our ICBM force as it is now deployed has served its purpose; it has deterred nuclear war. But now this force should be phased down to perhaps a quarter of its present size and dispersed more widely. The Minuteman missiles we remove need not be made into an expensive scrap heap; it would be technically feasible to adapt them for sea duty and place them aboard ships. And there is plenty of unpopulated land away from the continental United States, where we could deploy the remainder.

There is probably no final answer to our defense problems. Military technology and strategy are evolutionary, and our survival dictates that we evolve. Combined with our Polaris-Poseidon submarines, our strategic bombers and our scaled-down land-based ICBM forces, a missile-ship force would provide us with effective defenses for years to come.

We should of course also embark on development of other effective defenses without further delay. For example, we need 20 to 40 additional missile-carrying submarines of the most modern design; we need a new, advanced manned bomber, capable of penetrating the Soviets' formidable air defenses. And we should be looking hard at what can be done militarily in space, as the Soviets are doing. But new submarines, aircraft and space systems will take years to fund, develop and make operational.

Meanwhile, a time of danger is upon us. It can be met most quickly and effectively by putting our missile force at sea, far from the heartland of America.

"The most effective military strategy is the one which convinces all enemies that they

cannot successfully commit aggressions against this nation or its allies, that all such aggressions will be defeated. The adoption by the United States of the nuclear strategy outlined in this article might convincingly offset the Soviets' prodigious and threatening nuclear buildup."

SPEECH BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from Virginia, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, JR., spoke in my district last week and delivered a most timely address. He recently expressed his views on a variety of major issues across the State. I am happy to include in the RECORD the text of his remarks in my district, and brief accounts of several of the others:

SPEECH BY U.S. SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, JR., DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, BEFORE PENINSULA ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S. ARMY, FORT EUSTIS, VA., JANUARY 23, 1970

Gentlemen, none of you needs to be told that the role of the military in our society is today the subject of intense debate. You need only open your morning newspaper to be aware of that.

Unfortunately, one extreme position in this debate gets disproportionate attention. Sometimes it is difficult for those who hold a sensible, moderate position to be heard.

Time and again we are told that the military establishment is run by bloodthirsty generals, backed by some insidious conspiracy called the military-industrial complex. This extreme view has wide acceptance in the ranks of New Left militants.

To refute it, one need only look at the careers of such military men as George C. Marshall or Dwight D. Eisenhower.

No, the military establishment is not a conspiracy of warmongers.

Our armed services are the indispensable guardian of our liberties, and for the most part, the men and women who serve their country in uniform are a dedicated and selfless group. They deserve the highest praise.

But one should not react to the currently fashionable criticism by flying to the opposite extreme and claim that the military is above criticism.

On the contrary, responsible criticism of the military—and more particularly, military policy—is both healthy and democratic. I support such criticism. I like to think that I engage in it.

This nation cannot afford blank checks for any agency of the government. The Defense Department must be subject to the same close scrutiny that should be given to civilian departments.

But in making reductions in the military budget, we must take care not to jeopardize security. We must seek to cut the fat, and not the muscle.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate want to carry military reductions too far. Last year, they sought to eliminate the purely defensive Safeguard antiballistic missile system, a much-needed nuclear aircraft carrier, a Navy fighter plane and a number of other essential items.

I do not go so far as to say that the advocates of these drastic cuts favor unilateral disarmament.

I fear, however, that they make a basic mistake in their estimate of the world situ-

ation. They place entirely too much faith in the good intentions of the Soviet Union.

I do not trust the men in the Kremlin. They have a long track record of aggression and broken promises. In 1962, they put offensive missiles into Cuba and precipitated a grave crisis; since 1965, they have been the chief suppliers of war materials to North Vietnam; in 1967, they encouraged Arab adventurism that led to war in the Middle East; and in 1968, they crushed freedom in Czechoslovakia with a brutal invasion.

It would be foolish to trust the Soviet Union. That would be misplaced faith.

But it would also be an error to accept all the recommendations for weapons systems and other military hardware that come from the Pentagon.

What is needed is a balanced view—skepticism without hostility, loyalty without blindness.

Going beyond the military budget, to the broadest horizons of national policy, I find much to criticize in the present posture of the United States.

In the bluntest terms, this country is over-committed. We have mutual defense agreements with 44 different nations.

A re-evaluation of our foreign policy is much in order. The United States simply cannot be expected to fulfill indefinitely all the obligations it has undertaken.

There must be limitations on our commitments. One way to impose reasonable limitations is for the United States Senate to reassert its traditional and constitutional role in foreign policy.

I wholeheartedly supported a resolution recently passed by the Senate which was aimed at curbing the commitment of American troops by unilateral executive action.

And in November, the Senate overwhelmingly approved a resolution I offered that would require approval by the Senate before any change is made in the status of the island of Okinawa.

In 1968, the Senate failed to take action when the Bonin Islands reverted to Japanese control by executive agreement.

This inaction set a bad precedent. I feel that the Senate must reassert its historic and constitutional role in foreign policy.

That is one main reason why I proposed—and the Senate agreed—to insist that it be consulted on the proposed reversion of Okinawa.

The case of Okinawa offers an excellent illustration of the difficulties we face overseas today.

Following conversations with Japanese Premier Sato, President Nixon indicated that actions will go forward toward turning over Okinawa to the administrative control of Japan.

Okinawa is our most important single military base complex in the Western Pacific. It is vital to our commitments to Australia, New Zealand, Japan itself, Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam and the SEATO countries. I do not quarrel with the fact that Okinawa will ultimately revert to the Japanese, but that should not happen so long as we have these extensive commitments.

The situation in the Western Pacific points up one of the real difficulties we face in our effort to reduce the commitments we have with other nations. That is, powerful nations that are our allies fail to carry their share of the burden of defense in their own regions of the world.

The Japanese have the third strongest economy in the world, behind only the United States and the Soviet Union. Yet, Japan spends less than 1% of its Gross National Product on defense.

The Japanese seem to regard the defense of East Asia and the Western Pacific as just a problem for America. The fact is that Japan depends for its prosperity—and in fact its very existence—upon a strong defense in its part of the world.

So far, America has provided all of that defense. It is time for Japan to pick up some of the burden.

Our Mutual Security Treaty with Japan comes up for renewal this year. It would be well for this country to look carefully at the existing arrangements—under which the United States is almost the sole guardian of freedom in the West Pacific—before automatically renewing this agreement.

I think we must make it clear to our Asian friends that there must be a limit to our involvement on that continent.

A simple extension of all our commitments would be unwise. More than that, it could be basically dishonest, for I seriously doubt that American public opinion would tolerate another Vietnam.

There must be no repetition of the tragic error of judgment that plunged us into a land war in Asia—a seemingly interminable one.

I emphasize that we must support the men who are fighting in Vietnam today—nearly a half million of them—and we must bring this war to an honorable end.

Recently, we have witnessed a great deal of protest against our policies in Vietnam.

The protesters were within their rights. So long as the protests remain peaceful, those who express their opposition to the war have a right to do so.

But I think that public disunity in time of war is ill-advised.

The Communists in Vietnam are determined to win an all-out political victory over the United States.

Disunity at home adds encouragement and determination to North Vietnam and the Viet Cong.

I think that demonstrations in this country have the effect of encouraging Hanoi to prolong the war. I do not say this effect is intended. But I think that a prolonging of the war is the likely result of this kind of demonstration.

If we believe that President Nixon wants to end the war, and I do believe that he does, then we should give him our support in his efforts to end it.

I have said often that our commitment of troops to a ground war in Asia was a grave error of judgment.

But those who march in opposition to the war do not rectify the error.

I believe they compound it, by encouraging Hanoi to believe it can win a victory by default.

Along with the right of criticism, which is guaranteed under our Constitution, there goes a responsibility.

Criticism should be responsible and constructive. Criticism which undermines the position of the United States, is neither responsible nor constructive.

But while I urge support for the Commander-in-Chief in his efforts to bring the war to an end, I recognize that we must not repeat the errors that placed us in our present predicament in Southeast Asia.

For this reason, our position throughout Asia must be carefully examined.

And this kind of examination ought not to be limited to Asia. The whole structure of our foreign policy and commitments needs restudy in the light of the real interests of the United States.

I do not suggest a retreat to the old isolationism. The United States does have real interests overseas, and they must be defended.

But we must be realistic—both as to what is vital to this nation, and as to what the nation can reasonably be expected to accomplish.

A new, realistic foreign policy can do great things for this country.

For one thing, it can lessen an immense drain on our resources.

For another, it can reduce the risk of unwanted military involvements abroad.

And most importantly, it can bring a rebirth of national unity and patriotic spirit.

These things will not come to pass tomorrow, or the day after. But I believe they will come—if we have the courage and good sense to adhere to principles that will stand the test of time.

VIEWS—IN BRIEF SAYING "NO"

RICHMOND.—Congress and the President "must be willing to say 'no'—the most under-utilized word in the political dictionary" if inflation is to be curbed, Senator Byrd said in an address at the annual banquet of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce.

The Senator said the nation's budgetary outlook is not encouraging, with spending predicted to climb above the \$200 billion mark even without new programs.

"My concern with government fiscal affairs," he said, "is dictated not so much by a bookkeeper's wish for a neat set of figures as it is with what government spending means to the average American citizen.

"Vast, unchecked spending programs feed the inflation that deducts from the paycheck of every American worker."

JUDGE HAYNSWORTH

STAUNTON.—Senator Byrd deplored Senate rejection of Judge Clement Haynsworth as a Supreme Court Justice in a December speech to the Staunton Kiwanis Club.

Thorough investigation of Haynsworth uncovered no evidence that the judge sought to advance his own interest, Byrd said.

"Balance needs to be restored to the Court," Byrd said, and voiced the hope that the next nominee to the Supreme Court would be a man who shares Judge Haynsworth's philosophy—"one who will interpret the Constitution, and not attempt to rewrite it."

DRUG ABUSE

ARLINGTON.—A program to combat drug abuse must include prevention, rehabilitation and law enforcement, Senator Byrd declared at the graduation banquet of the Northern Virginia Police Academy here.

Authorities have learned that "drug traffic does not confine itself to the inner city poor," he said, noting that recent studies have shown an "alarming" spread of drug abuse to suburban high schools.

The Senator endorsed a new rehabilitation and education program for youths in the Virginia and Maryland suburbs of Washington.

TAX BURDEN

PULASKI.—The nation cannot go on forever increasing the tax burden of its citizens, Senator Byrd said to the Pulaski Jaycees.

"Thirty-six cents of every dollar earned by American workers now goes into federal, state and local taxes," he pointed out.

Federal taxes alone are 29 times as large as they were in 1939 and now take one fourth of all income earned in the nation, he said.

PEACE PROTESTS

FORT MYER.—Public disunity in time of war is ill-advised, Senator Byrd said in a speech at this Northern Virginia Army post. He spoke at a dinner honoring the commander of the U.S. Army Reserve School.

Participants in recent demonstrations against U.S. policy in Vietnam were "within their rights," the Senator said, so long as the protests remained peaceful.

But he added that demonstrations in this country encourage Hanoi to prolong the war and urged support for President Nixon's efforts to end it.

SALT TALKS

RICHMOND.—The United States must proceed with caution in arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union, Senator Byrd told the West End Jaycees here at their annual banquet.

The Senator recently was named to a spe-

cial subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which is to monitor the progress of the strategic arms limitation negotiations—the so-called SALT talks.

Byrd pointed to the Russian record of "aggression and broken promises" and to the recent buildup by the Soviets in strategic arms.

He pointed out that "nothing of substance" was decided in recent talks at Helsinki and said later negotiations in Vienna will indicate if there can be effective control of the arms race.

"I favor the SALT talks," he said, "but I want to be certain that our nation does not make concessions that will jeopardize our security."

CONSUMER BILLS

NORFOLK.—The label of "consumer legislation" doesn't make a bill either good or bad, Senator Byrd told the Tidewater Better Business Bureau at its annual luncheon here.

Each issue should be judged on its own merits, he said, adding that federal legislation is justified "where there is clear evidence of fraud or hazard to life and limb" and interstate commerce is involved. Other problems should be handled in the private sector or at the state or local level.

Byrd pointed out he has supported most major consumer legislation to date.

AVIATION PROBLEMS

CULPEPER.—The rapid growth of aviation has created severe congestion problems, Senator Byrd said at the dedication of the new Culpeper Airport.

The airlines lose about \$50 million a year because of airports delays, and losses by airline users are "immeasurable," the Senator declared.

But the most important problem in aviation is safety, he said. He cited the good safety record of aviation, but warned that "we must face the fact that danger exists in overcrowded skies."

CRIME WAR

FREDERICKSBURG.—Soaring crime rates in the nation's capital show that the federal government is not equipped to take over the war on crime, Senator Byrd said at the annual Awards Banquet of the Fredericksburg Jaycees.

"The crime problem in Washington is a national scandal," the Senator declared.

LEGISLATION TO PROTECT PLACES OF REFUGE FOR ANIMALS

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would provide a penalty for the shooting from aircraft of wildlife on land or water which is under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Government. The public outcry which resulted from a recently televised film showing wolves being hunted from planes demonstrates the depth of concern evoked by revelation that our wildlife population is being decimated by relentless "sportsmen." Aircraft have enormous usefulness in the study and preservation of our wildlife population but we must not allow this important function to be distorted into too-easy pursuit for sport. Civilization has made much of this continent uninhabitable for the animals that preceded us here; we must protect the places where they have found refuge from merciless exposure from the air.

THE HONOLULU ADVERTISER SUPPORTS TITLE II REPEAL LEGISLATION

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the effort now being made in Congress to repeal the infamous Emergency Detention Act of 1950, continues to gain wide support. A most noteworthy endorsement of the repeal legislation appeared by way of an incisive editorial in the Honolulu Advertiser of December 27, 1969.

The editorial recounts the shameful World War II episode involving 110,000 persons of Japanese ancestry who, despite the U.S. citizenship of about 70,000 of them and the absence of any grounds other than fear and hysteria, were herded out of the Pacific Coast States and into so-called relocation centers, complete with barbed wire and armed guards, in the hinterland.

The prospect of a repeat performance involving some other minority group, this time under the aegis of a Federal law, is indeed a frightening one for citizens in the greatest democratic nation in the world.

That we are one step closer to erasing this repugnant law from our statute books, as evidenced by Senate passage on December 22, 1969, of legislation calling for the repeal of the Emergency Detention Act, is most heartening.

Mr. Speaker, it is also gratifying to note that the House Committee on Internal Security plans to hold hearings on title II repeal bills commencing on March 16, 1970.

In order that my colleagues may have the opportunity to read the Honolulu Advertiser editorial on the repeal of the concentration camp authorization law, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

ERASING A SHAME

The Senate has unanimously passed a bill sponsored by Sen. Daniel K. Inouye and 25 others, including Sen. Hiram L. Fong, to repeal an infamous section of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

That section, Title 2, permits the Federal government to establish detention camps during periods of a declared threat to a national security.

Known also as the "concentration camp" provision, this section of the Internal Security law is responsible for widely circulated rumors among minority groups, mostly militant blacks, that there is a move afoot to intern them.

In the hopes of scotching such fears, Senator Inouye and his associates introduced their repealer. No doubt, the legislators also were moved by memory of what happened to 110,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry on the Mainland during World War II.

Despite their citizenship and the absence of any grounds other than fear and hysteria, these men, women and children were herded out of the western states to relocation camps in the interior.

Ironically, part of the impetus for this mass relocation was a belief in official circles on the Mainland that the Dec. 7, 1941, attack on Pearl Harbor had been accompanied by acts of sabotage by Japanese-Americans living in Honolulu.

Statements from the Justice Department,

the Honolulu Police Department and the local Army command that the sabotage reports were unfounded had no deterring effect.

One of those who endured relocation was Seattle-born Bill Hosokawa, now associate editor of The Denver Post, who has written a book about it, "Nisei." Here's how Hosokawa describes the mass relocation:

"One day these Japanese-Americans were free citizens and residents of communities, law-abiding, productive, proud. The next, they were inmates of cramped, crowded, American-style concentration camps, under armed guard, fed like prisoners in mess hall lines, deprived of privacy and dignity, shorn of their rights."

The relocation, in short, was nothing less than a major and shameful violation of the Constitution by the Federal government itself.

This blot on our history reveals dramatically the truth of the old saying that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty—and that vigilance must be practiced within as well as toward possible external aggressors.

Let anyone believe that the relocation of Japanese-Americans during World War II was an isolated, unprecedented act, Hosokawa points out that a similar relocation occurred in 1863.

In that year, Brig. General James Carleton decided that the Navajo Indians constituted a security threat to the Western frontier of the U.S.

General Carleton ordered 9,000 Navajos relocated from their homes in what is now Arizona, southern Utah and western New Mexico to southern New Mexico. Many were mistreated; many contracted disease; many died.

We are heartened that the U.S. Senate has stricken the "detention camp" provision from the Internal Security law and proud that Hawaii's Senator Inouye played a leading role.

Now the focus shifts to the House where Hawaii's Rep. Spark Matsunaga has introduced a similar repealer, with more than a quarter of the membership co-sponsoring. Matsunaga expects hearings early in the new year.

We are confident of success in the House, and it is fitting that Hawaii legislators are making such a distinguished contribution to the preservation of freedom in the U.S.

PRIVATE GHEE, 20, WOUNDED, DIES IN SAIGON HOSPITAL

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. James F. Ghee, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and to honor his memory, by including the following article in the RECORD:

PRIVATE GHEE, 20, WOUNDED, DIES IN A SAIGON HOSPITAL

Pfc. James F. Ghee, 20, of 1118 Montpeller street, died December 10 in a Saigon hospital of wounds received when he stepped on a booby trap three days earlier in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

The young man, a paratrooper with the 173d Airborne Brigade, had been in Vietnam less than one month, after enlisting in May, 1969.

Mr. Ghee was a native of Baltimore, and was graduated from City College in 1969. His hobbies included football and the tape recording of music.

He is survived by his mother, Mrs. Theima Ghee; four sisters, Mrs. Norma Allen, Misses Trudy, Karen and Phyllis Ghee, and two brothers, Keith and Angelo Ghee, all of Baltimore.

RETIRED NAVY CHAPLAIN COMMENTS ON MYLAI

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, my longtime friend, the Reverend Robert Gardner Andrus, formerly minister of the Presbyterian Church in Lake Forest, Ill., who is now a resident of Princeton, N.J., has composed a significant letter to the editor which appeared in the January 22, 1970, issue of the New York Times. Reverend Andrus' letter, together with the one to which it is responsive, are as follows:

ASSESSING BLAME IN MASSACRES

To the Editor:

In our revulsion from the massacre of Mylai we are in danger of learning the wrong lesson and wrongly assessing the blame.

The lesson to be learned from Mylai—which is the Vietnam war in microcosm—is not that war is hell, nor that a venturesome foreign policy is dangerous, nor even that we should not have intervened in Vietnam. Some or all of these propositions may be true, but the lesson of Mylai is the old one that war is too important to be left to the generals.

For without depriving the individual participants of their individual responsibility, it must be said that the strategic principles adopted and stubbornly clung to by our military leaders have made this sort of horror inevitable.

Captain Medina says there was no massacre, but he also says that at Mylai he saw something move out of the corner of his eye and shot, and later found that he'd killed an unarmed woman. It was, let us say, fear for his life that made him do it. Why was he in such fear? Because he didn't know friend from foe. And he didn't know friend from foe, not because Vietnamese look alike (all WASP's do, too), but because there was no place his friends could go to demonstrate their friendship.

UNSUITABLE STRATEGY

The search-and-destroy strategy is not interested in places, and so cannot be interested in the people who live in places, and so is peculiarly unsuited to a war said to be fought to establish a democratic government, that is, one of, by, and for the people.

Even if this not remarkably subtle point was too difficult for our military leaders to grasp in principle, the practice of a few months' fruitless searching and destroying should have taught them that something was wrong with their strategy. But these generals seem incapable of learning. And the air generals are no better, for bombing is only another form of searching and destroying—with the added contraindication that the destruction you can wreak on a largely undeveloped country is not much.

The stupidity of these generals has caused thousands of unnecessary deaths among the people we came to help and among our own troops. They have managed to lose a war and to waste the goodwill we had earned among men.

Would it not be wisdom now to retire them? We need soldiers, and we need officers to command them; but generals so

demonstrably incompetent we could do much better without.

GEORGE P. BROCKWAY,
New York, January 8, 1970.

MEANING OF MYLAI

To the Editor:

The Jan. 15 letter of George P. Brockway showed the communication problem of the American people.

First of all, he refers to "the massacre of Mylai." Until the books are closed, it is an alleged massacre. There is much to indicate it wasn't a massacre at all, if it occurred.

A "massacre" is an indiscriminate slaughter of people. If the alleged Mylai incident took place as a search-and-destroy operation, it was the selective wiping out of a Vietcong nest. So many people seem to forget that the term "Vietcong" includes women, children and old men. Their villages are targets, unfortunately.

As to generals, I for one much prefer them (and admirals) to a committee of Mr. Brockways. "Shoot it if it moves" is an order as old as warfare. A young Marine lieutenant I baptized was shot because he moved. Fortunately, he wasn't killed.

"Search-and-destroy" by bombing, to which Mr. Brockway refers, was a daily occurrence in World War II. Perhaps Mr. Brockway isn't old enough to remember this. As a matter of fact, one trouble today is that there is very small percentage of Americans who know what it is to be under fire.

He writes of "losing the war." That is news to the American people and to the world. Perhaps President Nixon and the 400,000 G.I.'s in Vietnam should get the word.

Instead of retiring the generals, perhaps Mr. Brockway should retire from writing letters to the editor.

ROBERT G. ANDRUS,
Lieutenant Commander, Chaplains
Corps., U.N.R. (Retired).
PRINCETON, N.J., January 16, 1970.

FEDERAL REGULATION OF THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I introduced a bill for myself and eight other members of the House Banking and Currency Committee. The bill would establish a Federal Insurance Guaranty Corporation, which would function similarly to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, but in this case apply to insolvent insurance companies.

The problem of insurance company insolvencies, and their accompanying loss to their claimants and the general public, is widespread and troublesome. In my State of Pennsylvania alone, 19 property and casualty insurance companies, which dealt heavily in auto insurance, have gone under in the past 10 years.

This not only leaves their clients without coverage but also offers those who have claims against the company little chance to recover anything near their just due.

The Federal Government in recent years has shown increasing interest in the insurance industry and the method of State regulation which allows many of these injustices to occur.

In connection with this subject, I would like to introduce into the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times, Tuesday, January 26. This well written article by the Times' Wallace Turner discusses the question of Federal regulation of the insurance industry and some of the attitudes in connection with this critical subject.

The article follows:

REGULATION OF INSURANCE INDUSTRY BY UNITED STATES IS PRESSED IN CONGRESS—MEASURE TO PROTECT CLAIMANTS AGAINST INSOLVENT COMPANIES WOULD REPLACE STATE CONTROLS WITH FEDERAL SETUP

(By Wallace Turner)

SAN FRANCISCO, January 25.—There are growing signs that the Federal Government may be ready to move into regulation of insurance companies, which in time could radically change the insurance business.

The move, which would end the state monopoly in insurance regulation, would be through the creation of a Federal Insurance Guaranty Corporation intended to do for claimants against insolvent insurance corporations what the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation does for depositors in insolvent banks.

The bill is now before the Senate Commerce Committee. It has been gaining support in the Senate and House despite intense lobbying against it. Public dissatisfaction with automobile insurance has provided the political support that makes the bill's passage seem certain. However, it will cover other insurance lines as well.

The proposed law would create a system of Federal examinations to supplement those traditionally made by the states. It would also set up a contingency fund, built on money taxed from insurance companies, and use it to pay claims against companies that went broke. Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Democrat of Washington, introduced the bill.

INDUSTRY REACTION MIXED

Industry reaction is mixed. The American Mutual Insurance Alliance and the National Association of Independent Insurers oppose it. The American Insurance Association, whose members write about 30 per cent of all automobile insurance, supports it.

The A.I.A. also wants to abandon the "tort" system, under which blame is placed on a motorist and then his insurance company becomes responsible for paying the claim. It would go to a "no fault" system, under which each motorist's insurance would cover his own medical bills and repair costs, thus eliminating court action and the need to place blame.

The state regulators, organized as the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, oppose any Federal regulation.

"I think it stinks," said Richards Barger, the California Commissioner. "We don't need the Federal Government to tell us how to run our insurance companies."

Richard E. Stewart, the New York Superintendent of Insurance, argued that the Federal bill would remove the states' incentive to do a good job, that it would blur their responsibility, and that New York already provided the insolvency protection the bill offers.

STUDY IN NEW YORK

(The New York Insurance Department has almost finished a special study of automobile insurance for a report to Governor Rockefeller. Superintendent Stewart would not discuss what his report will say. Qualified sources expect that the report will direct harsh criticism at automobile insurance practices and set out recommendations for sweeping reforms.)

The lengthening string of failures of automobile insurance companies is the chief reason that the bill has gained support in the

Senate. The story has been presented at hearings over the last four years and is based on the tenacious research of Dean E. Sharp, an assistant counsel of the Senate Anti-Trust and Monopoly Subcommittee headed by Senator Philip E. Hart of Michigan, also a backer of the bill.

The Commerce Committee now has a resident insurance expert, S. L. Sutcliffe, who also supports the insurance legislation. A recent survey report by industry sources states that 135 property and casualty insurance companies failed in the last 12 years for a total loss to policy holders and claimants of \$135-million.

Automobile insurance company failures have caused much financial hardship to claimants and have thus created political pressures. The insurance companies have used various devices to try to meet these complaints, the most recent the "post insolvency assessment plan."

The insolvency assessment plan has been adopted by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners as an answer to the pending Federal legislation.

GUARANTY ASSOCIATIONS

It envisions the creation of 50 state insurance guaranty associations. The members of the associations would be the companies licensed to sell insurance in the state. The companies would select the directors of the association.

The association would add up the claims against an insolvent company, and would then make levies against the remaining companies to pay off claims.

But because the bill includes a provision that the fund will not pay the first \$100 of loss, the guarantee fund (and the companies who must finance it) save many thousands of dollars at the expense of claimants.

Even so, the companies are alarmed by the post insolvency assessment concept. In such states as Illinois, where insurance company failures have caused enormous losses to the public, the companies are hesitant to support the plan.

It is an open secret in Illinois insurance circles that one company is being kept alive in the hope that it does not founder until a post insolvency assessment law can be passed. The company is said to be more than \$10-million in the hole.

"There are a lot of other ladies in waiting," said one insurance association executive. Another source estimated potential automobile insurance failures in Illinois as being worth as much as \$100-million.

"This and the Magnuson bill both miss the main point," said Vestal Lemmon, president of the National Association of Independent Insurers. "What's needed is to prevent insolvencies. This idea [the assessment plan] just gives incentive to the regulator to ride along until things get worse."

The companies expect to report heavy underwriting losses from last year to add to the \$1.7-billion that their books show they paid out in claims over premiums collected from 1959 through 1968.

The National Association of Independent Insurers has campaigned for changes in automobile design to cut repair costs. The association's counsel, Arthur C. Mertz, testified at a Washington hearing that a 1969 Chevrolet Impala, listed at \$3,500, would cost \$7,500 for the individual parts and another \$7,500 to assemble it, or a total of \$15,000, if bought one piece at a time.

The American Mutual Insurance Alliance has a film of tests it had made showing how a new car is damaged by the impact of collision with a stone wall at the speed of five miles an hour (a man walking moderately fast) and 10 miles an hour (a man walking rapidly).

REGULATORS' PROBLEMS

At five miles an hour the damage ranged from \$134 to \$305, and at 10 miles an hour,

the damage was from \$485 to \$814. The point is made that automobiles are improperly designed when damage from such minor impact costs so much to repair and thus increases insurance charges.

But in addition to those points, the backers of Federal regulation point to the problems of some of the state regulators. For example, last summer the chief executive of a defunct Florida insurance company refused to say whether he had given or lent money to anyone in the Florida insurance department.

The Florida commissioner, Broward William, was criticized by the state legislature for not having closed three companies as soon as their impaired position became known.

The Missouri insurance superintendent, Robert D. Scharz, was one of the state officials criticized for riding in an airplane owned by an insurance company that was taken over by the Oklahoma insurance department in an investigation of Mafia infiltration of business.

In Hinds County, Miss., a grand jury that reported in December said that it was almost impossible for a state to regulate insurance companies since most operate in many states. The Mississippi grand jurors asserted:

"We believe that insurance companies which do business across state lines should be subject to Federal regulations in the same manner as any other corporation or business which serves the public and operates across state lines."

TEXAS A. & I.

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

MR. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, before the deadline is reached for writing the history of college football during the 1969 season, I wish to call to the attention of Members of this body the fact that for the second time an outstanding educational institution in the 15th District of Texas, Texas A. & I. University of Kingsville, won the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics' championship.

In scoring a 32-to-7 victory over Concordia College of Minnesota on last December 13, Texas A. & I. became the National champion of small colleges and universities. The A. & I. team, the Javelinas, compiled an 11-1-0 record during the season.

Fifteen different members of this national champion football team have been named to postseason "all" units. A majority of these honorees were first-team selections. Eight of the Javelina players have been on all-America teams.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in south Texas are proud of this No. 1 team—proud of each member of it and of the entire A. & I. student body.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Concordia College people—after being defeated by A. & I.—wrote back and just thanked the whole area enthusiastically for the fine time they had being there. They had never seen such total hospitality—they sounded as though being beaten was made easy by the unique friendliness and good neighborliness shown by the Kingsville people. We are proud of that type reputation, Mr. Speaker.

And we are proud of the Javelinas' head football coach, Gil Steinke, who holds the distinction of being Texas' winningest college coach. He ended the 1969 campaign with a 118-44-4 record for his 18 years at his alma mater.

South Texas grows real men, Mr. Speaker.

GAS UTILITIES BASK IN THE CURRENT COLD

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

MR. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the cold wave the United States has been experiencing these past weeks has led some of us to wonder if Thornton Wilder may have been looking into a crystal ball when he wrote of the return of a glacial epoch in "Skin of our Teeth." These extremely low temperatures have brought home to many people in this country the meaning of the decline in gas reserve-to-consumption ratios.

Friday, January 23, 1970, the Wall Street Journal carried an article "Gas Utilities Bask in the Current Cold; It Gives Warmth to the Profit Outlook" that emphasized the increased consumption caused by declining temperatures. In Jackson, Mich., for example, consumption has increased by 18.5 percent. The article further states that—

So sharp has been the rise in gas demand that many utilities have been forced to curtail shipments to some industrial customers to conserve fuel for heating homes. So-called "interruptible" service contracts with large industrial customers allow the utilities to make the diversion.

General Motors Corp. says it has been forced to lay off 15,500 workers in Ohio because of the gas curtailment. Ford Motor Co. has told more than 9,000 of its workers, also in Ohio, to stay out until Monday. In Seneca Falls, N.Y., Sylvania Electric Products Inc., a unit of General Telephone & Electronics Corp., has closed a color television picture tube plant that employs about 1,600 persons.

U.S. Steel Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. and Armco Steel Corp. also have reduced operations because they can't get the gas they need.

These facts should make every one of us stop for a moment to reflect upon the importance of strong oil and gas reserves and the importance of increased domestic exploration and development. All the experts agree we are facing a critical gas shortage. This article points out the effects a shortage can produce. It seems to me that we should be trying to find ways to increase oil and gas—and they are inseparable—exploration and drilling rather than trying to clobber the domestic industry as it is now so fashionable to do politically.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the entire article printed in the Record:

GAS UTILITIES BASK IN THE CURRENT COLD; IT GIVES WARMTH TO THE PROFIT OUTLOOK

The cold weather that is sweeping over much of the nation is warming the profit

outlook for many of the utilities that supply heating gas.

"We're running like a car with the pedal to the floorboard," exults a spokesman for East Ohio Gas Co. in Cleveland. When the utility runs that near capacity, he says, "the profitability really goes up."

"If the weather is just normal from here out," gloats an executive of Northern Natural Gas Co. in Omaha, "we'll add at least several cents a share to first quarter earnings."

"This is the coldest January we've ever had," says the weather bureau in Pittsburgh. Daily temperatures there have been averaging 12 degrees below normal.

In Minneapolis-St. Paul, the thermometer didn't climb above zero for almost a week. In Chicago, temperatures this month are running 14 degrees below normal. Detroit officials say this will be the coldest January in half a century if the latest forecasts hold true.

In eastern Ohio, weather observers proclaim this the coldest January since 1918. In St. Louis, wind gusts of up to 34 miles an hour recently combined with readings of five below zero to drop the Weather Bureau's "chill factor" to a bone-chilling 56 degrees below.

As the readings have tumbled gas consumption has soared, sometimes 10% to 15% or more ahead of the year-earlier pace.

DELIVERIES UP IN MICHIGAN

Consumers Power Co. in Jackson, Mich., says it sent out 32 billion cubic feet of gas in the first 20 days of January, fully 18.5% ahead of the year before. Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., which is controlled by American Natural Gas Co., says in Detroit its deliveries in the period mounted 15%.

In St. Louis, Laclede Gas Co. shipments are running 17.8% ahead of the 1969 level, with a record one billion cubic feet dispatched on Jan. 9.

Northern States Power Co., which serves parts of Wisconsin, Minnesota and the Dakotas, says its shipments in the first three days of the week soared to a record average of about 350 million cubic feet a day, well above the previous 24-hour mark of 300 million cubic feet set last year.

In New York City, Brooklyn Union Gas Co. reports its sales this month are running one billion cubic feet ahead of last year. Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co., the Chicago retail gas subsidiary of Peoples Gas Co., reports its deliveries are running 16% ahead. Both the Providence (R.I.) Gas Co. and Connecticut Natural Gas Co., Hartford, say they set one-day delivery records this week.

INDUSTRIAL SHIPMENTS CUT

So sharp has been the rise in gas demand that many utilities have been forced to curtail shipments to some industrial customers to conserve fuel for heating homes. So-called "interruptible" service contracts with large industrial customers allow the utilities to make the diversion.

Such switches can mean substantial revenue gains for the utilities involved. Brooklyn Union Gas, for instance, charges American Sugar Co. and Procter & Gamble Co. as little as 34 cents a thousand cubic feet for gas supplied under an interruptible contract. Residential users typically pay \$2.40 for the same amount of gas.

South Jersey Gas Co., which also has set a one-day distribution mark this month, says in Atlantic City, N.J., that the cold wave "will bring in 10% to 15% in added revenues for our retail sales."

At many of the utilities, the added revenue will be reflected in earnings. "Inflation and billing lags make it difficult to tell just how much we'll benefit this quarter, but obviously we aren't unhappy," declares James Purcell, a vice president of Northern Indiana Public Service Co. in Hammond, Ind.

SOME DISSIDENTS

A number of other utilities, however, moan that extra costs are more than eating up the increased revenue from cold-weather sales. "You want to do me a favor, pray for warm weather," pleads an executive at Alabama Gas Corp. in Birmingham. "I can't visualize how the cold could help our earnings. And if we get another cold snap, it could have a very serious impact."

Alabama Gas is posting record deliveries this month, just as many other utilities, the spokesman says. To get the gas, though, it has been forced to pay a "penalty" price to its pipeline supplier to secure extra quantities. And it has had to buy higher priced propane, the liquid that is produced along with natural gas; it is normally stripped out of the gas in an extraction plant and sold as a consumer fuel in pressurized tanks.

Philadelphia Gas Works, a utility owned by the city of Philadelphia but operated by UGI Corp., estimates it costs the company \$1.25 to supply a thousand cubic feet of gas during normal times. In cold snaps, however, when the utility has to buy supplementary supplies at premium prices or pay overtime to its crews to make gas from fuel oil or coal, the cost for a thousand cubic feet jumps to between \$2 and \$2.25.

Washington Gas Light Co. says in Washington the gas it buys for supplemental use "costs up to three times as much as our natural gas."

Hurt, too, by the cold are hundreds of industrial companies that have been placed on short supplies by utilities rationing fuel for home use.

GENERAL MOTORS LATOFFS

General Motors Corp. says it has been forced to lay off 15,500 workers in Ohio because of the gas curtailment. Ford Motor Co. has told more than 9,000 of its workers, also in Ohio, to stay out until Monday. In Seneca Falls, N.Y., Sylvania Electric Products Inc., a unit of General Telephone & Electronics Corp., has closed a color television picture tube plant that employs about 1,600 persons.

U.S. Steel Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. and Armco Steel Corp. also have reduced operations because they can't get the gas they need.

At suppliers and transporters of propane gas and fuel oils, by contrast, business has soared as both utilities and major plants scurried to supplement skimpy natural gas supplies.

"I think we'll set a record this month," says Robert E. Thomas, president of Mapco Inc., a Tulsa-based producer, transporter and marketer of liquefied petroleum gas, including propane. Deliveries of propane this month, he states, are up more than 15%. "This is bound to help profits, at least for January. It's a nice pleasant way to start a year."

Another major supplier predicts propane shortages may lie ahead. "The big problem," he explains, "is that the gas companies, with their interruptible contracts, attempt to rely on propane for two weeks out of the year." A producer, he says, can't afford to spend what it would cost to increase propane supplies just for the "snowbirds" who "turn up only when the snow is flying."

A spokesman for Phillips Petroleum Co. said, "Propane supplies in all areas east of the Rockies are being prorated (to customers). The extremely cold weather that has covered most of the country for the past several weeks has caused tremendous demand for propane. Transportation limitations which have resulted in curtailment of deliveries are due to such demand being in excess of present pipeline capacities as well as effects of weather on rail and trucking facilities."

Humble Oil & Refining Co., the chief domestic subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. (New

Jersey) said that in the Southeast there is a shortage of propane due to the prolonged bad weather. Humble is a major propane supplier and one of 13 companies owning the Dixie Pipeline which transports propane to the Southeastern states.

Sales are also climbing for propane sold in tanks as "bottled gas." Suburban Propane Gas Corp., which services 33 states, says in Whippany, N.J., its volume is running 10% ahead of last year.

Major oil companies say demand for fuel oils has climbed just about as much as temperatures have fallen.

In New England, which consumes 22% of the nation's fuel oil, though it has only 6% of the population, one distributor says his volume is running 22% ahead of the 1969 pace. "Barring unseasonably warm weather in February and March, this should be an excellent season for us," he says.

Despite the propane shortage, Humble Oil asserts it isn't having any difficulty meeting the greatly increased demand for home fuels.

NO TROUBLE FOR HUMBLE

Humble Oil & Refining Co., the chief domestic subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), asserts it isn't having any difficulty meeting the greatly increased demand for home fuels.

Humble says, however, that supplies of heavy industrial fuel oils are very limited because of the cold. The company is still making deliveries to its industrial customers, but it complains of "trying conditions." It is refusing to take on any new accounts.

To speed the delivery time, Humble says, some trucks in the New York area are bypassing local terminals and going directly to the refinery in Bayonne, N.J., to pick up supplies.

Some prices have climbed with the increased demand. One marketer says quotes for home heating oils have risen one-half cent a gallon to homeowners in the past two weeks. Prices currently stand about one-quarter cent higher than last year in the East and a full cent higher in the Midwest.

NIXON SHOWS STATURE AS A TRUE STATESMAN

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, my very good friend, the chief of the Washington bureau of the Plain Dealer, John P. Leacacos, has given a standing ovation to President Nixon's splendid state of the Union address.

Jack Leacacos has observed a good many administrations at work during his years of reporting and commenting on the Washington scene. His Sunday column in the Plain Dealer has a wide and respectful audience in the greater Cleveland area, readers who rely on Jack for a candid analysis of happenings in the Nation's Capital. Jack is one of the Nation's most respected political observers, as well as an author of great merit. The sincerity of his appreciation for the President's address is enhanced by this distinguished background.

In his commentary, Jack also shares with his readers the intimate glimpse he had into the creation of the speech. His excellent column follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Jan. 26, 1970]

NIXON SHOWS STATURE AS A TRUE STATESMAN

(By John P. Leacacos)

WASHINGTON.—President Richard Nixon did a superb job in his first State of the Union speech. He began to show stature as a true statesman, viz., a leader who can combine the arts of politics to encompass the objectives of a nation.

The President's White House intimates in the several days preceding the address, which has been months in gestation, dropped the word that the speech was one of the great challenges that Nixon faced in his career, and that the President so regarded it himself. And it is only fair to add that the hints of the contents of the speech as given to me personally at least two weeks ago were actually borne out by the actual delivery, which, of course speaks well for the candor of the informants.

This reporter by pure chance had a further enlightening contact with the creation-in-process of the speech several days previously when I was sitting in the office of Henry A. Kissinger, the President's assistant for national security affairs.

Kissinger had read various drafts of the speech and he was perusing the latest version of the moment. He marked those pages he liked with a check mark, those he did not care for particularly with an x, and left unmarked those he was neutral about. Kissinger and I then resumed our conversation.

Some minutes later the phone rang and I was asked to step out of the room; the President was on the phone. Naturally I know nothing of what was talked about, but I do know the main topic at the White House for many days was the speech and I would guess that the President was asking Kissinger about points that the latter had made.

The impression I would like to stress in general is the President's sensitivity to responsible comment and his open-mindedness about revising his own views in the significant nuances that count. In that sense, the speech was a total administration effort, but above all, it was a reflection of everybody to the guidelines laid down by the President's own directions and instincts.

In the liberal rhetoric and conservative anchors of the Nixon proposals could also be seen the fine Irish hand of "Pat" Moynihan, the lone Democrat in the highest echelons of the presidential circles. This does not mean that Democrat Moynihan sold the President a bill of goods, but that the President's vision and needs made use of Moynihan.

All this is prefatory to a series of points the President made which were in the nature of the fine print, but highly illuminating nevertheless. Let us recall several phrases between the declarative sentences. For instance: "harnessing the vast energies . . . new beginnings and explorations . . . unfinished business . . . challenge of perfecting . . . the world as it is (as basis for policies) . . . how to use that growth . . . the effectiveness of government . . . reform of the institutions of U.S. government . . . re-direct growth . . . national growth policy (as a national plan)."

In brief, the President in his report to the Congress exemplified the two aspects of a President's function that often are overlooked in the purely partisan political analysis. One of the visions he disclosed in his capacity as the leader of all the people, irrespective of party. The other—and the phrases quoted above are directly pertinent—have to do with managing and administering the affairs of the American society in the most efficacious manner so that desired objectives can be achieved in reality.

It is perhaps in this aspect of tidying up the messes of the past where 400 urban programs went off in almost as many directions; where billions were frittered away with no

overall goal of coordinating vast and contradictory approaches; where no concepts of how to do the job were developed, that President Nixon might leave his permanent mark, among others.

Problems have been left to molder for close to 100 years. Programs have been left in abeyance like a pier in the midst of nowhere. Self-interests have never been evaluated and arranged. Priorities and systems have never been organized.

As a noted publisher remarked the other day, "If Nixon can bring modern management to the art of governments as Alfred Sloan did for the General Motors, the greatest exemplar of modern capitalism, he will build the base and machinery with which we can truly create a new nation for the next centuries."

PANAMA CANAL

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from Mr. Carl Svarverud of Eugene, Oreg., pertaining to the future progress of interoceanic canal construction in Central America. I would like to bring this analysis to the attention of my colleagues:

EUGENE, OREG.,
November 19, 1969.

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Oregon's 4th Congressional District, which you so ably represent, leads the world in the production and export of lumber products.

This District and the State of Oregon have always been deeply concerned with isthmian interoceanic canal projects and problems. The Oregon State Legislature in 1895 passed a resolution petitioning the Government of the United States to build the Nicaragua Canal.

As a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I hope you find the following statement of interest:

The Japanese government, six years ago, appointed a representative of the Japanese Iron and Steel industry to go to Washington to inquire what the intentions of the American government were in regard to constructing an isthmian interoceanic waterway that would accommodate the supersized carriers.

The Japanese not only lead the world in shipbuilding, but also in the importation of coal and iron ore. The annual shipping charges on that imported coal and iron ore would be more than \$100 million less if transported in 100,000 to 200,000 ton ships rather than in 60,000 ton carriers, the limit size that can transit the Panama Canal.

The restrictions on import and export to and from the United States due to the limitation of the Panama Canal locks are emphasized by two shipments of coal from Virginia ports to Japan this year. A 130,000 ton Norwegian freighter could only load out an 80% load—95,000 tons—of coal from Hampton Roads because of draft limitations of 46 feet—about seven feet over the Panama Canal draft allowance.

The Norwegian freighter with a beam width of 113 feet—three feet wider than the locks of Panama—had to deliver the coal to Japan by way of the Cape of Good Hope, an extra 13 days in sailing time over the Panama route. The extra cost was more than double the amount of tolls it would have paid at Panama if it could have transited the Panama Canal.

The Panama Canal company magazine "Spillway", October 10, 1969, shows a picture of the 70,000 ton Norwegian carrier "Rinda" in a tight fit at Miraflores lock. The 106' wide ship had only an 80 per cent load of 56,000 tons of Virginia coal, due to draft limitations at the Panama Canal. The coal cargo was bound for Japan.

The negative results of Japanese inquiries in Washington as to what the United States government planned for the immediate future in regard to building expanded isthmian interoceanic waterway facilities was reflected by the negotiation the past two years by Japanese steel interests for the purchase of some \$2 billion of Alberta Canadian coal to be delivered over the next 13 years. These Japanese-Canadian coal contracts represent a loss of \$2 billion in foreign exchange to the United States and the U.S. coal industry. Those contracts were made possible by the British Columbia government building a new \$50 million, 62-foot deep port at Roberts Bank, some 25 miles south of Vancouver, B.C.

This harbor, which will be deeper than any port in the United States outside of Puget Sound, will accommodate ships up to 200,000 tons. Although the Canadian coal is of inferior quality to West Virginia coal and the Canadian Railroad haul to port is twice that of the Virginia coal, the saving in shipping in 200,000-ton ships over 56,000-ton size—Panama Canal limit—made possible the Canadian coal sales. The Canadian coal would not have been competitive with West Virginia coal if the latter could have been transported to Japan via an American isthmian canal that could accommodate 200,000-ton carriers, including payment of canal tolls.

Tonnage through the Panama Canal has increased approximately 50 per cent in the past five years. Whatever urgency there may have been when Public Law 88-609 was enacted, the isthmian canal problem is obviously far more critical today.

It is evident, however, from an analysis of the fifth annual report issued July 31, 1969, by the Atlantic-Pacific Inter-oceanic Canal Study Commission, which was set up under the provisions of Public Law 88-609, the Commission has not come up with or can it now be expected to come up with a viable solution for the increasingly critical and vexing problem of the Panama Canal.

Two factors have been mainly responsible for the all but ineluctable dilemma it finds itself in. One of these factors is directly attributable to the Canal Study Commission's incredible error in accepting claims and assurances that nuclear explosives could be used to excavate an inter-oceanic sea level canal legally, with security, expeditiously and at a cost of about one-sixth that for conventional construction. On every point they were wrong. The Canal Study Commission consistently and stubbornly rejected all information that questioned the legality, security, economy and technical ability to successfully excavate an inter-oceanic sea level canal with nuclear explosives.

After having been granted an extension of two years and five months above the four years provided in Public Law 88-609, and additional fund authorization of \$6.5 million above the original \$17.5 million to carry on their studies the Atlantic-Pacific Inter-Oceanic Canal Study Commission tacitly admits in their 5th Annual Report issued July 31, 1969, that they may have had false hopes in selecting two so-called nuclear routes as preferred sites for the construction of a new sea level canal. The Canal Study Commission allotted 94 per cent of their \$24 million funds to studies of the so-called nuclear routes #17 and #25. (H.R. Hearings May 9, 1967, page 40.)

The Canal Study Commission frankly, but belatedly, now admits its earlier cost estimate of \$770 million for nuclear construction

of route #17 was approximately 67 per cent below their present estimate, which they state is comparable to conventional construction costs of routes 10 and 14—Chorrera-Lagarto—and the Panama Canal sea level conversion which have had cost estimates of \$3 billion and \$2¼ to \$2.5 billion respectively (see page 5, 5th Annual Report of Canal Study Commission).

That proponents of nuclear excavation of a sea level canal quoted cost estimates as much as 67% off on the low side is not only evident, but now admitted. There is equally factual available evidence that they also used cost estimates for conventional canal construction as much as 200% too high on some particular routes—particularly the Nicaragua-Costa Rica border route #8.

The Canal Study Commission quotes conventional construction costs for routes #17 and #25 at approximately \$2.70 per cubic yard, overall cost. At that excavation cost, the Atrato #25 in Colombia, the Sassardi-Marti #17 in Panama and the Nicaragua-Costa Rica #8 and the Tuysra-Atrato route proposed jointly by the governments of Panama and Colombia would have price tags of over \$5 billion. However, excavation costs of \$2.70 per cubic yard, six times that of the last work in 1963-64 on the Gaillard cut widening project in the Panama Canal as reported in the 1964 Annual Report of the Panama Canal Company. That report said that the costs on that project had been successively lowered between 1959 and 1964 from \$1.03 to \$0.44½ per cubic yard.

The joint venture contractors on the \$80 million Oroville Dam in California, completed two years ago, report a cost of 20 cents a yard for material placement in the dam after excavation and a 14-mile railroad and belt conveyor haul.

These two concrete examples of current excavation costs demonstrate strikingly how misleading and highly exaggerated are cost estimates of \$2.70 per cubic yard for canal construction by conventional methods. This accounts for the attempt by the Canal Study Commission to place the Nicaragua-Costa Rica border route out of contention, although that route has been historically recognized to offer the best route for inter-coastal and inter-oceanic shipping.

The 1947 isthmian canal studies showed that for the 10 major world trade routes that use the Panama Canal, there would be a net mileage saving by the use of the Nicaragua route averaging 185 miles. Ton mileage costs were figured at approximately 2 mills a ton mile.

These figures would indicate that if the Nicaragua route had been adopted rather than the Panama route as unanimously recommended by the Isthmian Canal Commission, November 16, 1901, the 424,000 ship transits through the canal on which 1,970,000,000 tons have been paid tolls since the canal's opening in August 1914 to date, there would have been a net saving to shippers of approximately \$730 million (185 x 2 mills x 1,970,000,000).

The U.S. Department of Transportation's recent Isthmian Canal Demand Forecast gives an estimated annual increase of isthmian canal traffic for the next 70 years averaging approximately 4 per cent. This shows an annual average tonnage for the period from 1980 to 2030 of a little over 470 million tons.

A sea level canal between Nicaragua and Costa Rica with a 185-mile advantage over the Panama or Southern canal routes at 2 mills a ton mile for 470 million tons annually would give approximately \$140 million annual savings by use of the Nicaragua route over the Panama or southern canal routes, or a saving of \$7 billion. This sum is approximately double the true cost of construction of a sea level canal on the Nicaragua-Costa Rica border.

The other principal factor that has in-

hibited the Canal Study Commission from determining a viable solution for the dilemma at Panama is the frustrated attempt by the chairman of the Canal Study Commission and the diplomatic officials of the United States to negotiate canal construction treaties with either Panama or Colombia. In view of this impasse in canal treaty negotiations, the comment in the 5th Annual Report of the Canal Study Commission is of great significance: "The treaty terms for the construction, operation, and defense of a new sea level canal will be of major importance in the determination of the feasibility of its construction by the United States. Therefore, for each of the routes under consideration, the Commission will take cognizance of possible terms in formulating its final recommendations."

No information has ever been made public that any canal construction treaty negotiation has even been initiated by the United States with Colombia. Prolonged negotiations have been carried on since 1962 between the United States and Panama concerning the present Panama Canal and new canal construction. The results of those negotiations have been negative.

The Hay-Bunau Varilla canal treaty, signed November 18, 1903, gave the United States the rights to build, operate, maintain and sanitize a ship canal across Panama in perpetuity and de facto sovereignty over a ten-mile wide strip of territory across Panama. That treaty has been considered by all elements of society in Panama as a cancer ever since its signing. They claim it was an imposed treaty not negotiated or signed by any Panamanian, but by a French citizen.

Panama has insisted since 1962 that the 1903 treaty be revised. Both President Kennedy and President Johnson named envoys to meet with Panamanian officials to work out a revision of the 1903 canal treaty. Tentative agreement was reached by the representatives of Panama and the United States in July 1967, but when the treaty drafts were published in the United States such adamant opposition immediately developed in both countries that the treaties were never formally signed or presented for ratification to the respective governments.

Any hopes of eventual success in negotiating treaties with either or both Panama and Colombia that would give the United States government full or partial ownership, management and protective rights over a new sea level canal in either Panama or Colombia were definitely laid to rest by the announcement in Panama City, September 15, 1969 that the two foreign ministers representing the governments of Panama and Colombia had signed an accord for a joint inter-oceanic canal venture. The projected sea-level canal would run from the Bay of San Miguel on the Pacific in Panama up the Tuyra River, crossing the 350-foot high Continental Divide into the Atrato Basin and coming out at the mouth of the Atrato in Colombia on the Atlantic. The canal would be about 125 miles in length.

This Tuyra-Atrato route would be from 70 to 570 miles longer than any other potential isthmian canal route between New York and San Francisco, California. Panama announced that they accepted the policy statement enunciated by the President of Colombia: "The canal would have to be Colombian property (any canal in Colombia), administered and guarded by our government and our own forces. We do not exclude, of course, foreign financial and technical cooperation."

It was the Spooner Act of June 28, 1902 that empowered the United States to buy out the French interests and complete the construction of the Panama Canal. The directive in Section 4 of the Spooner Act was injudiciously ignored by the President of the United States. In order to circumvent the directive in Section 4, the United States

government saw fit to aid and abet a conspiracy engineered and financed by Bunau Varilla to support Dr. Amador and associates in Panama to carry out a revolt in that Colombian province.

That conspiracy and revolt engendered a heritage of enmity in Colombia and Panama against the United States that is now endemic in both countries.

The United States government can control and operate the Panama Canal as long as this government is able and willing to use superior military forces to do so, but those same superior forces will not secure new canal treaties for the United States in either Panama or Colombia today.

The formal declaration by the two governments of Panama and Colombia, September 15, 1969, leaves the United States with a viable and most attractive alternative. That is to proceed literally in accordance with the stipulations of Section 4 of the Spooner Act of June 28, 1902, which states: "Should the President be unable to obtain control of the necessary territory from the Republic of Colombia, then the President after obtaining necessary rights from Costa Rica and Nicaragua shall through the Isthmian Canal Commission cause to be excavated and constructed a ship canal and waterway across what is known as the Nicaragua Canal Route."

Sincerely,

CARL SVARVERUD.

G. O. WESSENAUER, OUTSTANDING
PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, one of the most capable and dedicated public servants has retired this month after 35 years of distinguished service with the Tennessee Valley Authority.

On January 9, G. O. Wessenaer retired after heading the TVA power operations for 26 years as manager of power. He had started work with TVA in 1935 as a hydraulic engineer.

As a resident of north Alabama, I have seen the profound changes which this man's efforts have helped bring about in the life of the people. When I was growing up, few farms had the advantage of electric service; residents of towns had to pay high rates for the electricity they did receive; and industries were small and contributed relatively little to the economy of the area.

Now all this has changed. Today it would be difficult to find a farm in north Alabama that is not hooked up to the electric system; residential customers pay less than 1 cent for each kilowatt-hour of electricity used, and large power-using industries abound in the region.

As a Congressman from north Alabama, I have been fortunate in having the type of personal contact with Mr. Wessenaer that leads to an appreciation of the key role he has played in achieving these results. His knowledge and dedication are readily apparent when he explains the role that low-cost power plays in developing a region. His grasp of the intricacies of power system management becomes evident when he discusses the financial needs of an agency

meeting the electric needs of an 80,000-square-mile area.

His work has received recognition throughout the country. In 1963, he received the Rockefeller Public Service Award which is reserved for outstanding civil servants. In 1965, the Federal Power Commission sought him as a consultant in the investigation of the Northeast power failure. He has been elected to the National Academy of Engineering and received a life membership in the American Public Power Association.

Mr. Wessenaer's achievements could also be measured in the growth of the TVA power system while he was manager of power. When he was appointed to that position in 1944, TVA served slightly over 500,000 customers; today it serves more than 2 million. An average home in the TVA area used 1,700 kilowatt hours of electricity a year in 1944, while today the average annual residential use is 13,600 kilowatt hours. Commercial and industrial use has increased from 7 billion to more than 57 billion kilowatt hours a year. Finally, the investment in power facilities during Mr. Wessenaer's service as manager of power has increased from \$360 million to \$2.5 billion.

Despite these impressive statistics, and the high honors that "Wes" has received through the years, I think that the most significant monument to his efforts may well be a simple electric light in an isolated farmhouse window. Such a light is proof that G. O. Wessenaer's efforts have helped to bring the benefits of low-cost electricity to places that were previously dark.

I salute him on his retirement for a job well done. He has my best wishes for every success and enjoyment in his future endeavors.

A HUMAN SECURITY PLAN

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion in recent days on Senator McGovern's human security plan.

I think it is in the interest of House discussion that the Senator's speech itself be placed in the RECORD. It is an important document and is worthy of the attention of my colleagues.

The speech, delivered to the Citizens' Committee for Children in New York City January 20, is as follows:

A HUMAN SECURITY PLAN

For a quarter of a century now the Citizens' Committee for Children has sought to combine compassion and technical expertise in effective pursuit of one overriding goal: to help every American child achieve his full potential. This goal, set 25 years ago by your distinguished founding members, can never be improved. You have resolved, also, "that in all your work for children, your paramount concern shall be America's 'major unfinished business'—the elimination of poverty and racism from the lives of her children."

I count it a great honor to have been asked to share with you my thoughts as to

how that resolution might best be implemented.

In a speech delivered before the National Press Club last week, Secretary Finch spoke of the President's Family Assistance Program. That program, he said, "is the most revolutionary social proposal since the 30's . . . yet here we are coming down to the crunch in the Ways and Means Committee—and we haven't even begun to hear the kind of national debate on welfare reform we must have if any proposal is to succeed."

"We think," the Secretary continued, "it would be in the interest of welfare reform if there were some Democratic alternative on the table so that the cause of welfare reform need not be identified solely with a Republican President."

I agree with Secretary Finch. There is a fundamental alternative to the President's Family Assistance proposal—an alternative whose potential as an anti-poverty strategy far exceeds the poor people's approach of the President—A Human Security Plan which looks toward insuring each of our citizens against the risk of poverty and doing so simply because we believe that this kind of minimal financial security should be a right of citizenship in our country.

I share with you the common belief that our nation is approaching a pivotal moment of decision concerning her children. We must soon decide whether we are willing to commit our full energies to ending the hopeless poverty which enfolds the lives of 13 million American children. Unless we act now, these 13 million will take the place of their fathers and their fathers before them—they will become America's new generation of poor.

But the question before us tonight is not whether this would be an unspeakable tragedy—it would. The issue is how best to avert that tragedy. It is on this issue that I must dissent from the central thrust of the Nixon Family Assistance Plan.

Let me explain. The history of programs marked "for poor people only," has not been a happy one in this country. The reason is not hard to find—it is the "myth of the idle poor."

All of us have heard some version of that myth. The poor, it is said, are lazy. They have no pride. They drink too much. They drive fancy cars and own color television sets.

It makes little difference that this myth is a lie. Myths always resist facts.

As leaders, we must continue to talk facts. We must put on the record the truth that of America's 40 million poorest citizens, thirty million live in the home of a worker. Of 9 million welfare recipients, only 80,000 are able-bodied men who could work if there were jobs for them—more than four million unemployed Americans could work and want to work, but there are no jobs for which they are trained. These are the facts.

Over the past ten years we have sought to end poverty with programs which have driven wedges of misunderstanding between our people. In our anxiety to put a quick end to the suffering of the poor, we have pursued the gods of "efficiency" and "poverty-effectiveness." In order to partake of our paternalistic programs, we have required that men humble themselves in proof that they are destitute and "worthy." Our programs have been efficient—deadly efficient. You recognize the programs to which I refer—medical care in public clinics, public assistance, and public housing. All were started by reformers with high hopes. All have turned out badly. As a Health Center physician in the South Bronx said the other day: "Care for the poor inevitably becomes poor care." It is a hard lesson—but it is true. These programs have efficiently demeaned

the poor. They have efficiently alienated the non-poor. They have reinforced the mythology of poverty, fostered racial prejudice and earned us the title "ilmoisine liberal."

One would think that we might have learned from the experience. Yet, now we rush to embrace as new, radical, and a departure for the 70's, a Family Assistance Program which simply isolates the poor and their supporters more efficiently.

The Family Assistance Program is the poor people's program par excellence. Both in its actual provisions and in the long-term strategy which it suggests, its central principle is that of making payments to people because they are poor.

Backers of the plan make no bones about this. The purpose of their plan, they say, is to expand welfare—someday to an adequate income level—and rationalize the existing system in order to remove extraneous obstacles to paying people because they are poor.

Of course, the actual Family Assistance Plan makes some very serious compromises with this basic principle. It does not begin to adequately support anyone or even talk of a day when this will be done. It does not standardize payments across state lines. It grossly penalizes states and cities like New York which have conscientiously tried to meet the standard of need. And it fails to remove the privilege of welfare administration from local authorities in many states who have proven themselves amply worthy of losing that privilege.

Still, these inadequacies aside, the logical extension of the President's proposal remains a fully federalized guaranteed income plan which dispenses a uniform national payment generous enough to lift every poor family out of poverty within a very few years. Amendments designed to extend the Family Assistance Program in these directions will be offered in Congress this year. I will support them. In particular I will support federal assumption of all responsibility for the administration and cost of public assistance. I will offer an amendment to raise the payment level substantially above \$1,600 dollars.

Certainly, all of us who are concerned with putting a quick end to poverty must hope that when we open the door recommended by the Administration, we will find that it leads to an exit from poverty. But I fear this door will lead us into a tiny closet in which we will be confined by the same suspicion and mistrust of the poor that has trapped us in the past.

We will find ourselves pursuing that impossible dream of an efficiently operated, non-demeaning, generously funded program which benefits only poor people and does so only because they are poor. Such a program is a contradiction in terms. It is impossible.

When we pursue this dream—when we follow this strategy—we are ignoring the record. Worse, we are ignoring the fact that poor people's needs are no different than those of the rest of us. We are forgetting that our sacred poverty line is nothing more than a ridiculously low, arbitrary income standard. Instead of identifying those needs which the poor share in common with every American citizen—instead of offering assistance directed toward meeting those common needs of every citizen—we are branding the poor as different—dividing them from their fellows—stripping them of the political support which they need—and furthering the explosive divisions which threaten to tear our nation apart.

What is so painful about this spectacle is that there already exists in this country most of the major elements of a far different strategy of poverty prevention. Instead of waiting until people are already stigmatized—until they are poor and in despair—and then helping them half way out of poverty, this strat-

egy seeks to identify those who are most likely to fall into poverty and to help them avoid that fate.

What I am proposing to you tonight is that we finish the job of securing our citizens against the risk of poverty. What I propose is a Human Security Plan the benefits of which would go to each of our citizens as their basic human right.

What would a system of this kind look like?

It would comprise four major components—components which would protect each of us against the four major causes of poverty in America. *First*, it would include a Children's Allowance to secure the future of our children. *Second*, it would guarantee a job at a decent wage for every able-bodied working age citizen. *Third*, it would improve Social Security for the elderly and disabled. *Finally*, it would provide a small, federally administered special Public Assistance plan to protect the few who would remain in need of additional income maintenance.

First the Children's Allowance—its purpose would be to secure our people against what, incredibly, is the most frequent incidence of poverty in America—childhood. Over and over again, until it is almost intolerable, we hear of America's supposed commitment to her children. We hear that our children are the future of the nation. We hear of a commitment to the first five years of life. We hear that saving our children is the key to interrupting the poverty cycle. These are the things we hear.

What we see is something entirely different. We see that no single factor correlates so highly with poverty as does the number of children in a family. We see that only one of every eight families with a single child is poor—while one out of every two families with six children is poor. We see that two-thirds of the children in large female headed families are poor. We see 5 million children being brought up in poverty even though their father or mother—or both—works full time. And when we add all these figures together, we find that we have consigned 13 million of our children to poverty.

Nor is it just families labeled as poor who are unable to give their children the opportunities they need. Millions of young, middle class families who one day will earn eight to ten, even twelve thousand dollars a year, have much less than they need during their critical first years of childrearing. These are families who are appalled by the concept of welfare, and wouldn't accept it for themselves or for others. Yet they are also the forgotten young families whose children Dr. Milton Senn recently found to be raised under culturally impoverished conditions—often without even the simplest creative toys.

I submit to you tonight that these conditions—this yawning gap between what we claim to want for the children of America and what we actually deliver to them—is intolerable. The first and most important objective of any income transfer systems must be to close this gap, to close it for all our citizens, and to close it with dignity.

I am therefore preparing for submission to Congress early this year a program of Children's Allowances. While the details of my plan are not yet complete, it would provide, when fully implemented, a substantial allowance—50 to 65 dollars a month—for every child in this country.

Like the other parts of the Human Security Plan which I propose, the Children's Allowance would not be a pauper's program. It would go simply and automatically to every family with dependent children. Yet—though not a poverty program—the Children's Allowance would prevent a great deal of poverty simply because so many children are poor. It would, in fact, very nearly wipe out poverty among most families with children. It would also provide a critical boost in the incomes

of those young middle American families of whom I have spoken. Not until family income reached well into the \$25,000 plus brackets would the benefits of my plan be cancelled out by loss of the existing income tax exemption which it would replace.

Mention of the income tax exemption points up the fact that we have actually had a Children's Allowance for years—the familiar 600 dollar, soon to be 750 dollar, exemption for children.

But what a curious Children's Allowance that exemption has been. For the rich man—the family earning \$50 thousand a year—it has returned a benefit of over 300 dollars per child. For the average American who takes home about \$10 thousand a year it has returned an actual benefit of less than 150 dollars per child. For our poorest citizens—those most in need of help in lifting their children from poverty—it has meant an actual dollar benefit of zero and a life on the dole.

My plan would reverse this curious schedule and provide a substantial cash increase for every family whose income is less than \$25,000 per year—the poorer the family the larger the increase.

The United States stands alone among advanced nations in its failure to provide its people with a progressively taxed system of Children's Allowances. The benefits which would accrue to our nation if we reverse this failure and enact a Children's Allowance are many.

Some I have already indicated. But let me point out, in concrete terms, a few of the others.

First, for the supposedly standard poor family of four whose head is a working man but earns only \$2,400 per year, a Children's Allowance would provide at least the additional \$1,200 a year needed to escape poverty. It would do this with no trace of the work incentive problem that plagues welfare schemes. It would do it without submitting the father to the degradation of proving pauperism and without submitting his children to the taunts of their more fortunate playmates.

Second, for the welfare family headed by a woman with five young children, my plan would mean at least \$3,000 per year. If she were able to work, and chose to take on that extra burden, she would keep all, not 50% of what she earned. But, if she judged it more important to stay home with her family, her payments could be raised provided we are willing to enact a plan with more adequate levels of assistance than those the President has proposed.

Third, for the typical young middle American family having three children and earning \$6 to \$8 thousand per year, my allowance would provide a net cash benefit—after taxes and loss of the present tax exemption—of about \$1,000 to \$1,500 per year. With medical care, property taxes, and the cost of education skyrocketing, this modest sum could mean a college education, a decent home, or an annual medical checkup for millions of American children.

Finally, for the older business executive or the doctor whose income is in five or six figures, a taxable Children's Allowance would mean a loss of a few hundred dollars per year. They can afford this loss. From what I know of our professionals and business executives I believe that they will see this loss as a valuable investment in their country.

The Children's Allowance also deals effectively with the troublesome relationship between wages and poverty. At the present minimum wage of \$1.60 per hour, a man who works full time can support only two children. If he has more he is poor. The Family Assistance Plan tries to deal with this problem by permitting the wage earner to keep only half of his salary. Another way of meeting the problem would be to raise the mini-

mum wage. But if we were to raise the minimum wage to the point where it would eliminate poverty among working families, we would find ourselves demanding a four or five dollar minimum wage. The result would be to eliminate millions of jobs—hardly a favor to the marginal worker.

The Children's Allowance approach would permit realistic increases in the minimum wage and would permit workers to keep all—not just half—of those increases. The result would be to virtually eliminate poverty among working families with children while retaining a 100% incentive to work and not jeopardizing the marginal jobs on which many of our working men must depend for their livelihood.

Inevitably there will be a number of arguments made against the Children's Allowance. One in particular should be mentioned. It will surely be said that this kind of allowance will convince families to have more children. There are many reasons for which families have children. But all of the available evidence shows that a small payment for each child has not been one of those reasons in any of the many countries where it has been tried. In Sweden, in Canada, and in France the birth rate has not been affected at all by payments for children. Nor has it been affected by our AFDC program which already offers an increased payment for each child.

Since careful studies tell us that the relatively high birthrate in poor families comes about despite the fact that these families want to have exactly the same number of children as their wealthier countrymen, it would seem that if we wish to deal with our population problem, planned parenthood will be much more effective than planned starvation. There is even evidence that as families are stabilized and lifted out of poverty by the Children's Allowance, their birth rate may reflect the well documented rule "the higher the income the lower the birth rate."

These, then, are the arguments for Children's Allowances. They are badly needed to fill our supposed commitment to our children. They require no humiliating proof of poverty, yet will lift most children out of poverty. They recognize our poverty line for the ridiculously low, arbitrary measure that it is by helping children on both sides of the line. And they reverse the inequity of our present tax structure as it affects families with children.

I believe deeply, as I know the Citizens' Committee does also, that these are worthy objectives. I solicit your support in commending them to the President, to Secretary Finch and to the American people.

I have dwelt at length on the Children's Allowance because it is our children who are most in need, and perhaps most deserving, of protection against poverty. But just as children are not the only Americans whose needs must be secured, a Children's Allowance is not the only part of a fully adequate alternative to the President's Family Assistance Program.

The second most common cause of poverty in the United States is unemployment. The Human Security Plan which I propose would recognize that virtually every American wants very badly to be able to support his own family. It would secure this basic human right to work by guaranteeing a job to any person able to take one.

These jobs would not be make work jobs. They would be jobs in the private sector for which men need only to be trained. They would be new jobs created by an expanding economy. And, where necessary, they would be public service jobs created to help fill the crying need for housing, schools, libraries, parks, and hospitals all across our land. It has been estimated that meeting our country's needs in these areas will require the creation of as many as four or five million jobs.

Like the Children's Allowance, this right to work program would be open to all of our citizens. It would identify a part of the population—those who are having trouble finding a job—as a group that is likely to face poverty. It would not say to these people—wait until you are poor and we will give you a handout. It would not stop with offering training for jobs that do not exist. Instead, it would say, "you want to work. We need your work. Start today."

The third part of a system designed to secure Americans against the danger of poverty must meet the needs of those for whom neither work nor a Children's Allowance is adequate—the elderly and disabled. For them an end to poverty requires nothing more than a modest upgrading and expansion of Social Security coverage.

Specifically:

We must reintroduce and pass the minimum payment of \$100 per month for retired social security beneficiaries which was dropped last month in a misguided economy move demanded by the White House.

We must blanket into the Social Security System the one million aged individuals who are now excluded because they lack the necessary quarters of covered employment.

And we must broaden disability coverage to include those who have been disabled since childhood or are excluded because of the unduly rigid definition of disability which is written into the existing law.

I shall support, or introduce, legislation to accomplish each of these objectives.

Finally, we may always need a small program that provides money on the basis of a demonstration of poverty—that is, a welfare-type program. Under the Human Security Plan this special assistance would be a cushion, a flexible federal program to provide fully adequate income support for those few, perhaps 4 or 5 million Americans, whose special human needs may not be covered by the other parts of the system. Perhaps with such a small program we will finally learn to operate public assistance humanely.

If the Human Security Plan which I have outlined tonight sounds like something for everyone—it is. It is a program to meet this nation's unmet human needs—needs which are shared by all of us.

If you think that I have been putting something off, you are also right—I have. What will it all cost?

Here the time comes for some straight talk. It is time for this nation to stop fooling itself. For years we have been expecting million dollar results from penny ante programs and feigning surprise when these programs have failed.

Let me set it out for you. If we are to begin to phase in the Children's Allowance plan which I have outlined, it will cost us ten billion dollars the first year. This cost will rise each year until it reaches a level close to that of our existing Social Security System.

Nor will an adequate Social Security System and the creation of employment opportunities be cheap. These programs, together with a fully implemented Children's Allowance could reach close to 35 billion dollars per year by 1976.

These figures may seem fanciful when compared to the 4 billion dollars allocated by the Administration for its Family Assistance Program. But the two are not comparable. If the President really intends to expand his system to eliminate poverty and to provide jobs, training and day care—as the Human Security Plan would—he will find that it will also cost him 35 billion dollars per year. He will find too that in order to preserve the 50% work incentive in his Family Assistance Plan, he will be saddled with a program which imposes a poverty test on its recipients yet delivers only about 35% of its benefits to those who would otherwise be poor. This 35% ratio does not compare favorably with the ratio which would occur under the system

of non-demeaning poverty prevention which I have proposed.

Perhaps the sums I am suggesting still seem fanciful to you—particularly since I was among those who voted for what has come to be known as the Christmas Tree tax cut of 1969. I also voted for a number of substantial revenue raising tax reforms which were defeated—but that is not the point.

The point is that we are a nation with a one trillion dollar economy. We are a nation whose existing system of taxes and subsidies presently transfers from one hand to another over 100 billion dollars every year. We are a nation—and I want you to know that I mean this—we are a nation which can fully implement the Human Security Plan which I have proposed before our two hundredth birthday in 1976 and can do so without raising taxes.

How?

By 1976 our government will be taking in an estimated 50-75 billion real dollars more than it now does—and will take in these dollars without raising taxes. This is the so-called growth dividend.

Yesterday, before the National Press Club, I suggested that we could cut our present war budget by 50 billion in the next 3 years without any real loss in security. This would free another forty billion dollars.

I submit that the question before us tonight is not whether forty or fifty billion dollars will be available to meet our human needs by 1976. The question is whether we can convince the American people that meeting these needs is more important to our national security than a new generation of missiles or a new round of tax cuts.

I submit to you that those of us who call ourselves leaders should be realistic enough to know that we can never convince the American people of these facts if we persist in the delusion that only poor people or black people have unmet human needs.

We have been fighting with both hands tied behind our back and a blindfold on. We have been trying to convince middle America of a palpable absurdity—that in this day of the \$2,000 dollar a year college tuition only people who earn less than \$3,600 dollars a year have unmet human needs. And we do this in full knowledge that the Bureau of Labor Statistics says it costs over \$10,000 per year to live in New York City on a budget that allows a family the great luxury of a 2 year old used car and one new suit every 4 years.

This kind of argument is political suicide, and if we think that by committing political suicide we are helping to solve the problems of the poor and the blacks—or the cities or the farmer—we had better think again.

If the President wants to submit a plan whose great virtue is that it gives money only to the poor and only because they are poor, that is his problem. But if we rush to support that program as the push button answer to poverty, we are wrapping our hopes for those 10% of our citizens who are poor up in a neat little package addressing the package to Strom Thurmond and hoping that he will deliver it to the needy.

What I would suggest to you in closing tonight is that it is time that we stopped offering such a convenient target to the knee-jerk reactionaries. There is not the slightest reason why we should neatly label our proposals "for poor people only" and charge into battle supported only by that tenth of our people who know from personal experience what it means to be poor. This kind of strategy is a prescription for disaster. It is stupid. It seldom passes legislation, and when it does, it earns us only welfare freezes, mandatory work requirements and man in the house rules.

Our country lacks neither the means nor the will to meet the human needs of all of its citizens. What it lacks is leadership. It is time to tell it like it is. I invite you to join me in that exciting task. I thank you.

EFFECTIVE ACTION BY ICC

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, most of the Nation, particularly that portion west of the Mississippi River, has been plagued by a very serious railroad freight car shortage. This has been of concern to all of us and to the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has been actively seeking ways to remedy the situation.

While the Commission very naturally must direct its efforts in search of a long-range solution to the problem, there are times when it is called on for a more immediate response to correct a temporary deficiency. When this occurs, the Commission can and does employ all of its professional resources to avert what can develop into a critical or even tragic situation.

Very recently, such a condition arose at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, where, because of a shortage of coal cars, the university was faced with a shortage of coal needed to keep its heating plant in operation.

As a result of a direct appeal from the university, and through the combined efforts of the Commission's Bureau of Operations in Washington and its field offices in the affected area, the Commission was able to arrange for concentrated deliveries of cars in order to return coal reserves to their normal supply levels.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Commission should be commended for its effective action in this area and for its continuing efforts to encourage the railroad industry to maintain a viable freight car supply.

The effectiveness of the Commission's action in connection with the coal supply emergency at the University of Wisconsin is attested to by the following letter:

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
PHYSICAL PLANT DIVISION,
Madison, Wis., December 24, 1969.

Re emergency coal supply.

Mr. R. D. PFAHLER,

Chairman, Railroad Service Board, Interstate
Commerce Commission, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. PFAHLER: The help of you and your organization in efforts to relieve the emergency coal situation in Madison has been productive.

The emergency coal situation has been relieved by concentrated deliveries in the last several days. We now have what is considered to be a normal coal reserve supply. Routine weekly deliveries, in accordance with existing contracts, will now allow us to operate in a normal manner.

Many thanks to you and your people for your help in this matter.

Sincerely,

FRANK RICE, Jr.,
Director.

MR. PRESIDENT: CAPT. JEREMIAH DENTON, U.S. NAVY, REMAINS A PRISONER OF WAR IN NORTH VIETNAM

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since July 1965, U.S. Navy Capt. Jeremiah Denton, whose brother Peyton is a resident of West Palm Beach, Fla., has been a prisoner of war in North Vietnam.

Nine months after his capture, Captain Denton was seen by millions of Americans as a Communist-made film was shown on U.S. television depicting Captain Denton and other captured American servicemen in their restrained quarters.

Captain Denton appeared drugged, undernourished, and fatigued, testifying to the fact that the North Vietnamese do not recognize the requirements of the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war. Yet, in the face of this treatment, Capt. Jeremiah Denton reaffirmed his faith in the policy of the U.S. Government.

Captain Denton's wife likewise supports her Government's policy in Vietnam but she would like reassurance that priority is being given to securing the proper treatment of these prisoners and their eventual release. One of Captain Denton's sons is presently serving in South Vietnam as a helicopter pilot.

Dr. Peyton Denton, brother of Captain Denton, addressed a letter to President Nixon expressing the concern of Captain Denton's wife and I would like to insert the text of that letter at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA.,
December 17, 1969.

Mr. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you very much for your personal reply acknowledging my support of your Administration and expressing your concern for my brother's welfare (Capt. Jerry Denton, US Navy).

Your recent meeting with a group of wives of the prisoners of war was again indicative of the major priority you give the prisoner situation in the Vietnam policy.

Our family is most disappointed that my brother's wife was not selected by the Navy Department to be present during this interview. My brother's wife, Jane, has maintained an attitude of loyalty and support for the Government. Her husband, Capt. Denton, has been a prisoner of war in Hanoi since July of 1965. Nine months after his capture, on a nationally televised interview with Japanese Communist reporters, he appeared apparently drugged and extremely fatigued. He knew nothing at the time of the war situation (probably because of solitary confinement) but when asked struggled to say that whatever our Government's policy was he supported it and would as long as he lived. This was hailed in the House of Representatives as being tantamount to the heroism of Nathan Hale. Getting back to Jerry's wife, her 7th eldest son is serving now in Vietnam as a helicopter pilot. On two previous occasions, Mrs. Denton has requested audiences with you, Mr. President, and these interviews

were not granted due to your busy schedule. Although disappointed, she never complained and understood perfectly. In brief, I cannot think of any other POW's wife who has suffered more and given more in the course of this war than my brother's wife and why she was not granted the opportunity to receive personal reassurance at this recent meeting is incomprehensible to me.

I realize that you had nothing to do with selection of the group interviewed, but I wanted you to know that a very heroic, gallant lady was omitted from that list. I pray to God that in some way and at some time in the future you will be able to personally reassure her in whatever way you can. She is under extreme strain and I am afraid that this matter has not helped her morale.

Respectfully,

PEYTON S. DENTON, M.D.

I have joined with many of my colleagues in the House in sponsoring a resolution calling upon the President, the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and all other concerned departments or agencies of the U.S. Government, the United Nations, and the peoples of the world to appeal to North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam to comply with the requirements of the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war and to take such steps as may be appropriate to obtain the humane treatment and prompt release of all members of the Armed Forces of the United States so held as prisoners of war.

This resolution should be passed without further delay.

WEST VIRGINIA ASSISTS 5,814 IN TRAINING SETUP

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon vetoed the Labor-HEW appropriations bill he took \$8.9 million away from West Virginia.

What does that mean?

It means that one of the foremost vocational rehabilitation programs in the Nation, a program which has returned 5,814 persons to a useful and self-supporting life, will no longer receive assistance from the special needs vocational education program.

It means that \$2.9 million will be lost in Federal aid to educationally deprived children and \$1.5 million in aid to vocational education.

These losses are especially hard on West Virginia because of its high poverty and unemployment rates.

It means that fully seven specialized programs, which would have received Federal backing under the amended bill, will now go without Federal assistance.

These programs, and the funds they would have received if the President had signed the bill, include instructional equipment, \$350,000; students with special needs, \$500,000; grants to schools for library materials, \$400,000; educational research, \$400,000; construction for undergraduate facilities, \$300,000; con-

struction of public libraries, \$130,000; and guidance counseling, \$150,000.

West Virginia has long been recognized as the Nation's leader in the percentage of people rehabilitated. The State's division of vocational rehabilitation annually averages 323 rehabilitations per 100,000 population, a truly outstanding record.

These are persons who have such physical or mental disabilities they have been unable to properly function in society. They have been given training and have reentered society as a new person, no longer wanting to live off welfare.

Larry Nicely, the "Rehabilitant of the Year" who is described in the following Wheeling News Register story by Monroe Worthington, is the type of person who will be hurt by the President's veto of the bill.

The President's veto affected West Virginia most adversely. It took away \$8.9 million which Congress had added to the original proposal.

Among the greater losses the State can ill afford are \$1.5 million in vocational education basic grants, \$630,000 in national defense student loans, \$400,000 in supplementary educational centers and services, and \$175,000 in grants for public library services.

I urge you to read the following article. It will show the fallacy and danger of vetoing a bill for its so-called inflationary aspects:

STATE SETTING RECORDS—WEST VIRGINIA ASSISTS 5,814 IN TRAINING SETUP

(By Monroe Worthington)

The story of how the State of West Virginia's Division of Vocational Rehabilitation has restored—or is restoring—5,814 people to useful, self-supporting life is told in a 16 page report, printed and bound by the handicapped students themselves.

West Virginia has long held the national record for the percentage of people who have been rehabilitated, although it occasionally drops to second place. The Division averages 323 rehabilitations per 100,000 population per year.

Those who have benefitted from its services include people who are blind or have impaired vision, 699; speech or hearing impairments, 340; amputations or other defects of limbs, 993; mentally retarded, 350; mental or personality disorders, 579; cancer, diabetes and other organic disorders, 201; epilepsy and other disorders of nervous system, 132; heart and circulatory condition, 262; respiratory diseases, 102; digestive system disorders, 1469; and others, 687.

Sixty-seven had never completed even one grade; 1449 had completed one to seven grades; 1244 had completed the eighth grade; 1500 had gone to high school; 1337 had graduated from high school; 159 had gone to but not graduated from college; 36 were college graduates.

Some 2,826 were married; 536 were widowed; 485 were divorced; 316 were separated; and 1,651 had never been married.

Of the total number receiving training 82 were from Brooke County; 77 from Hancock; 267 from Marshall; 253 from Ohio; 42 from Tyler; and 75 from Wetzel County.

"Larry Nicely", whose tale is told as "the Rehabilitant of the Year" is described as "overcoming almost insurmountable obstacles. He has an IQ of 47—and has the nickname "Happy."

"Larry Nicely, of Huntington, was born 25 years ago with three strikes against him—mental retardation, cleft palate and speech impediment. Larry was placed in a foster

home at the age of nine months. Through the services of the West Virginia Department of Welfare, he stayed in foster homes until he was nine years old. It had become evident that Larry was mentally retarded and could not attend public school like other boys his age. So at the age of nine he was admitted to the West Virginia Training School (now the Colin Anderson Center) at St. Marys. For over 10 years this was his home.

"During his teen-age years, Larry grew to love the institution. He became quite attached to the supervisor and the other children. Larry learned to read and write at Colin Anderson and it was felt that he had the potential to leave the institution.

"The road to employment and self support was to be a long uphill struggle. . ."

The story tells this in full, and continues "Seven years of rehabilitation work finally paid off. Larry was placed as a janitor at Ted & Ed's Pro Bowl—a bowling lane in Huntington where he has been employed for 10 months at a salary of \$55 per week. During that time Larry has not missed a day's work.

"Larry has managed to save over \$2,000 and he plans to buy a mobile home." (The story does not explain the arithmetic.)

The State's expenditure this first year for rehabilitation was \$2,053,215, or \$353 per person treated. But the federal government has provided enough funds to bring the total to \$9,520,983, or \$1,637 per person.

The size of staff and facilities were doubled at the Division's rehabilitation unit at the West Virginia penitentiary.

Plans were developed for two new projects in Wheeling; one was an innovation, to rehabilitate young persons with behavioral problems; the other was to demonstrate a school rehabilitation program and a juvenile offender program.

Offices are maintained, also, at New Martinsville; Weirton, Wellsburg and many other cities over the state. There is a Wheeling special school program, at Lincoln School, P. O. Box 6054, Wheeling.

AID TO LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will help alleviate the difficulty experienced by low- and middle-income families in locating adequate housing.

This bill, which follows the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PARMAN), would encourage private pension funds to invest in federally guaranteed mortgages.

The bill operates in the following manner: The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is directed to estimate the total amount of mortgage investment required in order to meet the Nation's goals for low- and middle-income housing during a specified period. He is also directed to estimate the total amount of actual investment in this type of mortgage to be expected during this same period. The Secretary is then required to request private pension funds possessing adequate assets for mortgage investment to invest an amount sufficient

to eliminate any difference between the amount of investment required and the amount of expected actual investment. Any pension fund which fails to invest its share of the amount directed by the Secretary will be taxed 100 percent of the difference between its actual investment and the amount of its share.

The need for this bill is clear. The Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Veterans' Administration have recently increased the interest rates for FHA and veteran's home mortgages to 8½ percent. These actions further jeopardize the ability of low- and moderate-income families to locate adequate housing. If this situation is to be remedied and if the Nation is to meet the housing goals established by Congress, additional amounts of mortgage funds on reasonable terms must be made available immediately.

Private funds, which are among the largest institutional investors in the stock market, represent a source of the requisite mortgage funds. Presently, only a small portion of the assets possessed by these funds are invested in mortgages. My bill would rectify this situation by increasing private pension fund investment in mortgages without risk or sacrifice of an adequate return.

Mr. Speaker, low- and middle-income families face a continuing housing crisis. If we are to end this crisis, we must utilize all the wisdom, energy, and creativity we can command.

THE CASE FOR PRAYER

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the case for prayer has rarely been stated more forcefully than in the story in the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader of Mrs. Julia Carter. It is shocking that the Congress has not proposed a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary prayer in the public schools of our land.

Lower courts are obliged to follow the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. It is not their fault that Mrs. Carter and others are appalled as the right to pray voluntarily in public assembly is limited by judicial decision. But now there is in process a recomposition of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Millions of Americans hope and pray that the new Burger court will redress their lack of communication with God, or perhaps better said, God's grievances with a blind, materialistic element in America that seems bent on self-destruction. We are not so big and prosperous that we can afford to ignore our dependence on Almighty God—or allow our children to become indifferent to man's need for spiritual guidance.

I commend the story of Julia Carter to the thoughtful consideration of all Americans, as follows:

CXVI—92—Part 1

"THERE IS NOTHING MORE POWERFUL"—JULIA CARTER: A CASE FOR PRAYER (By Gerald Stiles)

MILFORD.—To be condemned to die is a terrible fate.

To be granted life after such condemnation; then only to see your benefactor struck down, is probably the most unbearable blow of all.

Such is the general feeling of Julia Carter of Milford, a gentle lady who lives an uncluttered life of solitude in a neat mobile home on the east side of town. Now, an undecurrent of turbulence has come along to ripple this solitude and leave Mrs. Carter a woman of some worry.

Julia Carter is not out to change the world singlehandedly, but she does have a story to tell. It is the reader's right, of course, to take it or leave it; but at least, hear it first.

The year is 1928 and the scene is a Franciscan convent in Allegheny, New York. There, a novice barely 18 years old is told by the mother superior and a group of doctors that she is suffering from incurable tuberculosis. This novice, now Julia Carter, is only four scant months from taking her vows when she is told that she will soon lose two lives, both physical and spiritual—the latter finally so near, yet so horribly far away.

That was the condemnation to die. Too soon.

Then followed several months of bedridden sickness, attended by a nurse night and day. Finally, it was to a farm on the West End of Boston where Julia, presumably, was to live out her last days. During all this time, there was prayer. "My sister and all my relatives," said Mrs. Carter, "all prayed for me. These weren't just Catholics, but Protestants as well."

Something, somewhere, somehow happened. One morning, after a hemorrhage that must have resembled the end, Julia announced she was going to walk to the mailbox, a distance of one-half mile. This was the same Julia who hadn't been out of the house in months, the same Julia who had lain diseased and ravaged beyond repair. This Julia walked to the mailbox and back, intercepting a frightened relative who was in the process of hitching a wagon to come after the girl.

This was the return to life.

Mrs. Carter tells of the Jewish doctor at St. Elizabeth Hospital in Brighton, Mass., who examined her shortly after and declared her cured of TB. "He called it a miracle." This "miracle" later married and led a full life.

Now Mrs. Carter watches in unbelieving awe as court after court throughout the land strikes down the right to pray. Her voice is low and concerned as she says, "We've got to wake up. Wake up and not let anyone stop us from praying where and when we want to. I know for a definite fact that there is nothing more powerful than prayer. I also know that He died for us all, both black and white."

As stated before, Julia Carter is not trying to reform the world singlehandedly. But she does want to try in any way possible to make contact with those who formulate and administer the law of the land. "I know," says she, "that there will be plenty of those who doubt my story. But the entire case is a matter of record both at the convent in Allegheny, N.Y., and at the hospital in Brighton. To those who want proof, it is available, and perhaps will be helpful to them in their thinking on the subject of prayer."

Though Julia Carter is a gentle woman, she also speaks words of dire warning. "I hope the judges and other big shots read this. Someday, they may just try to raise their own voice to be heard, and not be able to do so."

That is the story of Mrs. Julia Carter. It may not change anyone one way or another, but it may cause some thought. That, in itself, is a gigantic step.

ALL WILL NOT BE SOLVED BY BALANCED BUDGET

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's promise in his state of the Union message last week of a balanced budget for fiscal 1971 is encouraging. But as the only solution put forward in connection with the Nation's problem of inflation, it falls short of expectations.

Hobart Rowen, writing in the Washington Post this week observes that balancing the budget may be sound doctrine, "but it isn't likely to do much about 1970's inflation."

He adds that "the President's anti-inflation program" is based on the "classic Republican belief that all will be solved by balancing the budget."

This could be tragic if it is true. Certainly the Federal Government must develop a greater sense of fiscal responsibility if the economy is to stabilize.

But the Government cannot ignore any longer what is happening in prices and wages if inflation is to be curbed.

Rowen comments that—

Mr. Nixon refuses to recognize that in the absence of any pressures from the White House on what Arthur Okun calls "responsive" industries, prices shoot higher than they otherwise would.

He reports that Dr. Okun, the distinguished Chairman of President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers, believes Government intervention in the price-wage spiral can pay off, and he has the evidence to prove it.

In 1968, Dr. Okun says, industries that were restrained by administration efforts boosted prices only 1 percent, while other prices rose an average 2.9 percent. He also notes that between 5 and 1 percent of extra inflation in the wholesale index can be attributed to President Nixon's announced intention not to attempt to influence price and wage actions.

Rowen's conclusion is thought provoking:

If the President's anti-inflation program for 1970 is nothing more than contained in the State of the Union message, 1970 is likely to be just as troubled a year as 1969. It could, in fact, be worse: at least, in 1969, there was not recession.

I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues:

ALL WILL NOT BE SOLVED BY BALANCED BUDGET

(By Hobart Rowen)

This time, President Nixon came down hard on the problem of inflation; a year ago (and this is admitted privately in high administration councils) the problem was vastly underestimated.

For a while, it may be recalled, the President wasn't sure that the income tax surcharge needed to be extended. And it wasn't until early March, 1969, that the administration understood the extent of the business investment boom.

But now, says the President, he can think of no action more important than "for the Congress to join this administration in the battle to stop the rise in the cost of living."

The pity of it, however, is that the President seems just as determined this year as he was last to give labor and management a free hand to get whatever the traffic will bear in wages and prices.

We may—hopefully—learn more from the Economic Report due to go to Congress shortly. But the President's entire anti-inflation program is based on the classic Republican belief that all will be solved by balancing the budget.

Excessive federal expenditures, uncompensated by a sensible tax policy, have doubtless contributed to inflation. But the federal government has been running a surplus for a more than a year, in company with a monetary policy so tight that interest rates are the highest in more than 100 years.

Still, prices move up. Even as the economy failed to show real growth in the fourth quarter, the consumer price index was rising at a faster rate than when Mr. Nixon took over.

There is always a lag, we have been assured, between the imposition of a policy of restraint and actual results in terms of lesser rates of inflation. But the time has dragged on, and some administration insiders confess that there should have been results long ago.

Last year's rate of inflation—6.1 per cent of the consumer index—cannot be sustained. Yet, even the most optimistic administration men warn that there cannot be much progress this year.

Many business leaders would be willing to gamble on a temporary resort to wage and price controls, along the lines recently suggested by former Treasury Under Secretary Robert V. Roosa. This was openly espoused last week by many builders and money-market men at the National Association of Home Builders convention in Houston. Even more of them urge selective controls on credit by the Federal Reserve.

But the President seems determined to rely on expenditure control—and on that alone.

Perhaps the most significant phrase in the speech was this: "It is time to quit putting good money into bad programs; otherwise, we will end up with bad money and bad programs."

This reflects the urging of Arthur F. Burns that more attention be paid to "zero-base budgeting"—the requirement that an agency justify each year the case for its entire appropriation, not just the increase over a previous year's.

No doubt, this is sound doctrine. It could lead to elimination of much bureaucratic federal waste. But it isn't likely to do much about 1970's inflation.

The President properly assigns a good share of the blame for inflation to his Democratic predecessors. But he is stuck with his own record for 1969—and not the least of administration failures has been its own inability to limit expenditures, as it promised to do.

Beyond that, however, Mr. Nixon refuses to recognize that in the absence of any pressures from the White House on what Arthur Okun calls "responsive" industries, prices shoot up higher than they otherwise would.

There is more than just politics in this charge. Okun, who was Lyndon Johnson's Economic Council chairman, recently revealed that LBJ's jawboning was far more extensive than publicly reported. And it paid off.

In 1968, for example, those industries that were pressured to minimize their price hikes

boosted prices an average of 1 per cent, while all other commodities on the industrial wholesale commodity index (including those that rejected LBJ's urgings) rose 2.9 cent.

But last year, after Mr. Nixon made it clear that jawboning was out, the "responsive" group rose 6 per cent, while all others moved up 3.5 per cent.

Okun's data makes clear that there is a wide area of price discretion in some segments of American industry. This has been amply documented over the years by Gardner Means and Adolph Berle; and in a recent study of 1969, Means suggests that a realistic

inflation-control policy must deal directly with corporations and unions who have a unique power to generate a part of the inflation.

For example, can the administration continue to ignore the spectacle of sharply rising steel prices at a time when steel production, if not actually down, is barely stable?

If the President's anti-inflation program for 1970 is nothing more than contained in the State of the Union message, 1970 is likely to be just as troubled a year as 1969. It could, in fact, be worse; at least, in 1969, there was no recession.

CHANGES IN PRICES OF SELECTED COMMODITIES, 1969 COMPARED WITH PRIOR PERIODS

	Relative importance ¹ (percent)	Annual rate, percent change ²					
		1969	1966-68	1968	1967	1966	1961-65
Selected petroleum products:							
Gasoline.....	2.772	3.5	-0.6	-0.9	-3.6	2.8	-0.9
Crude.....	.843	4.8	1.0	.7	.9	1.2	-1.1
Middle distillate.....	1.053	3.7	2.0	-1.3	5.9	1.6	.4
Sulfur products:							
Sulfur.....	.104	-33.3	18.1	7.7	39.3	9.8	1.6
Sulfuric acid.....	.085	0	9.9	3.7	21.0	6.0	1.7
Tires and tubes.....	1.221	2.2	3.0	1.7	4.2	3.1	-2.1
Paperboard.....	.669	5.0	-1.8	-2.8	-3.3	.7	-1.2
Glass containers.....	.375	5.3	3.3	9.1	0	1.1	.6
Cigarettes.....	.890	6.6	3.6	1.6	5.0	4.2	.8
Newsprint, standard.....	.426	3.3	2.2	0	2.1	4.6	-3.3
Photographic supplies.....	.346	3.4	2.2	2.0	5.1	-5	.8
Passenger cars.....	5.818	1.9	1.2	1.2	1.9	.3	-7.7
Tin cans.....	.301	2.7	2.3	3.0	4.1	0	2.3
Laundry equipment.....	.242	1.2	1.7	2.4	2.8	-1	-1.3
Selected steel products:							
Finished.....	4.247	6.8	1.6	2.2	1.3	1.3	.4
Semifinished.....	.272	5.7	1.4	.3	2.9	1.0	.3
Selected nonferrous metals:							
Aluminum ingot.....	.143	8.7	1.7	3.0	2.0	0	-1.2
Aluminum ingot, alloyed.....	.058	7.2	2.5	4.6	1.9	1.0	.2
Aluminum shapes.....	.660	6.7	1.2	2.4	1.1	.2	-2.5
Copper wirebar.....	.386	24.3	5.3	10.2	5.9	0	3.7
Copper and brass shapes.....	.743	27.9	4.1	-4.2	5.7	11.5	3.6
Wire and cable.....	.809	22.2	1.7	-3.8	2.3	7.0	-3.5
Listed items.....	22.463	6.0	1.7	1.0	1.9	2.1	.1
All other (nonlisted) industrials.....	77.537	3.5	2.3	2.9	1.9	2.3	.5
All industrials.....	100.0	4.0	2.2	2.5	1.9	2.2	.4

¹ Fraction of industrial wholesale price index in December 1968 accounted for by commodity.

² Year figure represents change during year—e.g., 1969 is period from December 1968 to December 1969. 1966-68 is thus December 1965 to December 1968.

Extra inflation?—The above table, compiled by Dr. Arthur M. Okun, shows components of the wholesale price index he believes responded to the administration pressure from 1966 to 1969. He concludes that somewhere between 1/2 and 1 per cent of extra inflation in the wholesale index can be attributed to President Nixon's announced intention not to attempt to influence price and wage actions.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join today in this observance of the anniversary of the Ukraine's independence and in the sentiments expressed on the floor that freedom will one day be a reality for the 47 million captive people in the Ukraine. I fail to see why there are no demonstrations in this country protesting what is happening to these repressed people under the Soviet regime.

But, I also fail to understand the continued refusal of the Congress of the United States to take action on the resolutions so many of us have introduced to give the words we speak some meaning. I refer specifically to my legisla-

tion—House Resolution 77 and House Concurrent Resolution 59, the first of which would establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, the second of which calls upon the President to support actions taken by the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations in the interest of self-determination and political independence of captive nations. The resolution has been before the House Committee on Rules since January 3, 1969, and the concurrent resolution before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for the same length of time.

I am at a loss as to why these measures have not received any action whatsoever in view of the lipservice we always give the captive nations on the House floor. For the benefit of colleagues who may wish to join me in actively urging enactment of these resolutions, I wish now to include them as a part of these remarks. I hope that this will encourage sufficient cosponsors among the membership to activate the committees.

The resolutions follows:

H. RES. 77

Whereas, on the issue of colonialism, the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas two Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommend themselves to the support of the just

aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy, and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalitarian form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "non-interference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas, in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the four Presidential proclamations, it is our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the pur-

pose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1966.

Sec. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

Sec. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

H. CON. RES. 59

Whereas the United States of America was founded upon and long cherished the principles of self-determination and freedom; and

Whereas these principles, expressed in the sovereign quality of nations, are the very reason for the existence of the United Nations, as set forth in the charter of that world organization; and

Whereas the United States and all other members of the United Nations have solemnly pledged themselves to make these principles universal and to extend their benefits to all peoples; and

Whereas on December 10, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations passed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which was accepted both by the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, defining said rights as relating to citizens of all member states; and

Whereas since 1918 Soviet communism has, through the most brutal aggression and force, deprived millions of formerly free peoples of their right to self-determination; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has unanimously expressed in Public Law 86-90, approved July 17, 1959, its revulsion

at the continued enslavement of the peoples of Eastern and East Central Europe who were described by the said public law as captive nations; and

Whereas the Hungarian, Polish, Czech, Slovak, Carpatho-Ruthenian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, East German, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Albanian, Ukrainian, and White Ruthenian peoples may only look to the United States and the United Nations for the restoration of their national self-determination and political independence; and

Whereas the member nations of the United Nations have failed to bring before the General Assembly for successful discussion the problem of self-determination and political independence of the peoples of Eastern Europe; and

Whereas despite the numerous resolutions passed by the United Nation General Assembly, Russian occupation troops are still maintained in Hungary and the issue of their removal has not come up for discussion in the Assembly since 1962; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States and to the perpetuation of free civilization that the nations of the world act in concert through the forum of the United Nations in demanding national self-determination and political independence for the peoples enslaved by Communist governments; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America, in article II, section 2, vests in the President of the United States the power, by and with the advice of the Senate, to make treaties and to appoint Ambassadors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to instruct the United States Ambassador to the United Nations to request at the 1968 session, that (1) the United Nations insist upon the fulfillment of its charter provisions based on self-determination of all peoples in the form of the sovereign equality of states and condemnation of colonial rule; and (2) the Soviet Union be asked to abide by its United Nations membership obligations concerning colonialism and interference with the sovereignty of other nations through the withdrawal of all Soviet Russia troops and agents from other nations now under Communist rule and through returning to their respective homelands all political prisoners now in prison and labor camps; be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States is further authorized and requested to use all diplomatic, treaty-making, and appointive powers vested in him by the Constitution of the United States to agument and support actions taken by the United States Ambassador to the United Nations in the interest of self-determination and political independence of these nations.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,400 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

THE SUPREME COURT—IS IT
REALLY SUPREME?

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of the United States has been the subject of much controversy in recent years. The issue of judicial ethics aside, it is incumbent upon all Americans to acquaint themselves with the changing character of the Court as an institution vis-a-vis the two—supposedly coequal—sister branches: Congress and the executive. Has the Court in truth usurped the prerogatives of both executive and legislative? Of the constitutionally—guaranteed inviolability of the separate States? Has the hegemony of the Court been allowed to extend itself so as to create for itself a first-among-equals status which is inimical to the American concept of separation of powers—and thus become destructive of American freedom?

For all Americans this question is of more than evanescent significance. For some who tend toward agreement with the recent decisions of the Court, it is more difficult to violently disagree with this obvious usurpation, but we must all remember that the power of the institutional qua institution grows irrespective of the human constituency of the institution at any particular time and that the future holds a great potential of disaster for America—no longer depending upon the restraint of the institutions, but on the tenuous restraint of the individual composing it.

In light of what I consider to be one of the more serious problems facing America in the coming decade, I enclose the following article from the October 26, 1969 issue of *Twin Circle*, the National Catholic Press, entitled "The Supreme Court—Is It Really Supreme?" The article is written by Clarence Manion, for 25 years a professor of constitutional law and dean emeritus of the University of Notre Dame Law School. It is my hope that through making the views of this distinguished scholar more readily available to my colleagues and to the American people, we can begin the long road back to reassertion of the prerogatives of the people and their representatives against the ever-increasing powers of the Court. The article follows:

THE SUPREME COURT—IS IT REALLY SUPREME?

(By Clarence Manion)

How supreme is the Supreme Court of the United States? A learned lawyer writes:

"In recent years, popular opinion has accorded to the Court a quality of supremacy that goes far beyond the express directives of the Constitution."

But is that surprising? "Handsome is as handsome does," said the poet Goldsmith, and the Supreme Court does "supremely" well these days to say the least. For instance, it tells the children in our public schools that they may not say in class together:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy bless-

ings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country."

The Supreme Court tells the children not to say that prayer—Why? (370 U.S. 421) Because the First Amendment of the Constitution says:

"Congress [sic] shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise hereof."

Now that language has been in the Constitution since 1790 and nobody has ever before been "supreme" enough to tell our public school children that it prevented them from saying such a prayer. So a Court that can now suddenly start telling the children not to say a prayer sounds, well, pretty "supreme" wouldn't you say.

CHANGED MIND

And now let's take another look at that same school. There is a Communist teaching there now in spite of the fact that the state law provides that no Communist may teach in a public school in that state. Why, then, doesn't the state enforce the law and throw the Communist teacher out? As a matter of fact, the state did just that about 17 years ago and the Supreme Court said that the state did the right thing (342 U.S. 485-1952). But "in recent years," the Supreme Court changed its mind and ordered the state to put the Communist teacher back into the school. Why did the Court do that "in recent years"? It did it because that same First Amendment of the Constitution also says:

"Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech."

"In recent years," the Supreme Court has been holding that this Amendment protects everybody's "freedom of association" which, says the Court, includes the right, among other things, to join the Communist Party. But didn't the Supreme Court know about that when it made its first decision seventeen years ago? Yes, 17 years ago the Court said that neither the First Amendment nor any other provision of the Constitution prevents the state from "screening" its teachers for loyalty and in doing so, to consider the teachers' association with Communists as a disqualification for teaching children. However, "in recent years," the Court has changed its mind. It now says that "pertinent Constitutional doctrines have since (1952) rejected the premises upon which the previous decision rested." And so it told the State that it had to employ the Communist now regardless of the previous decision of the Supreme Court. Well, that too sounds pretty "supreme," wouldn't you say?

RESTRICTION ON STATES

How does it happen that a Constitutional prohibition upon "Congress" ("Congress shall make no law," etc.) turns out to be a restriction upon state action? Well, here again, "in recent years," the Supreme Court suddenly said, and it says it now, over and over again, that "the First Amendment is 'presently' a part of the Fourteenth Amendment" and since the Fourteenth Amendment is a restriction upon State action, all of the language of the First Amendment is now, likewise, a restriction upon all State Action. The Court "in recent years" has gone beyond that to say that the language of all the First Eight Amendments is now a part of the Fourteenth Amendment. Yes, that is what the Supreme Court has been saying "in recent years" and that is why the Court has been sitting in judgment on State obscenity laws, for instance, clearing the way for the sale and showing of "hard-core" pornographic moving pictures, books and magazines by freeing hard core pornographers who have been convicted by juries after fair trials in State courts. Now I submit that a Court that can suddenly say that

the language of one part of the Constitution shall hereafter be considered the language of another part of the Constitution, and proceed to enforce it as such, well, that Court is pretty supreme, wouldn't you agree?

Where does the Supreme Court get all of this supreme authority including the power to force the re-districting of state legislatures on its one-man one-vote principle, and to revise and relax state criminal law enforcement procedures, etc., etc.? Like the powers of the legislative and of the executive branches of our Federal Government, the power of the Supreme Court comes from and through the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution says:

Article III: "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior [Federal] courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. . . ."

Section 2: "In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls and those [cases] in which a State shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all other cases . . . the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

The Supreme Court itself has held many times that this language vests an unrestrained power and discretion in Congress to curtail and even abolish the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and to prescribe the rules and forms in which appellate jurisdiction when granted, may be exercised. This appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court consists of all of the cases that are appealed to it for decision from lower Federal courts and state courts. Without the consent of Congress, the Supreme Court could not consider any of these appeals.

Of and by itself, without the assistance of Congress the Supreme Court would have nothing to do, no "power" at all except to hear cases involving "ambassadors, public ministers and consuls" and those in which a State is either the plaintiff or the defendant. Thus all of the prayer cases, obscenity cases, criminal cases, one-man-one vote cases, Communist cases, segregation and civil rights cases, among others, that the Supreme Court has decided "in recent years" have come to it in the discretion and by the direction of Congress.

ABOLISHES POWERS

When, in the course of hearing and deciding these appeals, the Supreme Court invades the legislative domain of Congress or abolishes the reserved Constitutional powers of the states by gratuitously merging the first eight Amendments with the Fourteenth, or otherwise, Congress has the Constitutional power and duty to correct the Court's presumptuous and unconstitutional intrusions by withdrawing from the Supreme Court its appellate jurisdiction to hear cases in each or all of the offended areas. Congress has done this many times in the past. It can and should do so now. Thus, Congress could and should restore power to the public schools simply by withdrawing from the Supreme Court its jurisdiction to hear appeals in prayer cases.

The late Senator Dirksen introduced and left a bill now pending in the Senate which would withdraw from the Supreme Court all jurisdiction to hear appeals from jury convictions in State or Federal courts for the violation of state or Federal obscenity laws. Tell your Senators that the Dirksen bill should be revived now and passed as a first step in the curtailment of the Supreme Court's unwarranted assumption of unlimited supremacy "in recent years".

MADISON COUNTY, IND., GRAND
JURY

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I insert the findings of the Madison County, Ind., grand jury upon the completion of their investigation of the shootings at the Indiana State Reformatory on September 26, 1969:

ANDERSON, IND.,
December 11, 1969.

HON. CARL T. SMITH,
Judge, Madison Circuit Court,
Madison County, Ind.

DEAR SIR: The Grand Jury has completed an intensive investigation regarding the incident that took place at the Indiana State Reformatory, located at Pendleton, Indiana, on September 26, 1969, in which an inmate by the name of James E. Durr died, and a number of other inmates were wounded.

We feel this is a problem of the general public, legislature, and the Governor of the State of Indiana. They all should know of the findings of the investigation of the Indiana Reformatory by this Madison County Grand Jury.

After considering the evidence that was presented, including the testimony of 79 witnesses, the Grand Jury has determined that in the early afternoon of September 26, 1969, approximately 300 to 400 inmates congregated in the area within the walls known as the basketball and volleyball court; that a number of the group broke away from their group and followed Captain Jason Hucceby to the building called the "D.O."; and that the captain was hit either by a flying object thrown by one of the inmates or was struck by an inmate or inmates and almost knocked to the ground.

It was further determined by the Grand Jury that a warning shot was fired by the guard at Tower No. 6; that after this the inmates went back toward the area from which they had come; that about this time fires were started in Furniture Factory No. 4 by an inmate or inmates, the identity of whom has not been determined.

Also it was determined that 12 reformatory personnel were lined on two sides of the area (11 of the reformatory personnel were custodial officers and one a vocational officer) where the inmates were congregated; that there was fencing, primarily a chain-link fence, between the inmates and the reformatory personnel, except that Captain Hucceby stood to the west of the area where the inmates were congregated and was inside the fencing; and that all, except Captain Hucceby, were armed with shotguns loaded with .00 (double ought) shot.

The Grand Jury findings show that the inmates were instructed to leave; that some left voluntarily, leaving slightly over 200 inmates still in the area; that Captain Hucceby then gave the inmates five minutes to disperse; that during said period some of the inmates involved yelled threatening, traducing and provocative statements to the reformatory personnel who were in the area; that some inmates hurled objects at the reformatory personnel.

The Grand Jury also found that after instructions were given by Captain Hucceby, shots were fired into the air, then into the earth and pavement in the area, causing shots to ricochet and to strike a number of inmates who were all, except one, lying or sitting down on the basketball and volleyball court area; that all shots that were removed from the bodies of the inmates and which were submitted to the Grand Jury (except

three which were so badly mutilated that no determination could be made) hit intermediate objects before striking individuals; that the shot which struck James E. Durr, the decedent, had debris embedded in it which indicated that this shot had struck pavement before striking the decedent; and that it could not be determined how many shots were actually fired since the testimony submitted varied from estimates of fifteen to slightly over ninety shots.

It was further determined that a short time after the shooting had stopped, the inmates decided to disperse, and those who had participated and were not injured were placed in isolation for a short period of time and then placed in administrative segregation where they remained until shortly prior to the submission of this report; and that the injured depending upon the degree of injury involved, were taken to St. John's Hospital at Anderson, Indiana, Robert Long Hospital at Indianapolis, Indiana, and the Reformatory Hospital.

Finally the Grand Jury observed that the film identified by Gary L. Dortch as the film used by him in taking pictures of the scene at the time of the incident, was of no value to the Grand Jury since the negative was not of sufficient quality from which pictures could be made.

From all the evidence submitted, the Grand Jury has concluded that the guards were in the performance of their duties at the time of the incident; therefore, there is insufficient evidence to place criminal responsibility on any of the reformatory personnel involved.

Further, there was no evidence showing the identity of the person or persons who set fire to the furniture factory, causing damage to State property.

We, the members of the Grand Jury, feel that we would be remiss in our duties if we did not comment on our observations, and we feel that we should make certain recommendations to those responsible for the use of tax money in handling those persons who have run afoul of the law.

Since we have not visited other penal institutions, we have no criterion by which to judge whether this institution is among the best or the worst of the institutions of this type; however, even to unskilled eyes certain shortcomings and problems can readily be seen.

Although it is conceded that it was possible that another method or other methods, could have and should have been used to disperse the inmates involved, this was a judgment call. Possibly, this was the best judgment that could be made at that time in light of the fact that the training was inadequate for an incident of this type. There had been no unit training, nor had there been a predetermined plan of action to handle such a situation.

There had been plans to train a unit, but there was an insufficient number of custodial personnel to man the posts, and no custodial officers could be spared to train as a unit. The problem of the shortage of custodial personnel, now understaffed and short 39 men, has been further aggravated by the present governor's cutback order.

It is the opinion of the Grand Jury that there should be immediate training of a sufficient number of custodial officers to handle such situations, and that regular practice sessions and refresher courses should be required in order to keep the men prepared. Recently a training officer was placed in a part-time job at the institution. It is the feeling of the Grand Jury that there should be a full-time training officer who would be responsible for adequate training of the custodial officers. Such a program is necessary if the Correction Department personnel, inmates and State property are to be protected at the institution.

The institution, which was designed for

1200 to 1300 people, presently has a population of approximately 2300 inmates, who are generally from the age of 15 years to 30 years. The fact that there is an overcrowding of youthful offenders sets the scene for a very volatile situation. Rehabilitation programs for those who can be rehabilitated are definitely hampered. Younger inmates may become prey of the older inmates in homosexual activities. Older inmates may influence the younger ones and teach them to be more efficient at crime once they are released from custody.

It is apparent that our law should not arbitrarily state that younger inmates should be committed to the same institution as the older and more hardened inmates. There should be definite plans made and implemented at the earliest possible date to alleviate the overcrowding and to give, by legislative change, the Department of Corrections more latitude as to where an inmate should be committed.

There are many important factors which should be taken into consideration in determining where a convicted felon should be committed. Presently the sentencing of an inmate to the Indiana Reformatory is primarily dependent upon his age being between 15 and 30, and his being convicted of a felony. It is not realistic to make the age of the felon the determining factor. Our present law dealing with sentencing is antiquated and should be changed.

The Grand Jury was further concerned that certain personnel at the reformatory, and particularly custodial personnel, do not have a pay scale commensurate with their jobs. There are many dedicated State employees at the Indiana Reformatory who for years have had a pay scale which is much lower than the average pay scale of men and women who work at our local factories. In many instances, this has led to employees taking a second job to support themselves and their families. It is difficult to see how the State has been able to keep some of the employees under these conditions.

The staff must be composed of stable and well-adjusted people who are able to cope with the many difficult problems of their jobs and to justly, intelligently and authoritatively deal with the inmates. It is imperative that an adequate raise be made in the pay scale so that the most able personnel available are hired in each job; and that an incentive be given to encourage good personnel to stay in their jobs.

Evidence submitted indicated that the communication system used at the reformatory is inadequate for emergency situations. At the time of the incident, a guard who was aware of impending trouble was unable to reach either the "Wheelhouse" or "High Tower" because the telephone facilities were inadequate. Communication should be remedied at the earliest time so warnings of trouble can be given instantaneously to authorities in charge. If this dangerous condition is allowed to exist, the security of the institution and the safety of the personnel and inmates may be jeopardized.

Food, its preparation and its distribution, is an important factor to any person, whether an inmate at the institution or a person on the "street". It would appear that the raw products used are as good as any that can be found; however, because of lack of trained personnel, the proper facilities and atmosphere, the present food facilities leave much to be desired. For example, there are not adequate steam tables to keep the food warm for the last of the inmates to be served.

Many of the problems regarding the food, its preparation and distribution, have been brought about by the lack of interest of the Legislature in providing sufficient funds for the administration of the reformatory for the repairs, replacement and renovation of the present unclean, unsanitary and aged facilities and equipment.

The problems relating to food have led to discontent among the inmates. It was noted that all persons who testified concerning the conditions at the reformatory, agreed that many changes should be made, and that they should be made as soon as possible in the areas of food storage, food preparation, food distribution and the equipment involved.

Since 1963 there have been six superintendents at the reformatory. This is unconscionable in that a lack of continuity of leadership vitally affects the morale and security of both the employees and the inmates. It is inconceivable to anyone that any organization could be efficient and effectively operated under leadership which is often changing.

The Grand Jury learned that the personnel and inmates would just begin to get accustomed to the ideas and directions of one superintendent when another would be brought in for one reason or another. The lack of continuity in leadership obviously lends itself to discord and strife between many of the employees, and in turn the inmates are given an opportunity to exploit the situation.

It was apparent that partisan politics have played, and continue to play a part in the departure of various administrators, and more particularly the superintendents of the institution.

It would be highly desirable that standards be established for each of the administrators, and that leadership be of a stable, continuing nature. Further, that from the superintendent to the lowest paid employee there should be no political interference as is presently the case, so that advancement of personnel will be based on ability, not political allegiance.

It is our belief that all personnel in the Corrections Department should be absolved from political designation and political pressure. This would undoubtedly make for a better Corrections Department.

Legislation should be enacted to set standards for all administrators, and to set up a bi-partisan board selected by the Governor to name the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections. Legislation was not passed.

The present vocational training seems to be very good and to be carried out by able personnel; however, it would appear that only a small number of inmates are able to avail themselves of such training. There is a need to add new subjects in vocational training which would necessitate the hiring of more personnel, and also the providing of larger vocational shop facilities.

Definite rules and regulations should be established for the inmates. It was noted that there are no published rules, and that various officers in charge require the inmates to observe the rules as these officers make them. This leads to confusion as far as the inmates are concerned, and discipline is not uniform.

It is suggested that rules and regulations be established now, and be published and given to each inmate as he comes into the institution. Once the rules have been published, they then should be strictly enforced by the officials of the Reformatory.

Counseling by well-trained and experienced counselors has long been accepted as a necessary element in the scheme of rehabilitation of the inmates. Younger inmates, such as those housed at the Indiana Reformatory, must have some personal outlet since they are cut off from many of the things which are commonplace to us.

The counselors have a very important place in the penal system. We have found from our investigation that because of the heavy caseload for each counselor, there is very little time for him to properly carry out his job of counseling. Instead, the counselors are

covered up with routine paper work and are not able to make use of their talents and training for which they were hired.

It appears that there should be more counselors added so that individual caseloads can be lowered. In addition, the Grand Jury found that their salaries are not adequate. Low salaries, heavy caseloads, the instability of the administration, and generally the lack of time to counsel according to their training, cause most of the counselors to move on to "greener pastures" after they have gained experience.

It is noted that there are several able counselors at the Reformatory, and it is imperative that the conditions be changed so that they will stay and make a career of their jobs with the Indiana Corrections system.

During the course of this investigation, the Grand Jury was made aware of the fact that the expenses of the prosecution of all criminal violations that take place at the Indiana State Reformatory are borne solely by the taxpayers of Madison County. This particular information does not directly pertain to the incident that took place at the Indiana Reformatory, but the Grand Jury feels that it is apropos and should be included in this report.

The expenses paid by the taxpayers of Madison County include the furnishing of an attorney, the paying of jurors, the paying of expert witnesses, and the paying for transcript costs in those cases where appeals are taken. These are only a few random costs incurred by the County. Even the expense of this Grand Jury investigation falls upon the taxpayers of this County.

Inmates at the reformatory come from all over the State of Indiana, and fewer than 5% of the inmates presently incarcerated at the Reformatory have been committed to the reformatory from Madison County. It appears patently unfair that the taxpayers of Madison County should have to stand all the expenses of criminal prosecution, and the members of this Grand Jury feel that all taxpayers of the State of Indiana are liable, not the taxpayers of Madison County alone.

The 1969 Legislature passed legislation which would have taken the burden off the taxpayers of this County and placed the expense where it should be, on all taxpayers of this State. This legislation was vetoed by the present Governor. It is suggested by the Grand Jury that the Legislature again pass similar legislation to become law.

In summary, the Grand Jury recommends to the Governor, to the members of the Legislature, and to the Commissioner of the Indiana Department of Corrections that the following recommendations be implemented at the earliest possible date:

1. Provide an adequate number of personnel to properly supervise the inmates:

(a) There is a special need for more and better qualified custodial officers and more counselors.

2. Provide appropriate extensive mandatory training for all custodial personnel to better prepare them for their jobs, with frequent refresher courses given on a regularly scheduled basis:

(a) Establish a full time training officer to accomplish this recommendation.

(b) Should include the training of an emergency unit well versed in various methods of handling situations such as happened at the reformatory on September 26, 1969.

(c) Should include a course on human relations.

3. Remove partisan politics from all departments of the Indiana Department of Corrections, from the Commissioner to the lowest level employee:

(a) Establish a bi-partisan board, named by the Governor, for the appointment of the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections.

(b) That the jobs be on a merit basis and

administrators be removed for cause, only after a hearing has been held.

4. Establish standards for all administrative officers of the Corrections Department.

5. Raise the pay of the custodial officers and counselors.

(a) This is especially true of custodial officers who have a sub-standard pay scale.

6. Alleviate the overcrowding at the Indiana Reformatory.

7. Revision by Legislation the manner of sentencing so that the Corrections Department would have more control on the amount of time an inmate would serve:

(a) This is required so that the present inequities caused by the fact that the present discretionary power of the prosecutors and the judges throughout the State does not lend to uniformity of sentencing for various types of crimes.

(b) Sentencing by a court should be made to the Department of Corrections, which in turn can screen each inmate and place said inmate at the institution which will be most advantageous to the inmate and to the public.

8. Enact new legislation which would change our present law that causes young inmates to be placed in the same institution as older, hardened inmates:

(a) Factors other than mere age should be considered.

9. Prepare, publish and provide to each inmate, written rules of conduct for the guidance of the inmates at the Indiana Reformatory; after these rules have been given to the inmates they should be strictly but fairly enforced by the reformatory officials.

10. Require custodial personnel to follow manual establishing their duties for each individual job.

11. Completely renovate the present unclean and unsanitary food facilities and replace the antiquated equipment now used.

12. Establish an adequate communication system, so that communications can be instantaneous in an emergency situation.

13. Provide adequate trained and qualified personnel to supervise food preparation.

14. Increase the present vocational training system to include more subjects of vocational training and to increase vocational shop facilities so that more inmates can be given the opportunity to participate in the vocational training.

15. To remove troublesome, hostile, hard-core criminals from the Indiana Reformatory and away from the inmates that do have a rehabilitation potential.

16. Work towards making the Indiana Reformatory a place for the rehabilitation of inmates to carry out the purpose for which it was constructed.

It is not the intent of the Grand Jury in writing this report to indicate that the inmates should be coddled and that they should not be punished for the crimes which they have committed. However, it is important that the inmates be treated like human beings and that a great deal more emphasis be placed upon rehabilitation.

The average stay of an inmate at the Reformatory is approximately 22 months. It is not a savings of tax money to fail to provide an adequate number of qualified personnel, adequate pay for personnel, and adequate vocational training for inmates. In so doing, we fail to improve the inmate's talents, his attitudes, and his incentive to discontinue a life of crime when he is released. We would be naive to think that all inmates desire to be rehabilitated, or can be rehabilitated. The type of inmate that can be rehabilitated should be moved away from those inmates who cannot be rehabilitated. Such a program will require adequately trained personnel to properly screen inmates. The inmates that cannot be rehabilitated and those that are hostile to society can be separated from the younger inmates if proper screening and adequate facilities were made available.

The Grand Jury is aware that there have been many reports and investigations made recently regarding the Indiana Department of Corrections and/or the Indiana Reformatory, one of which was reported to have cost the taxpayers of this State, \$50,000. It would appear that there have been a sufficient number of investigations and reports, and now is the time to implement many of the suggestions and recommendations that have been made, including the recommendations made in this report.

It has been the intent of this Grand Jury to touch only on those matters which were pertinent to the incident that took place on the volleyball and basketball court, and this report is not intended to be a complete and comprehensive study of the Indiana Reformatory.

It certainly will be discouraging to this panel of the Grand Jurors, if nothing, in fact, is done by the administration to launch a program to better use the tax money allocated, and to insist upon more money to carry out a program whereby more effort is made to rehabilitate the inmates who are receptive, so that they will not be turned loose to prey again upon the persons and property of the citizens of this State.

Members of this Grand Jury unanimously feel that it is urgent that the above recommendations should be implemented as soon as possible. It is suggested that if the much rumored special session of the Indiana Legislature is called, that the Governor and the Legislature work co-operatively in enacting legislation to carry out the recommendations where new legislation is needed.

The taxpayers of this State, contrary to popular belief, have a great deal at stake and should get interested and insist upon the reforms that are urged in this report.

This Grand Jury in its investigation has considered all demonstrative evidence available, as well as all witnesses who had pertinent information to the incident, namely: several inmates, including many that were involved in the incident; reformatory personnel, including administrators, teachers, custodial officers involved, and counselors; Indiana State Police investigators and firearms expert, social workers, former personnel of the Indiana Reformatory, a prison reform expert, assistant commissioner of the Department of Corrections; training officer for the Department of Corrections, and citizens who requested to appear. The last witness appearing to be heard on this matter was on December 8, 1969.

The Grand Jury visited the institution.

This Grand Jury requests that this report be made public immediately, with copies afforded to the various news media. It is our desire that a copy of this report be sent immediately to the Governor, the commissioner of the Department of Corrections, superintendent of the Indiana Reformatory, and the State Legislative Committee on Benign and Penal Institutions.

Further, that as soon as it is possible, a copy of this report is to be sent to each member of the present Indiana Legislature so that they will be informed of the conditions we found at the Indiana Reformatory, and the recommendations we have made.

We submit this as our report on the Indiana Reformatory and will submit a final report at a later date.

Respectfully submitted,

FREDERICK J. BELL,
EDWARD GILLESPIE,
CAROLYN CARMANY,
FRANCES L. DUNHAM,
LILLY L. COX,
JACK E. GUARD.

RESOLUTION FOR PEACE SETTLEMENT IN MIDDLE EAST

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, I cosponsored a resolution introduced by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida. This is a simple and straightforward resolution reaffirming the support of the Congress for a negotiated peace settlement in the Middle East.

Secretary of State, William Rogers' statement of December 9 and reports of the October 28 proposals, indicate that the Nixon administration has not only reversed the policy of previous administrations but abandoned its own policy of endorsing face-to-face negotiations between the parties as the only realistic and lasting solution to the conflict. This resolution restates the position of two-thirds of the Members of the Congress that only an agreed-upon settlement will be a lasting settlement; that only a peace in which all sides have a stake will be a meaningful peace. An imposed settlement can easily be broken and indeed the temptation to break it would be great for the Arab nations.

Israel is our one true and tested friend in the Middle East. Her preservation and security are in our vital national interest. So long as she remains free and independent, we do not have to directly face the Soviet Union in the Middle East. All of those qualities we, the American people, so deeply cherish—freedom, liberty, democracy—are what Israel stands for. Would we abandon her to win the favor of authoritarian governments, of undemocratic nations, who care little for their own people? Would we abandon our good friend and trusted ally for a meager chance of having a share in the Arab oil already pawned like a birthright to the Soviet Union?

There are many ethical and humanitarian reasons for supporting Israel, but there are also very selfish reasons. Our national security and our national interest lie with her continued sovereignty, unthreatened by the states around her borders who call for her total and immediate destruction.

On January 9, I wrote to Secretary of State Rogers objecting to his apparent change in policy with regard to the Middle East. I have not yet received a reply. I am enclosing a copy of that letter for the benefit of my colleagues. I would also like to include a statement by His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, and articles from the Boston Globe and Boston Herald-Traveler with regard to the conflict in the Middle East. I think Secretary Rogers and all of us should heed the Cardinal's words. It would be a blot on the history of the United States if we abandoned this noble nation in her time of need.

The material follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 9, 1970.

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

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Since Israel's creation in 1948, when we were the first world power to give her diplomatic recognition, the fundamental issue between Israel and the Arab states has been the right of Israel to exist as a sovereign nation.

Overwhelming American opinion has firmly and wholeheartedly supported Israel's right to exist and the right of Jewish refugees from Europe, Asia, North Africa and the Middle East to have a secure home where their lives are not dependent on the whims of ruling cliques; and every American President to date has accepted this as the basic premise of our Mid-East policy. Unfortunately, the Arab nations and their allies affirm the exact opposite premise. It is imperative to mention this in the light of your statement of December 9—for you discuss the Middle East problem as though the Arab States and their allies were anxious to come to an agreement with Israel and have peace in the Middle East. You surely know that the Arabs in word and deed have called for an end to Israel—for a blood bath that would destroy the Nation and drive the Israelis into the sea. And you surely know our own self-interest cannot allow this. For it is Israel's strength, her tenacity and her will to live that has averted a direct military confrontation between us and Russia in the Middle East.

Your proposal regarding the Arab-Israeli conflict is incredible and insupportable in the light of recent history. In 1956, upon guarantees from the major powers, Israel withdrew from captured territory and granted concessions to the intransigent Arab states. She would be foolish and suicidal to do so again. Each withdrawal has granted to the Arabs what they could not win on the battlefield. The major powers have encouraged the Arabs belief that war is more profitable than peace. No Nation will keep a peace if it believes it can gain more through war. It is imperative that the Arabs and Israelis in face to face negotiations settle this conflict and bring an end to the aftermath of the 1967 War.

You have said that there should be no aggrandizement through conquest. But in your statement, you honor the gains made by the Arabs in 1948—you call for Israeli withdrawal to pre-existing boundaries—but these were only cease-fire lines and were supposedly temporary and subject to change. You must realize if Israel followed your proposal her enemy would be occupying fortified hills with artillery trained on Israel's civilian population. Mr. Secretary, you must realize that your proposal will only continue a tragic condition of Israel suffering through a major war every ten years and being subjected to terroristic attacks almost daily.

If we have learned nothing from the wars of 1948, 1956 and 1967, then let us look to a much more impressive lesson which you now fail to heed. Munich, in a word, characterizes the beginning of the Second World War—only because the West thought it could appease a madman and prevent war through major concessions at the expense of smaller nations. That was a tragic lesson for us—never to be repeated.

Your position of appeasement makes war profitable for the Arab states and allows the Soviet Union to use the Arabs as tools in its plan to take over the Middle East. Enough of

our unilateral concessions to the Soviet Union.

These are not only my sentiments but represents the overwhelming feeling of my constituents. I await your reply.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

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

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe,
Dec. 2, 1969]

CARDINAL CRITICIZES NIXON ON MIDEAST: FEARS CALAMITY FOR ISRAEL IN BIG 4 TALKS—SEES U.S. SHIFT FROM "FACE-TO-FACE" TALKS

(By George M. Collins)

The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Boston criticized the Nixon administration yesterday because of what the archbishop deems to be a switch in United States policy toward Israel in the continuing conflict with the Arab states.

In a brief statement, Richard Cardinal Cushing called for a return to the previous policy which called for "face-to-face negotiations" between the Mideast antagonists.

The prelate, a longtime supporter of Israeli statehood, voiced fears that efforts of the U.S., in concert with the Soviet Union, Great Britain and France, to impose a settlement in the Mideast "may end in calamity for Israel."

The Cardinal's statement came as Israel rejected as "appeasement of the Arabs" U.S. proposals for peace between Israel and Egypt and between Israel and Jordan.

A communique issued after a special, three-hour cabinet session in Jerusalem said Israel "views with concern the disquieting initiatives of the United States at the four power talks."

The cardinal's statement follows:

"In this season of rejoicing I am mindful of strife among the peoples in and near the Holy Land. It grieves me to see peace still unrealized between Arabs and Jews and my prayer is that the grave differences will be settled soon . . . very soon . . . by the parties to the dispute.

"The proposals made in Washington within the past few days seem to me to reflect a departure from a previous well-established determination on the part of the United States to insist on direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab states. Efforts by our government and the governments of the Soviet Union, England and France to impose peace terms may end in calamity for Israel, which needs so desperately to be secure, to be free to help remake the lives of thousands driven out of Europe by harsh oppressors.

"Let me say again that the return of the Jews to the Promised Land constitutes the answer to the prayers of generations of people. Israel must be assured a permanent place among the family of nations. I ask all men of good will to join me in urging our statesmen to cling fast to the policy rooted in the realization that lasting peace in the Middle East is achievable only by face-to-face negotiations between the Arab states and Israel."

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Dec. 23,
1969]

HUB JEWISH LEADERS HAIL CARDINAL FOR HITTING U.S. PLANS ON MIDEAST

(By George M. Collins)

The leaders of Boston's Jewish Community Council today acclaimed Richard Cardinal Cushing for his statement yesterday calling for the United States to return to a hands-off policy in the settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute.

The cardinal decried the apparent switch in United States Mideast maneuvering in aligning with Russia, Great Britain and France in attempting to impose demands on Israel.

Robert M. Segal, president, and Robert E. Segal, executive director, of the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Boston, hailed the cardinal's comments as highly significant.

"For all who have the long-time interest of the United States at heart and thus understand the critical need for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, Cardinal Cushing's forthright statement is most encouraging and significant," they said.

"The conflict in the Middle East means many things to many people," they continued. "To Soviet Russia it is an opportunity to extend the power of Communism. To those who think primarily in materialistic terms it is a battlefield for the possession of oil. To those who remember history and grasp the meaning of the persecution of the Jewish people, a deep moral issue is paramount.

"The Jewish Community of Greater Boston is eternally grateful to Cardinal Cushing for speaking out as he has in a spirit of brotherhood and the great magnanimity," they concluded.

The cardinal in his statement warned that "efforts by our government and the government of the Soviet Union, Great Britain and France to impose peace terms may end in calamity for Israel. . . ."

He called for all "men of good will to join" him in "urging our statesmen to cling fast to the policy rooted in the realization that lasting peace in the Middle East is achievable only by face-to-face negotiations between the Arab states and Israel."

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald-Traveler,
Dec. 24, 1969]

GROUP HERE IN PLEA FOR ISRAEL—ASKS NIXON AVOID "ANOTHER MUNICH" IN MIDEAST

A plea to leaders in Washington to halt "one-sided concessions . . . to the Soviet Union and her client Arab states," was made yesterday by a group of Boston clergymen, educators, civic leaders and labor representatives.

Direct negotiations between Arabs and Israelis, the group maintained, can best serve America's interest in a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. They appealed for the avoidance of "another Munich in the Middle East."

The appeal was made by Bishop John M. Burgess of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts; Salvators Camello, President, Massachusetts State Labor Council AFL-CIO; Rev. Msgr. George Casey, Lexington; Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J., Dean, Boston College Law School; Rev. Myron W. Powell, Program Director, Churchmen's League for Civil Welfare; Judge J. John Fox, Judge Lewis Goldberg, Superior Court; Prof. Paul Kootner, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Phillip Kramer, Vice President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Prof. Gordon A. Martin, Jr., Northeastern University Law School; Stephen Mugar, Star Market Corporation; Thomas A. Pappas; Paul Parks, Director, Model Cities Program.

Also, David R. Pokross, President, Combined Jewish Philanthropies; Rev. Robert F. Quinn, CSP, Director, Paulist Fathers Center; Prof. John Roche, Brandeis University; Rabbi Murray I. Rothman, President, Massachusetts Board of Rabbis; Joseph Salerna, Vice President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Robert M. Segal, President Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Boston; Rev. Samuel Tyler, Trinity Episcopal Church; Rabbi Charles Weinberg, former President, Rabbinical Council of America; Prof. Harold Weisberg, Brandeis University.

Following is the text of the plea:

"We are urgently compelled to speak out against the dangerous one-sided concessions now being offered by our government to the Soviet Union and her client Arab states at the four-power talks. These concessions rep-

resent a direct and immediate threat both to Israel's vital security and to our own long-term national interest.

"It is particularly reprehensible that Israel's fate should be 'negotiated' with Moscow—a declared enemy of Israel, which is carrying on a shamelessly anti-Semitic campaign against its own Jewish citizens, has again equipped Nasser's forces, and is training and guiding them in the field.

"Our clear national interest in a just and lasting peace in the Middle East would have been and still can be far best served by insisting that the states directly involved in the conflict be themselves directly involved in negotiating a mutually-agreed peace settlement. Is it unreasonable or unfair to insist that the parties to a conflict meet to resolve the conflict?"

"The present cease-fire lines in the Middle East are a standing reminder to Moscow's Arab clients that the U.S.S.R., whose incitement and fabrications in May, 1967, plunged them into catastrophe, has not been able to make good their subsequent losses in territory and prestige. In what way is it compatible with America's interests to rescue Moscow from this self-inflicted impasse?"

"We must remember, as the Israelis remember, that when Israel was menaced in 1948 and 1967, no foreign power lifted a finger on her behalf. The peril was hers alone, and so was her astounding victory. Threatened with annihilation, Israel drove the menacing Arab armies away from the outskirts of her cities to relatively defensible lines.

"Now, at the precise moment when Nasser—twice rescued by the Great Powers from self-inflicted disaster—again calls for 'a sea of blood . . . under a horizon blazing with fire,' the Great Powers undertake to do what he remains incapable of doing, by 'persuading' Israel again to forgo an agreed and binding peace settlement and to retreat to the mortally vulnerable lines of May, 1967—in contradiction even of the November, 1967, U.N. resolution which calls for secure and agreed frontiers.

"What purpose does it serve to offer concessions that . . . undermining the vital interest . . . of the only free, democratic and reliable friend America has in the Middle East—in a futile effort to appease regimes which, even aside from Israel, offer no significant hope for peace or progress to the exploited people of that tragic region?"

"In the true interest of world peace, the U.S. cannot afford, and the majority of Americans will not permit, another Munich in the Middle East.

"We respectfully call upon the President, who expressed understanding for Israel's plight during Israel Premier Golda Meir's visit and who properly has stressed that America does not abandon her friends, to reject the shortsighted, self-defeating maneuvers that are seriously undermining the vital interests of the U.S., as well as the security of Israel.

"America's interests and the interests of Israel are the same. We call upon thoughtful Americans to support, by telegrams and letters to the President and the Congress, a firm, determined stand by our government against appeasement and against any imposed 'solutions' in the Middle East.

"There must not be another Munich in the Middle East."

ALL SQUARES PLEASE STAND

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD

the following editorial which I noted in the Wauwatosa News-Times a few days ago while I was back home in Wisconsin's Ninth District:

ALL SQUARES PLEASE STAND

"Square," another of the good old words, has gone the way of "love" and "modesty" and "patriotism." Something to be snickered over or outright laughed at.

Once there was no higher compliment you could pay a man than to call him a "square-shooter." The adman's promise of a "square deal" was as binding as an oath on a Bible. One of those admen, Charles Browner, says he's fed up with this beat generation distorting and corrupting our time-honored vocabulary. He said most of this first, but we second the motion:

Today's "square" volunteers when he doesn't have to.

He's a guy who gets his kicks from trying to do a job better than anyone else.

He's a boob who gets so lost in his work he has to be reminded to go home.

He hasn't learned to cut corners or goof off.

This creep we call a "square" gets all choked up when he hears children singing, "My country, 'tis of thee . . ."

He even believes in God and says so—in public!

A square lives within his means whether the Joneses do or not, and thinks his Uncle Sam should, too.

A square is likely to save some of his own money for a rainy day, rather than count on using yours.

A square gets his books out of the library instead of the drugstore.

He tells his son it's most important to play fair than to win. Imagine!

A square reads scripture when nobody's watching, prays when nobody's listening.

A guy who thinks Christmas trees should be green and Christmas gifts should be hand-picked.

And he wants to see America first—in everything.

He believes in honoring father and mother and "do unto others," and that kind of stuff.

He thinks he knows more than his teenager about cars, freedom, and curfew.

Will all gooney-birds answering this description please stand up. You misfits in this brave new age, you dismally disorganized, improperly apologetic ghosts of the past, stand up: Stand up and be counted! You squares . . . who turn the wheels and dig the fields and move mountains and put rivets in our dreams. You squares . . . who dignify the human race . . . You squares who hold the thankless world in place.

"THE PEOPLE" FINDS A PLACE IN HIS HEART

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following article came to my attention during the recent adjournment, and I would like to take this opportunity to share it with my colleagues. The young man, who is the subject of the article, is Fred Toomey. I am proud to say that he is a Bostonian, and like many of his fellow volunteers is doing an excellent job in the Peace Corps. Fred is stationed in Kirin County, Korea, where he lives and works among Korean villagers. Due to his genuine interest and

concern for people, Fred has succeeded in becoming a beloved and integral part of the community.

The Peace Corps has always stood for optimism, energy, and a willingness to help. Fred Toomey personifies these attributes. He represents, like many of his generation, the best of the American spirit that has upheld us in the past, and the central core of our hope for the future. Since the beginning of the Peace Corps in the early part of the decade, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has frequently contained similar accounts of dedicated men and women. I have found such stories to be a constant source of inspiration and a valid means of demonstrating the inherent good of this organization. Let us hope that their work will continue.

The article follows:

[From the Pacific Stars & Stripes, Dec. 6, 1969]

"THE PEOPLE" FIND A PLACE IN HIS HEART
(By Pfc. Rick Goetz)

HYUN, KOREA.—Fred Toomey's adam's apple was judged the ugliest thing in his room by a group of his young Korean neighbors. And as Fred tells the story, "It even won out over my waste basket and my nose."

Toomey, the man with the ugly adam's apple, is one of some 200 Peace Corps volunteers working in the Republic of Korea, one of 104 working in the field of public health. The others work in English-language education, teaching in ROK universities.

This is the second time Toomey has lived in Korea. In 1956, during his Army time, the young Bostonian served both with the 24th Inf. Div. and the Joint Security Force at Panmunjom.

"While at Panmunjom, I traveled only once or twice to Seoul—it was a rough trip. As far as language, I only learned the usual phrases that most GIs pick up," he said.

But today, Fred Toomey speaks fairly fluent Korean as he nears the end of his two-year stay in "the land of the morning calm." "Actually, I have one of the lesser speaking abilities of the Peace Corps workers here," the 34-year-old volunteer said.

But in the field of public health, Fred Toomey is quite conversant. Like other Corps public health workers here, Fred works in the tuberculosis-control program, started by the ROK Ministry of Health-Social Affairs.

Originally, all public health volunteers were to work in the rural health sub-centers in the myuns (districts) like Toomey. But that program proved too ambitious, and a lack of equipment, doctors and supervisors forced the Peace Corps to turn to the TB program.

The Corps staff gave the volunteers a choice of changing from the outlying sub-centers to the county health centers, where supervisors and equipment would be more readily available—but Fred Toomey stayed in "his" village of Hyun to work among the some 12,000 residents of Kirin County.

Located about 80 miles northeast of Seoul, Hyun is nestled in the mountains of Kangwon Province. A crystal-clear mountain stream flows nearby. On clear nights, millions of stars weave a soft canopy of subtle light, challenged only by the glow of an occasional kerosene lamp. Here, Korea is almost as it was a thousand years ago.

Toomey lives in a single room, across a walkway from the three-room health sub-center. The room is large compared to the normal-sized Korean room, but fits the lanky Toomey like a too-small overcoat.

The walls are lined with boxes, a miniature bookcase, a large black trunk and a low Oriental table. In one corner is a small hot plate. Hanging on two walls are bright

crayon drawings, renderings of the village children. In the center of the floor is a pillow.

Although crowded, the room many times at night seems somehow to expand kindly to encompass the village children who drop by. "I really love these kids. They're probably one of the main things that have kept me here," he said.

Down the street from Toomey's room is the "corner drug store." "We don't have a doctor here so the man who runs the drug store gives some medical help. I do some emergency first aid, but nothing more."

The nearest doctor is at Inje, which is about an hour-and-a-half ride on a crowded bus over a rocky, jarring road. "The bus schedule isn't always dependable, and many times, especially in the winter, the road is impassable for as long as two weeks at a time," Toomey said.

There is a single phone in the village, in the post office. Nearby calls only take a few minutes. A call to Seoul usually takes hours, if it gets through at all.

The village market place, quiet and bare on normal days, becomes a colorful array of activity on market day, every fifth day. Makeshift tents are set up, and brightly-colored clothes mix with the sparkle of fresh fruits and vegetables.

And market day is also a "special" day for Toomey and his co-workers at the health subcenter. "We always make sure that all or at least one of us is here on market day, when our TB patients come to pick up their medicine or get some information."

Toomey's two "fellow health workers" are Miss Lee Jung Ok and Miss Meng Bun Ok, both 23-year-olds. "These kids put in a hard day, and are paid about a dollar a day," Toomey said.

Obviously enjoying being "one of the gang," Fred knows everyone in the village, and immediately picks out any transients that happen through.

"The people here must be the friendliest in the world. Whenever you knock at a door, you're never turned away. Of course everyone knows me now, but even in the beginning I didn't have to use any 'stick your foot in the door' tactics."

When Toomey sets out to visit the tiny villages nestled in the hills of the country, he never takes food along. "If you're there when mealtime comes, you'll always have something to eat."

The main mode of transportation for Toomey is walking. "And I'm just not a hiker," the lanky Easterner quipped. Sometimes he is able to get around by bicycle, but because his two coworkers cannot ride a bike, and because the conditions of the roads are constantly changing, he is usually forced to walk.

"There are small villages scattered all throughout the district and some are almost completely hidden." Standing in front of the Hyun post office, Toomey pointed out an almost unnoticeable indentation in the hillside towering over the village. "I was here a year before I discovered that path led to a village of almost a thousand people," he said.

Toomey, before joining the Peace Corps, had no background in public health or social work. On returning to the States he plans to get his master's degree in social work.

One of the warmest aspects of the work in the republic, said Toomey, is the freedom and individuality the Corps volunteers find. "The freedom we have must be unique for any organization."

The workers are pretty much on their own, and want it that way. "There were a few in the beginning who set up their operations together, but they found that it formed too much of a clique, and kept them from really getting out. So they disbanded and live on an individual basis, like me."

The Republic of Korea is one of only a few countries where the Corps allows the volunteers to set up their own individual budgets.

"We tell the Corps how much money we think we'll need for a month and they give it to us. The budgets range anywhere from 11,000 won to 20,000 won (\$38 to \$70), and sometimes more than that depending on the situation and location."

So obviously, after two years in the republic, it won't be the money that Fred Toomey will remember. He'll remember the many hours hiking through the hillsides visiting patients; the rides on jam-packed buses over rocky roads, or the times he enjoyed heady gulps of makkoli with some of the farmers in the field. But what will always come first in his memory, he says, will be "the people."

GALLAGHER CONTINUES COMPUTERIZED INFORMATION SYSTEMS INVESTIGATION WITH LETTER TO SECRETARY RESOR ON ALLEGATIONS OF AN ARMY DOMESTIC SURVEILLANCE DATA BANK

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 4 years I have been conducting a careful study of the implications of computerized information systems. In 1966, my Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy held what could accurately be described as a "technology assessment" on the Bureau of the Budget's proposal for a National Data Bank. We found that the threats to a dynamic and creative America outweighed the promised benefits of the system's efficiency and economy and that our knowledge of the computer, especially of ways to guarantee the integrity of data within the system, was not sufficiently advanced to allow such a Mount Everest to be constructed on the plain of data processing.

While we were successful in halting the National Data Bank, however, many slightly less ambitious versions have been proposed and implemented. Allegations contained in the January 1970 issue of the Washington Monthly charge that the Department of the Army is erecting a nationwide data bank of information about the constitutionally protected protest and dissent activities of many American organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I have, therefore, written to Army Secretary Stanley Resor and given him the opportunity to respond to charges which are, in my judgment, extremely serious. I insert the text of that letter into the RECORD at this point:

JANUARY 26, 1970.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The most recent issue of *The Washington Monthly* contains allegations which are very disturbing to me. In an article entitled "CONUS Intelligence: The Army Watches Civilian Politics," by Christopher Pyle, it is charged that the Department of the Army is collecting dossiers on individuals who engage in legal protests around the United States or who are connected with activist groups. Among the organizations whose members are mentioned for inclusion in the Army's intelligence reports are the National Association for the

Advancement of Colored People and the American Civil Liberties Union.

While many questions come to my mind about the Department of the Army maintaining such surveillance over the domestic affairs of our Nation, a source of particular concern is that this information is to be stored in, and disseminated from, a computerized data bank at Fort Holabird, Baltimore, Maryland. It appears that, should Mr. Pyle's article be totally factual, a nationwide data bank of extremely sensitive personality reports is being constructed at the Investigative Records Repository.

As Chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy, I conducted hearings on a suggested National Data Bank advanced by the Bureau of the Budget in 1966. Based upon my investigation, the Committee on Government Operations issued in August 1968 "Privacy and the National Data Bank Concept." As part of my continuing studies on that issue, I received a letter dated March 21, 1968, from the then Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Charles Zwick. The letter contained the following relevant comments:

"We will prepare a specific concrete plan which could be exposed to the critical review of a group representing the broad variety of interests in the matter. Only after that would we consider that we have a proposal for appropriate consideration by the Congress."

On January 15, 1970, Lawrence Speiser, Director of the Washington Office of the American Civil Liberties Union wrote to you on the issue of the computerized Investigative Records Repository. He referred to my agreement with the Bureau of the Budget and to the intense Congressional concern over computerized data banks:

"Their concern was responsible for the review and reconsideration of plans for a national federal data center and the promise by the Bureau of the Budget that none would be created without prior Congressional approval. Also it was clearly understood that under no circumstances would raw investigative data ever be fed into any computer bank."

Mr. Speiser accurately reflects the understandings reached with the Bureau of the Budget about a National Data Bank. Yet, it would seem from Mr. Pyle's article that precisely the proscribed information is to be fed into what if it is not formally a National Data Bank, is, at the very least, a nationwide data bank.

I clearly recognize, Mr. Secretary, the necessity for some data to be at the disposal of the Department of the Army in order to meet its responsibilities to quell civil disorders and I would not quarrel with an attempt to isolate trouble spots around the country. However, I am deeply concerned about the implications of collecting dossiers on Americans who are pursuing constitutionally protected activities, especially when they are to be inextricably embedded in immediately available form in a computerized data system. I would, therefore, ask the following questions:

1. Is the article sufficiently substantive to describe the current data collection procedures and the eventual construction of a computerized data bank at Fort Holabird? If it is, have you discussed the National Data Bank implications with the Bureau of the Budget or with any group concerned about the constitutional questions such as compilation and centralization of data would raise?

2. Is there any plan for the individual to be informed of the range of information on him in the bank and does he have the possibility to file mitigating or ameliorating rebuttals? I note that Mr. Pyle indicates that at least some of the information in the Investigative Records Repository is based on newspaper stories and conjectural information which has not been subjected to judicial review for its accuracy or completeness.

3. Mr. Pyle states "The personality files are likely to be made available to any federal agency that issues security clearances, conducts investigations, or enforces laws." Should that sentence reflect current operating procedure, may I have your assurance that you are taking steps to make such inter-agency transfer unlikely, if not impossible?

4. What is the specific source of funds under which the Department of the Army is constructing this alleged nationwide data bank? How is it connected to the mission of the Department of the Army to collect and store such sensitive information in a computerized data bank which, according to Mr. Pyle "... will specialize in files devoted exclusively to descriptions of the lawful political activity of civilians." (Emphasis in Original)

It is entirely possible, Mr. Secretary, that Mr. Pyle's article is an inflated estimate of what is being collected, what will be contained in the nationwide computerized information system, and who will have access. I would hope that you could report to me that that is true, for it would represent an unconscionable and unconstitutional threat to the privacy and spontaneity of Americans if *The Washington Monthly* has accurately described the Investigative Records Repository at Fort Holabird. I anticipate your prompt reply to the questions contained in this letter.

With continued best wishes,
Sincerely,

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
Member of Congress.

THANKS FROM A VIETNAM VETERAN

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege and honor of assisting many constituents with various problems during my years in the Congress and I am always encouraged by the faith, energy, and dedication of so many who are burdened.

Of particular encouragement to me are the young men who have returned from Vietnam, many of them bearing the scars of that difficult war, and yet they are not bitter and they do not seek sympathy but only the opportunity to pick up their lives again and to be good Americans.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues a letter that I have received from Mr. William F. Mitchum, Jr., which, I believe, exemplifies the attitude of this country's young men:

DEAR MR. ROGERS: I don't know what to say to show my appreciation for what you have done for me. The only words I can think of is "Thank you Mr. Rogers," you and your office staff for taking your valuable time to help me again.

It makes me real proud to know that we have a man like yourself in Washington never too busy to help a veteran out when he needs help. I feel that my humble effort to fight for our country and all free people has been well spent.

I don't mind the limp I have in my walk or the scars I carry on my body, not even the hurt I have in my back, because I'm proud to have served my country when it needed me. If this is what it takes to keep men like

yourself in our government and our country free, then I would gladly do it over and over again.

I only regret I got wounded as soon as I did and can no longer serve in our armed forces, but at least I can now be a good and active citizen and serve my country in this way.

I don't have a recent photo of myself so I have enclosed a write-up done by Westinghouse Elec. company where my father works showing a picture of myself not long before I went to Vietnam.

Maybe someday I will have the opportunity to meet you in person and thank you personally for your help. So, along with my parents and my sister, we all say again, Thank you Mr. Rogers, may God bless you.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. MITCHUM, JR.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.

CAREER EDUCATION FOR THE AEROSPACE AGE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following are remarks that I delivered before the 1970 National Laboratory for the Advancement of Education, sponsored by the Aerospace Education Foundation, Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., January 27, 1970.

CAREER EDUCATION FOR THE AEROSPACE AGE

In this Aerospace Decade of the Seventies, I feel privileged to be part of such an unusual concentration of talented people—educators, corporation executives, government leaders, Air Force officials, and concerned citizens—all gathered here to ponder the problem of "Education for the World of Work."

Over the past 10 years, the Aerospace Education Foundation has emerged as a vital catalytic force in education. Each year the Foundation's education conference has provided a forward thrust. It has served as a vanguard of new practices and programs—disseminating innovative ideas widely throughout the United States.

"Education for the World of Work" is the single most important theme you could have chosen for this year's aerospace colloquium. For we are approaching a trillion dollar economy in this decade—which will grow to \$2 trillion in the 1980's, \$4 trillion in the 1990's.

With an anticipated work force of 200 million by the 21st century, this decade truly belongs to the vocational, the career educators. No longer will vocation training be reserved for education's castaways—for those whom educators have labeled "dum-dums" and "ding-a-lings."

Under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, the Congress authorized more than \$858 million for Fiscal 1970. However, the Administration has requested only \$279 million for vocational education, but the appropriations bill passed recently by the House and Senate raised that amount to \$489 million.

We hope and pray this sum can survive the veto tomorrow. And it will, if you lend your support to those of us in the Congress who are committed to a maximum level of Federal investment in vocational education.

I am especially pleased to be a part of these deliberations today, at the 1970 National Laboratory for the Advancement of Education. With the assistance of private business and industry in the sixties, the

educators began to borrow freely from the rich legacy of aerospace training and education concepts developed by the military.

For example, from systems analysis—once solely a Department of Defense management technique, educators have learned how to be more precise in their thinking and planning, how to state their goals more exactly. And they have begun to utilize feedback about their performance to improve the quality of their learning output.

From the practice of performance contracting in the military—guaranteeing, for example, that 90 percent of a training class can successfully perform certain specified functions—there has developed the new practice of contracting for educational products and services with private enterprise, and paying according to their results. This approach, already available to consumers for a fee in many parts of the country, is now being tested by the U.S. Office of Education in the Texarkana project—and we in the Congress will await the results with keen interest.

Drawing on the Air Force work in programmed instruction, which began in 1947, educators have designed whole systems of individualized learning for millions of American students.

From the Army's experience with Project 100,000, educators have discovered that persons with low scores on intelligence tests are, indeed, educable—provided they have proper support and appropriate opportunities for tutoring.

And finally, educators are still learning from the Air Force—which operates the largest single vocational education system in the country. The Air Force can take great pride in its vocational programs. For many years now, its training courses have paralleled those of industry—and the Air Force annually sends 85 percent of men who leave the service directly to jobs in the private sector.

I am personally pleased with the aggressive entry of America's industry into educational technology. There is a \$55 billion dollar education market out there and industry has a right to go after it.

Following this gathering, I understand that you will be assembling in more than 30 workshops to consider issues relevant to the subject of education for the world of work. Therefore, I want to spend the remainder of my time this morning suggesting what I hope will become priority areas for your discussions in the next two days. Let me enumerate them briefly for you.

First, the entire education curriculum should be centered around preparation for the world of work.

An effort of this magnitude will require unique vision and perspective, reaching into the rest of the 20th century and even beyond to the 21st. That is why I speak of "career education"—which encompasses not only the teaching of specific vocational skills but also a comprehensive orientation to the challenges of working in the adult world.

Existing programs in our present institutions have tended to overlook these broadly-based needs. Instead, such concerns have been reserved to vocational education departments and guidance counselors—while the rest of the academic community has become sidetracked by the college prep syndrome.

At the elementary level, the subject of career is either ignored or treated unrealistically through stereotypes of such roles as policeman, fireman, farmer, engineer, through the old "Dick and Jane"-type readers.

Consequently, our young people face the future with apprehension, misinformation, and confusion. And one message of the contemporary youth rebellion seems clear—our students have been given no real understanding of the meaning of adulthood. They

find their classes ivory-towerish, superficial, misleading, and—above all—disillusioning. This is hardly surprising, given that our schools have not begun to struggle with the question of preparation of students for the world of work.

To a large extent, a person's life is fashioned—even governed—by his job. His geographical location, standard of living, available leisure time, modes of commutation, style of dress, even his relationship with his wife and family are influenced—if not determined—by his occupation.

An individual translates his sense of self in his work—and his level of personal fulfillment and happiness is shaped by his work situation.

Therefore, it seems astonishing that our schools have virtually ignored these phenomena.

All of our young people will face a number of crucial career decisions—even career crises—in their working lives. The first one comes, in fact, with the first job. Yet, society provides no vehicle for helping them face important job choices—no direction for helping them increase their capacity to cope with change, to become more flexible and adaptable.

Most students will spend at least part of their time in some type of corporate or bureaucratic environment. But their education does not enable them to develop sensitivity toward the systems in which they will be forced to operate.

Our young people have no chain to grow as persons—to gain insight into themselves and other human beings—to engage in a type of "humanistic" or group process education to help them cope with their feelings or sharpen their skills in working with others.

Second, education for the world of work should be construed as a lifetime experience—practically from birth to death.

Perhaps a book like *The Peter Principle*—which says that people eventually rise to their level of incompetence in their jobs—would not have been necessary, had we begun earlier to think about lifetime career education.

We must create an educational system that serves all Americans, throughout their lives—one which offers training and retraining for the rapidly shifting occupational spectrum.

Today's student, in his working lifetime, can anticipate changing jobs at least three times, and probably more. A man like Robert McNamara, for example, has moved from industry to government and then to international finance in less than 10 years. Even if a person remains with one company or job situation, he can still expect to shift roles a number of times.

All of this requires re-education. Nevertheless, our society has no institutional mechanisms to help adults adjust to the changing job market. If a man loses his job, we literally leave him on the street—no matter what his skills, intelligence, training, or experience may be.

We should begin by guaranteeing every student a marketable skill before he leaves high school. With 12 percent of America's teenage population, ages 16 to 19, unemployed—and with about 50 percent of those who enter college not finishing—this is an absolute necessity.

The New York Public Schools have already taken the first step in this direction. They have abolished their track system and every student is now required to complete a vocational education course in order to graduate from high school.

We must also begin to expand our community college system—so that every adult at any stage in his career development can return for additional training and education.

Third, the concept of education for women must be vastly expanded and modernized.

With more than 31 million women currently in the work force, we must place a new and more vigorous emphasis on preparing women for the dual roles of homemaker and breadwinner.

The Vocational Education Amendments authorize \$25 million for home economics in Fiscal 1970, and the Congress has appropriated \$20 million in the recent bill. Hopefully, these funds will stimulate home economics educators to revise their traditional courses to give much greater emphasis to such timely areas as consumer education, home management and finance, and child rearing.

In addition, our educational programs must help both men and women understand the changing role of the female in the working world. With growing opportunities for women in education and various occupations, the 19th century and pre-World War II stereotypes of the American female no longer apply—and we must encourage young people to develop more realistic expectations about the place of American women in occupations and in the contemporary family.

Finally, we must move to eliminate the credentialing system which prevents young people from their maximum potential.

For too long we have placed disproportionate value on the college diploma. Consequently, we now find ourselves in what I call the "diploma dilemma." In place of this credential, we must develop a democratic system of assessment that opens the doors of personnel offices to everyone with talent, whether or not he possesses the proper piece of paper.

Realization of these objectives will require determination and courage from all citizens—the more than 61 million Americans who are full-time teachers, administrators, or students in the nation's educational enterprise; the more than 132,000 who are trustees of local school systems, state boards of education, or institutions of higher learning; and parents throughout the nation. The courage to change constitutes a vital ingredient in the process of revitalizing our institutions—and it must become the driving force of the seventies in American education.

In this room we have the men and women who can reshape American education. I tell you that I am absolutely convinced vocational education—total education for the world of work—is the last home of America's public educational system.

Vocational education is our last hope in the decade of the 70's. If it fails, we all fail.

What a tragedy of our time that a nation which has reached man's highest dream of technological achievement; a nation that has carved for its people the highest standard of living ever contemplated by man; a nation that is now charting a course for the entire world in human relations and equal opportunity for all—a nation that is reaching for man's highest pinnacle in industrial growth—still continues to treat occupational education as a stepchild. God grant this inspiring conference can change that course.

THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the environment has become the political issue. Everyone is hastening to get into the act. Those who have been expressing concern over a number of years are accusing others of being Johnny-come-late-

lys. Industry is being blamed, government is being blamed, institutions are being blamed, people are being blamed. When all is said and done, however, we still must face the challenge of saving and renewing our environment. How we go about this task will really determine how much we care and are willing to do to solve our environment problems.

Think of some of the issues of the 1960's—civil rights, poverty, urban decay, hunger. They are still with us—perhaps on their way to solutions, but greatly diminished as political issues in the minds of most Americans. Why is this? Long before we have solved the problem we saturate ourselves with concern, outrage, exposés, promises, plans, words. We become so saturated we do not want to hear any more; we do not want to see any more, and we do not feel any more. We start new programs. We invest large sums of money. We are long on concern and short on foresight. We grow impatient and less concerned, and finally, we embark on another crusade.

What has been lacking in our approach to these issues is a plan—where we are going and how we are going to get there. We look for easy solutions, declare war on a problem, hastily enact programs and expect immediate results.

Will we follow the same course in our pursuit of a renewed environment?

Congress, perhaps more than any other body, can immediately determine the answer to this question. We enact the laws and set the Nation on a course of action. The President has called for an all-out effort to renew the environment. He has made some proposals, and will be recommending additional legislation. In order to help him in his task, Congress created a Council on Environment Quality mandating that it provide "a broad and independent overview of current and long-term trends in the quality of our national environment, to advise the President, and through him the Congress and the American people on steps which may and should be taken to improve the quality of that environment." The President may recommend the consolidation of environment programs into a single agency, perhaps creating a new Department of Natural Resources.

Will the Congress be equipped to fulfill its obligation? The executive branch through President Nixon can provide the leadership and coordination of Government machinery. But right now there are 23 committees, subcommittees, and a joint committee with jurisdiction over matters affecting the environment. According to an article in *Business Week* magazine, in the last session of Congress more than 1,200 bills affecting water resources alone were introduced and referred to 13 committees in the House, and 11 in the Senate. Are we to allow the same fate that has befallen other issues, competing legislation, private interests, jealous committees, legislative-executive bickering defeat our environmental struggle before we have begun? A sizable number of our colleagues have said no. Congressmen DON BROTZMAN and PETE BIESTER have introduced legislation to create a House Committee on the Envi-

ronment, and Congressman JOHN DINGELL has proposed a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality. The Democratic leadership has assured us that a joint committee will be created. This is one promise that I hope to help them make good on. Today, I am introducing both of these proposals. I believe they supplement one another. We need legislative oversight and long-range planning. We also need a unified legislative approach to solving these problems.

Certainly, the 91st Congress and each Member of it will rate more than its share of credit if it is the Congress that puts us on the road toward solving our environmental problems. We can all introduce competing legislation, each subcommittee can hold hearings and recommend programs in a piecemeal fashion. We have done it before—in day care, in manpower, in education, and we have failed to achieve our objective. I hope we will not fail again.

OIL AND GAS OR WATER

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, New York State is currently considering whether it should permit industry to drill for oil and gas in the State's part of Lake Erie bottom. The oil and gas division estimates that New York State will earn about \$1 million each year from drilling leases for the lake. The division believes that the probabilities of finding oil rather than natural gas are quite low; but they do admit that it is a possibility.

Most recently the International Joint Commission, a body of United States and Canadian representatives, has been considering whether or not it should approve drilling in Lake Erie. I submitted testimony to the IJC opposing such a move.

I oppose the granting of licenses for oil and gas drilling because I do not believe that the risks justify the possible returns. The relatively small size of the natural gas reserves under the lake bottom mean that we will not see a decrease in fuel prices even if the drilling is successful. The oil potential is small enough to be almost nonexistent when compared with the recent discoveries on the North Slope of Alaska.

In contrast to the limited economic benefits that might be gained from drilling in Lake Erie is the specter of a pollution disaster. A recent report has indicated that we may have as many as three oil drilling accidents a year as we expand our underwater explorations. In such a situation a Santa Barbara incident would become the rule rather than the exception. The consequences of such an accidental spill in a lake that many communities use for drinking water are all too obvious. Brine that is often found in conjunction with oil and gas deposits may leak into the lake. Drilling chemicals are bound to get into the lake. There are already \$2 billion in claims for damages filed as a result of the Santa Bar-

bara spill. The cost would certainly be higher if it occurred in Lake Erie.

Fortunately, many public officials have opposed any further drilling in Lake Erie. The Governors of all the Great Lake States except New York and Pennsylvania have signed a resolution urging the Department of Interior to ban further drilling in the lakes. The legislative bodies of the communities along the New York State shore have opposed the drilling. The State of Ohio bans all drilling today. Pennsylvania has no active drilling or proposals to do so. It is only in New York State that we find Governor Rockefeller willing to hazard this danger to our precious water resources.

I have made my opposition to further drilling clear. I will do what I can to see that neither the Interior Department nor the Corps of Engineers grant permission for drilling in the lakes.

I am inserting in the RECORD an article by David Bird in the January 25, 1970, issue of the New York Times describing some of the problems involved in Lake Erie. I am also inserting an article by Gladwin Hill in the January 25, 1970, issue of the New York Times describing the continuing pollution in the Santa Barbara Channel. Finally, I am inserting an article appearing in yesterday's edition of the Washington Post concerning an oil spill on the Louisiana shoreline. These articles point up the need to effectively regulate oil and gas drilling in our coastal and inland waters.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1970]
UNITED STATES AND CANADA IN CONFLICT ON
DRILLING IN LAKE ERIE

(By David Bird)

PORT COLBORNE, ONTARIO.—The United States and Canada are in growing disagreement over drilling for gas beneath Lake Erie.

Canada, which controls half of the lake, believes that drilling for gas—and someday for oil—is merely tapping a valuable natural resource. The United States, which controls the other half, believes that drilling holds the threat of further pollution disaster for the lake, which is already in extremely poor condition.

Drilling is allowed now only on the Canadian side. On the American side there has been next to no drilling and all plans have been held off as a result of the disastrous blowout from a drilling rig off Santa Barbara a year ago that spread oil onto miles of California beach.

Asked why the Canadians are apparently less worried about the dangers, an American, Dr. Gordon Everett of the Department of the Interior, suggested that there were different priorities in Canada, a thinly populated land of cold temperatures that needs fuel.

NOT AS EXCITABLE

The Canadian attitude was reflected by H. W. Thompson, an engineering adviser to the Canadian Government, who said, "We're not as excitable a people."

Additionally, when Canadians are challenged by Americans about pollution, they tend to point at the much more heavily populated United States side of the lake, which produces far larger volumes of the sewage and industrial waste that, in the view of experts, has been hastening the death of the lake.

For example, the International Joint Commission, the body that handles problems be-

tween the United States and Canada, has just been told by a Canadian official that it needs more power to control pollution.

D. S. Caverly, general manager of the Ontario Water Resources Commission, said at a hearing of the commission at the University of Western Ontario that such control required "more teeth to put the bite on some states or provinces." He was especially critical of what he termed a lack of pollution control at Cleveland and at Niagara Falls, N.Y.

HIGH-SPEED RIGS USED

The dispute about pollution of Lake Erie has intensified with the introduction of high-speed drilling rigs like one called the Mr. Neil, which is tied up in this port for the winter, its twin hulls jacked high above the icy water.

The Mr. Neil and similar rigs that work around the clock when weather permits are operated by Consumers Gas Company, a Toronto-based utility that is by far the largest prospector on the lake. Consumers Gas holds exploration rights to more than 1.4 million acres, on 47 per cent of the bottom that is in Canadian waters.

Consumers Gas denies that its operations could contribute any significant pollution, and, indeed, contends that the gas it gets is helping to control contamination on shore.

Brian J. Wallace, superintendent for production for the utility, said that pollution was caused by the burning of "dirty fuel like coal" and that if gas or oil could be substituted, there would be less pollution.

Opponents of the drilling fear that brine associated with petroleum deposits or oil will leak out of the gas wells, from which no oil may be produced now. Public concern arose in 1959 when oil blew out of a well being drilled in western Lake Erie and washed up near Colchester, Ontario.

The spill was soon checked, but Mr. Wallace said people "got so concerned about the five barrels that spilled" that they began to have what he terms excessive fears about the drilling.

Lake Erie's gas is needed, Mr. Wallace said, because the Ontario region is energy-poor. Most of the gas for the Great Lakes area comes from vast resources in western Canada or from the Texas Panhandle.

Lake Erie is a relatively small field, but the gas is no cheaper from larger fields farther away. The production is justified on the ground that every source needs to be tapped to satisfy growing demand for natural gas.

NO SERIOUS INCIDENT SINCE 1913

The expectation of continued drilling is reflected in a recent report by the Ontario oil industry to the International Joint Commission.

The report, by the Lake Erie Committee of the Ontario Petroleum Institute, said that "oil and gas explorations have been conducted on Lake Erie since 1913 without serious pollution incident" but it added: "It is recognized, however, that if drilling is extensive, accidents may result."

It is the expanded drilling that is worrying conservationists.

From 1913 through 1955 just 38 wells were put down in Lake Erie. Drilling activity has increased sharply since then, with the total now up to 600 and increasing rapidly.

The drilling has led the prospectors to eye the undeveloped lake bottom on the American side, and Consumers Gas approached New York State officials for permission to drill in the eastern part of the lake. The State Conservation Department looked on the idea favorably until strong objections were voiced by the public and Federal officials.

Kenneth Biglane of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, speaking at a hearing of the International Joint Commission, said:

"Many will argue that the odds are small that oil would escape because of drilling and/or production activity. They may be right, but we cannot afford to gamble on these kinds of odds when Lake Erie water supplies are at stake. We cannot be overly cautious in this kind of situation."

Public hearings on the state's proposal to lease the underwater land for drilling drew strong opposition last summer.

Stanley P. Spisiak, a conservationist from Buffalo, received loud cheers when he testified in Dunkirk that "there's going to be a revolution in conservation if you jam this down the throats of people."

At the same hearing Dr. Robert Sweeney, director of the Great Lakes Laboratory of the State University at Buffalo, speaking against the drilling, said, "I have never seen what I would term a 'pollution-free' operation." He cautioned that drilling might cause a brine leak that could destroy life in the fresh-water lake.

Last September New York State officials declared a moratorium on drilling.

Michigan, which borders the westernmost part of the lake, has expressed the strongest opposition. Gov. William G. Milliken has said that "technical knowledge to date does not provide enough safeguards from possible damage."

He has called on the Department of the Interior to "prohibit any drilling for gas and oil in the Great Lakes." The Federal power to do this is less than certain, however, because the land is actually owned by the states.

Governor Milliken also has called on Canada to stop all drilling in the sections of the lakes under her control.

Ohio, which has the longest Lake Erie shore on the American side, has a policy that "no drilling for the production of oil and gas be permitted in Lake Erie until such time as the hazards, possible safeguards and the need for utilizing potential gas reserves under the lake are adequately studied."

The only drilling on the American side has been in small sections off Pennsylvania, and that is now in abeyance.

Despite the opposition Canadian drillers are confident.

"Eventually the furor is going to die down and we're not going to waste time waiting," says Harold Townsend, who is chairman of the Lake Erie Committee of the Ontario Petroleum Institute and assistant superintendent of production for Consumers Gas.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1970]
ONE YEAR LATER, IMPACT OF GREAT OIL SLICK
IS STILL FELT

(By Gladwin Hill)

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., January 24.—One year after the great offshore oil well blow-out here, the leakage of gummy petroleum has largely been stemmed and the beaches are generally clean. But repercussions from the ecological "shot heard 'round the world'" continue.

As a dozen oil companies pursue sharply limited operations in the Santa Barbara channel, local residents do not consider the situation stabilized at all.

"Everybody's waiting for the other shoe to drop—another blowout, an earthquake, who knows?" remarked one citizen.

The channel is a geologically unstable area, full of faults and fissures of the sort that caused the original leakage in a deposit five miles offshore. Small earthquakes are frequent—there have been several perceptible ones in the last two months.

And since the big leak of one year ago next Wednesday in which perhaps several million gallons of oil were loosed, there have been periodic lesser recurrences. The latest of them came Christmas week, when a pipeline to the mainland broke and caused a new slick.

NIXON INTERVENTION ASKED

Leading California newspapers are calling for immediate intervention by President Nixon to stop the channel oil activity, and Santa Barbarans are militant about removing the operations from the area entirely.

The drilling companies bring little money into the community, and even without the go, the drilling platforms marring the Azure channel view and the bustle of oil activities along the resort city's waterfront are unwelcome to residents.

But Santa Barbara's only recourse is the Federal Government, which in 1968 auctioned off nearly 600 square miles of channel leases for \$603-million, the prelude to the trouble.

Leaders of the community's protest organization, Get Oil Out, even with the backing of such national conservation organizations as the Sierra Club, have made little headway in Washington.

Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel listens sympathetically to their complaints and offers suggestions for palliative measures. But he points that the leases were something he inherited, and that to revoke them now would be a billion-dollar matter fraught with complications.

A POSITIVE ASPECT FOUND

But while Santa Barbarans, and many Federal officials as well, agonize over the situation, environmental observers have found many a positive aspect to it.

At a critical time when environmental degradation was reaching crisis proportions, they say, Santa Barbara dramatized for millions the dangers of unbridled technology.

And public attention swung to a dozen other environmental problem areas, from air pollution to food additives, compounding the concern that moved President Nixon to place improved quality of life at the head of national agenda for the new decade.

After initially shutting down oil operations in the channel, Secretary Hickel has gradually authorized some resumption of activities. Several syndicates are doing exploratory drilling at points distant from the ill-starred "Block 402" where the big leak erupted.

There the Union Oil Company, in partnership with the Texaco, Gulf and Mobil companies, today has two platforms in the 200-foot-deep water, from which stem 35 wells producing 30,000 barrels of oil a day, with an approximate value of \$90,000.

RELIEF OF PRESSURES URGED

Continued extraction of the oil was recommended last June by a Presidential scientific panel to relieve the oil-sand pressures that, after last January's drilling, caused oil to squirt from a number of cracks in the ocean bottom. The daily production now goes through underwater pipes to storage centers near Ventura down the coast.

Expert estimates of how much oil has escaped range up to several million gallons. The United States Geological Survey, which oversees the oil operations, says that leakage around Block 402 has now been reduced to only eight barrels a day (336 gallons). It says that about a quarter of this being recovered, and that the total is overshadowed by the historic natural leakage from "Coal Oil Point," just west of Santa Barbara, which is estimated as high as 50 to 70 barrels a day.

But Santa Barbarans note that there is almost a chronic, if small, oil slick around the drilling area in the channel, subject to winds that may blow patches ashore without warning.

The oil companies have not disclosed how much they have spent on clean-up operations since the big spill, but an informed source has estimated the figures at \$5-million.

There are some \$2-billion in lawsuits pending against Union Oil and its partners and the Government for damages.

The United States District Court in Los

Angeles has appointed a panel of three special masters to rule on damages in one \$1.3-billion "class action" by Santa Barbara residents in which there may be as many as 17,000 claimants.

Local business sources estimates that Santa Barbara lost at least \$1-million in tourist expenditures last year as a result of the oil slick publicity.

Thousands of birds were killed by the oil slick, but up to now there has been no comprehensive assessment of the overall ecological damage to the area.

Federal experts who studied the effects of the Torrey Canyon tanker spill off England and France in 1967 have predicted that the disruption of marine life at Santa Barbara would be slight. But some local naturalists disagree.

Senator Alan Cranston, a Democrat, and Representative Charles Teague, Republican, both of California, have bills in Congress to stop the oil operations. But they have conceded that as things stand now, the chances of passage do not seem bright.

ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE

Muskie, Democrat of Maine and a leader in environment legislation, joined the battle yesterday, urging that the Federal Government revoke the leases, compensate the lessees, and make a national oil reserve to be tapped only in an emergency.

A Federal maritime oil spill measure now before a Senate-House conference committee would penalize offenders as much as \$125 a ton, up to \$14-million, with unlimited liability in case of negligence.

Last February by Administrative order, Secretary Hickel made oil companies responsible for cleaning up any pollution they cause, even in the absence of any proof that they were at fault.

Santa Barbara community and conservation organizations have joined in a "Jan. 28 Committee" to mark the anniversary on a big scale next week with a daylong national conference on environmental problems.

Among the scheduled participants are several members of Congress, a number of National conservation leaders and former Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, who has called the oil lease of 1968 his own "Bay of Pigs."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 26, 1970]

A 15-MILE OIL SLICK SMEARS LOUISIANA BEACH, KILLS WILDLIFE

GRAND ISLE, La., January 25.—An oil slick 15 miles long and about 20 feet wide oozed ashore early today and completely covered the beaches of Grand Isle, a small island off the South Louisiana coast in the Gulf of Mexico, killing sea birds and fish.

"It's every bit as bad as Santa Barbara," said Mrs. Jan Sebastian, a conservationist and island resident who reported the spill today.

Ed Cocks, a New Orleans journalist who went to Grand Isle today, said the slick was "15 miles long and covers the entire Grand Isle beach.

"It's crude oil that showed up sometime during the night," Cocks said. "Same act as Santa Barbara—killing sea birds and fish."

Cocks said the two major oil companies drilling in the area, Humble Oil and Refining Co., and Continental Atlantic Getty Co., both denied any knowledge of the slick's source.

"There are dead birds and fish all along the beach," said Mrs. Sebastian. "It's terrible, unbelievable."

Mrs. Sebastian, who lives by the beach near the center of the island, said, "It apparently came up during the night. It wasn't on the beach yesterday."

A Coast Guard spokesman said oil appeared Friday off Timbalier Bay west of here and a shifting of the winds Saturday night could have caused the slick to move toward Grand Isle. He said he did not know the source of the oil.

FOOT-IN-THE-DOOR WELFARE PLAN

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the administration's welfare reform package promises to generate much heat in the coming weeks and months, much of which might well be justified if a current article from the newsweekly Human Events evaluates HEW's position correctly. As some of us fear, initial appropriations are gaged for the time being at a comparatively modest level, with the really serious spending called for once the program has been established. The article raises some serious questions about the "workfare" proposal which should be borne in mind as the welfare debate heats us.

The article, "Foot-in-the-Door Welfare Plan," appeared in the January 31, 1970, issue of Human Events provides much food for thought on the advisability of the administration's welfare recommendations. I insert it in the Record at this point:

FOOT-IN-THE-DOOR WELFARE PLAN

Just days before President Nixon was touting his No. 1 legislative priority—welfare reform—in his State of the Union message, a key Administration official revealed to a pro-welfare group in New York the truly revolutionary nature of the program. Moreover, this same official indicated it would not only be extremely costly to the taxpayer, but that its passage would probably be the first step toward an even greater outpouring of lavish welfare benefits—an outpouring that the Nixon Administration appears to actually welcome.

Though this official didn't exactly say so, the thrust of his remarks suggests the Nixon package is designed to clear the way for a complete federal takeover of welfare and the start of a guaranteed annual income for every person that falls below the upward spiraling "poverty line."

Speaking to a meeting of the Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York, Robert E. Patricelli, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and the Administration's chief lobbyist for the measure, frankly acknowledged the mammoth size of the "reform" package.

"The total cost in new federal dollars of the proposal," he stated—and some think vastly understated—"is \$4.4 billion per year, and the coverage under the Family Assistance portion of the program will be some 25 million people—up from the present 10 million recipients (emphasis ours)."

While the common conception is that the federal government will provide only \$1,600 yearly to a family of four, Patricelli pointed out that to "that \$1,600 base must also be added the expanded food stamp subsidies which the President has proposed and which the Administration has already moved to implement as much as possible by administrative action. Under that program, a family of four receiving \$1,600 in Family Assistance benefits would also receive about \$860 in food stamp subsidies for a total package of \$2,460 in federal income maintenance payments." And all this, of course, is to be supplemented by state payments.

Yet suggested Patricelli, this was just the beginning. "First and quite properly," he remarked, "our critics point out that the Family Assistance Plan is not universal in its coverage. It does not provide federal assist-

ance to non-aged childless couples or single persons. But that omission in the plan traces not to any disagreement in principle with the need to cover such persons, but rather to the need to accommodate to what we hope will be short-term budgetary limitations.

"Within the \$4.4 billion available, we chose to place our emphasis upon families with children, but there is no disagreement in principle that the system should be made universal when resources permit."

Second, said Patricelli, "critics point out that \$1,600 for a family of four is far from adequate. That, too, is certainly the case and we have never suggested that the Family Assistance Plan provides a guaranteed adequate income. It does, however, when combined with food stamps, provide over two-thirds of the amount up to the poverty line. . . . Again, when and if the budgetary situation improves, we might look toward increases in the federal base payment."

Thus, even before the legislation is launched, Administration spokesmen are selling the program to welfare pressure groups—those that can effectively lobby Congress—by stressing that the Nixon welfare package is just a foot-in-the-door proposal.

Contrary to initial impressions conveyed by the Nixon Administration, furthermore, the new welfare program is a giant leap away from the President's concept of a "New Federalism" that would return powers to the states. Patricelli himself thinks the welfare system "should ultimately be fully administered by the federal government and financed wholly or in major part by that level of government." Financial "incentives" in the Nixon proposal, in fact, would help "persuade" the state governments to turn over their own welfare programs to the federal Social Security Administration.

"This would be," said Patricelli, "to my knowledge, an unprecedented arrangement in federal-state relations—an upstream delegation by the states to the federal government for the administration of a wholly state-financed program."

Nor does this exhaust the astonishing aspects of this proposal. A central feature of the President's initiative that had a certain appeal to the public was the "workfare" formula requiring all able-bodied welfare recipients (excepting mothers of pre-school children) to accept either training of suitable jobs so they could work themselves off welfare.

Yet this ingredient is far less revolutionary than originally believed, for a similar "workfare" formula is contained in the current welfare program, the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

Under 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act, mothers in the AFDC program were to seek work training. The legislation provides that an attempt be made to find jobs for those who are employable and that those in need of training be trained and given \$30 a month as incentive payment. Those who refuse to accept work or undertake training are to lose their welfare benefits. The legislation also provides 80 per cent federal matching funds for the cost of the work training program and day-care centers for pre-school children of mothers in training or on jobs.

Despite these supposed "workfare" provisions, however, the number of persons on AFDC has increased substantially and the federal contribution has soared more than \$500 million. Patricelli himself told *Human Events* that these provisions "hadn't worked as well as anybody wanted them to work. . . ."

The Administration proposal, nevertheless, is deliberately designed to weaken the existing welfare formula. Many people, says Patricelli, have criticized the inclusion in the Nixon welfare plan of the "work require-

ment which they feel is regressive and punitive." In fact, says Patricelli, "President Nixon's work requirement does represent a significant liberalization of the similar requirement found in the present law, for it does exempt women with children under six from its operation, and it does require that jobs provided be 'suitable' under guidelines to be established by the secretary of labor."

As Patricelli suggests, then, the Nixon "workfare" proposal, under the guidance of a secretary of labor and a juggling of the word "suitable," will actually make it less compelling for a welfare recipient to take a job and more easy for him to take welfare than the current law provides—even though the current law has also failed to prevent the mushrooming of welfare rolls.

In short, President Nixon appears intent on fastening upon the nation and his party one of the costliest welfare programs ever devised. Thus, *Human Events* readers are advised to write their congressmen and tell them they are opposed to this "welfare reform" package. Do the Republicans, it should be asked, wish to be known as the "welfare" party, the party that added 15 million people to the relief rolls?

UNJUST, ARBITRARY, AND CAPRICIOUS COURT ORDERS

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I am handing in for enclosure in the RECORD a press account of the activities of the Federal Court and Federal marshals in Oklahoma City, Okla.:

OKLAHOMA CITY.—Ray York, 14, who wants to attend his neighborhood school instead of his assigned one, spent Monday in U.S. marshal's office instead of the classroom.

And the marshal's office has a court order to place York in custody every school day until he agrees to attend Harding Junior High.

Ray York was taken into custody by U.S. Deputy Marshal Richard F. Moerck when he arrived at Taft Junior High School, his neighborhood school.

A court order—effective Monday—prohibits Ray from attending Taft and orders him to start attending Harding provided he wishes to remain in public schools. U.S. Dist. Court Judge Luther Bohanon issued the order last week, saying Ray's attendance at Taft was disrupting efforts to integrate Oklahoma City schools.

The confrontation Monday took place before about 25 supporters and newsmen in 9-degree weather and was without incident.

CROWD SHOUTS

"Son, you'll have to go with me," Moerck told Ray as the youngster and his mother, Mrs. Raymond York, approached the school. The crowd began to shout, "What's he charged with? What's the boy charged with?" as the marshal and the boy walked away.

Ray was taken to the marshal's office, where he spent the day reading magazines and drinking hot chocolate. Bohanon had ordered the youth held until the end of the school day each day he shows up at Taft. He was to be released to his parents' custody at the close of each school day.

"They'd just better bring him back the way they took him," Mrs. York said after her son was taken into custody. "I don't like the way he was pulled from me. I had wanted a last word with him and they just pulled him on away."

The marshal's office said Ray had not been arrested, that he was merely taken into custody. Asked the difference, a spokesman said: "Technically, there isn't any."

Mrs. York said she asked the marshal if he was arresting her and "he said no, he was not arresting me but he was going to take my child.

He volunteered to let me go baby sit but little do any of you realize, I have two other children I have to take care of and I am fighting for them and for the rest of the children in Oklahoma City.

Mr. Speaker, unjust arbitrary, and capricious court orders are not new and novel to those of us who live in the South. We are particularly able to sympathize with the situation confronting young Ray York and his parents. The courts are no longer governed by facts, logic, reason, and law. Justice once came from the "mind" and the "heart." We have suspected for quite some time that the "mind" was gone and we know now it appears the "heart" has left as well.

EL SALVADOR-HONDURAS CONFLICT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I have previously introduced into the RECORD reports of the tragic results of the July fighting between Honduras and El Salvador. I include at the end of these remarks a news story appearing today in the Wall Street Journal. The article relates more sad consequences of that conflict:

CENTRAL AMERICAN ROADBLOCK—HONDURAS-EL SALVADOR TENSION CONTINUES TO HOLD UP ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE AREA

(By Norman Pearlstine)

SAN SALVADOR, EL SALVADOR.—Six months after a cease-fire halted the brief but torrid war between Honduras and El Salvador, hatreds fanned by the hostilities still continue to block economic progress within Central America.

"We don't sell Salvadoran products. To do so would be traitorous," proclaims a sign in a shop window in Tegucigalpa, the Honduran capital. Indeed, the Honduran government has barred all trade with El Salvador. Honduras refused to even take the field for a baseball game with its former war foe.

Far more damaging economically, however, Honduras has closed its 65-mile stretch of the Pan American Highway to all traffic to and from El Salvador. This has effectively crippled Salvadoran land commerce with Nicaragua and Costa Rica, its two major trading partners to the south.

The result is economic deterioration in both El Salvador and Honduras. And it has meant markedly slower growth for the Central American Common Market, to which both countries belong, along with Guatemala, Nicaragua and Costa Rica.

"The Central American Common Market is far from dead," observes Richard J. Abernethy, an official at First National City Bank's branch here. "But this," he says, "will be a rough year for it."

CONTINUED EFFORTS

Common Market leaders still are pushing efforts to resolve the conflict. Foreign ministers of the five member countries, including the two belligerents, agreed recently to

arrange direct talks between El Salvador and Honduras. They agreed, also, to a massive reorganization of the trade group's basic operating plan. The meeting, says Alberto Fuentes Mohr, Guatemala's foreign minister, was "proof of the Common Market's resiliency and gives hope for continued economic development throughout the area."

To end the conflict, however, the negotiators will have to resolve differences that have been smoldering for years. Honduras and El Salvador can't agree on their common border, and some Hondurans protest that El Salvador is trying to establish an economic suzerainty over their land. Hondurans, furthermore, have become increasingly bitter about the 300,000 or so Salvadorans who have fled the tight labor conditions in their home country to seek new opportunities in far-larger but less-developed Honduras.

It was a three-match World Soccer Cup competition, however, that sparked the tinder box into an open war. When Honduras won the first contest in its own field on June 8, rioting erupted in the streets of Tegucigalpa. And the violence flared anew the following week in San Salvador when El Salvador won the second game on its home field. (El Salvador won the third game in neutral Mexico).

Each country accused the other of brutality. The charge led to border clashes, then air raids and, ultimately, a Salvadoran invasion of Honduras on July 14. The assault continued for five days before both sides—their war materiel largely depleted—agreed to a cease-fire arranged by the Organization of American States.

The cease-fire, however, did little to ease the economic impact of the war, either on the hostile countries, or on their trade with other members of the Common Market.

"Our sales dropped 30% in the months directly following the fighting," complains Carlos Weissenberg, general administrator of a Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. subsidiary in Guatemala, to the north of the belligerents. In Nicaragua, to the south, Peter Sengelmann, sales manager of Cia Automotriz & Equipos Industriales Nicaragua, an auto distributor and equipment maker, says, "We lost an \$800,000 paper-bag contract in El Salvador because we couldn't get goods across Honduras."

Within Honduras, U.S. businessmen talk darkly of closing their subsidiaries rather than contend with the Honduran restrictions on trade.

In El Salvador, the more economically advanced of the two countries though only one-fifth as big as Honduras, the war's cost is running especially high.

An \$8 million oil refinery, knocked out of operation by Honduran bombers during the war, managed to restore only 50% of its operations by last December. And the unit, 65%-owned by Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) and 35%-owned by the Royal Dutch-Shell Group, doesn't expect to return to full production until May.

HIGHWAY BLOCKADE

Those Salvadoran plants that emerged unscathed from the fighting have had to contend with the blockade of the Pan American Highway where it snakes through Honduras. El Salvador since September has turned to air freight and ocean barges to get some of the traffic through, but analysts estimate the trade flow still creeps at less than half its prewar pace.

"It is crucial for us that the highway be reopened soon," declares Carlos Jimenez, general manager of Ideal Standard of Central America, an American Standard Inc. subsidiary that exports air conditioners to Nicaragua. The company, he says, has been forced to lay off 30% of its workers, and still its inventory is twice the level of a year ago, because it can't move its products out.

Roberto Freund, president of Sherwin-Williams of Central America S.A., a Sherwin-Williams Co. licensee, protests that the company is losing a substantial part of its business because of the closing of the Pan American Highway. "Half of our products were exported to the rest of Central America before the war," he says. "Honduras was 20% of our market and we lost all that. And we are having tremendous problems servicing Nicaragua and Costa Rica."

"Without the highway," asserts Mr. Abernethy of First National City Bank, "Salvadoran trade can't be normalized."

Neither can it be normalized without free access to Honduras. Roberto Salazar, a Salvadoran builder who used to buy lumber from Honduras, says his wood costs have skyrocketed 50% because he has been forced to seek wood elsewhere. Other Salvadorans bemoan that Honduras has frozen some \$40 million of accounts receivables that are due to them.

SALVADORAN REFUGEES

Returning refugees complicate El Salvador's economic recovery, aggravating an already-serious unemployment problem. As many as 70,000 Salvadorans have returned home from Honduras where they had gone, some of them decades ago, in search of land and better work opportunities.

To many Hondurans, the Salvadorans were unwelcome intruders. Many aggressively won jobs that might have gone to local workers. Many squatted on government land.

Last year, in a move that undoubtedly fired up emotions in the soccer riots, the Honduran government started clearing some of the Salvadorans from the public lands. And that was only the beginning of what, since the war, has intensified into unrelenting pressure on Salvadorans to leave Honduran soil. Honduran labor unions have forced companies to fire all Salvadoran workers and hire Hondurans instead. Salvadoran shops have been boycotted. A rooming house in Tegucigalpa posts a sign advising prospective tenants, "No dogs, cats or Salvadorans" allowed.

Some of the returning refugees have been able to find work harvesting coffee, El Salvador's principal export product. But that work ends in March, and then those workers, too, will be forced onto El Salvador's already-swollen jobless rolls.

Understandably, refugee bitterness runs high against both Honduras and El Salvador.

Consider Louis Godinez, a 46-year-old Salvadoran who had lived in Honduras for 14 years, married a Honduran woman and raised seven children there. He had been earning \$7 a day in Honduras working for a U.S.-owned lumber company until a Honduran labor union forced him out of his job. Now, back in El Salvador with his family, he can manage to earn no more than \$1.80 a day by scurrying after odd jobs. "The Hondurans made it rough for us," he confides bitterly, "but life isn't any better here in El Salvador."

Ironically, El Salvador's assistance to its refugees is compounding the government's problems. To finance the refugee and other postwar programs, including military refurbishment, El Salvador has imposed a \$3.8 million emergency tax surcharge and has authorized two bond issues totaling \$12 million. As some business critics note, however, both measures take money from the private sector at a time when it also has pressing needs.

WHITHER THE TRADE BLOC

Officials within the five-nation Common Market do, nonetheless, see some good emerging from the turmoil. "The war has brought home to us in stark terms that the Common Market wasn't perfect," declares a Costa Rican with the trade group.

That's a far different assessment of the regional association than the one voiced when the trade bloc was founded in December 1960.

To supporters in the U.S. and elsewhere, the Common Market was the one best hope for economic progress in this poor and politically unstable region of 15 million persons. As envisioned by the planners, the Common Market would prod growth by eliminating tariffs on most goods traded between the member countries and imposing a high tariff wall against goods from the outside. In theory, such a tariff structure would prompt more outside companies to set up manufacturing facilities in one of the member countries to serve customers in all five.

Trade among the five members did, indeed, spiral under Common Market aegis. It jumped from \$327 million, or 7% of their total exports, in 1960 to \$259.2 million, or about 25% of exports, in 1968.

Emboldened by the success, the Common Market also set up regional institutions for finance, education, investment and research. Some leaders even talked glowingly of a return to a single political unit, or "patria grande," similar to the unified Central America that existed briefly before independence from Spain in 1821.

But the progress hasn't been shared by all. El Salvador and Guatemala, as the two most advanced countries, have attracted most of the new industry, and they have been posting huge trade surpluses with the other member lands.

THE HAVE-NOTS

Honduras and Nicaragua continue as have-nots, with new complaints. Government officials protest that the tariff-free entry of goods from other Common Market members is depriving them of sorely needed customs revenues. Business leaders gripe that the higher external tariffs are forcing them to shun quality goods made outside Central America for inferior merchandise made in El Salvador, Guatemala or Costa Rica.

"Honduras has feared domination by El Salvador for a long time," says one U.S. businessman in the Honduran capital of the tensions that led to the war. "The trade balance between the two countries added significantly to that fear," he explains.

Common Market officials hope that a major overhaul of the group's machinery will resolve the difficulties that culminated in the fighting. One possibility might be special incentives to spur development in Honduras and Nicaragua.

If an agreement can't be reached, however, "Honduras may decide to leave the Common Market," warns Roncoco Murillo, an official of the Honduran economics ministry.

That could signal the end of Central America's bold reach for success.

MR. NIXON'S CHALLENGE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President's state of the Union message was an impressive statement and, I believe, an objective report to the Nation.

The Chicago Sun-Times in its lead editorial of Friday, January 23, labeled the address as "President Nixon's Challenge" and in its editorial commentary carefully analyzed the President's theme. The editorial follows:

MR. NIXON'S CHALLENGE

President Nixon's first State of the Union address contained specific proposals. A \$10 billion program for cleaning up the nation's water was one. A plan for increased spending on law enforcement was another. He

touched on the urgent need for welfare reform and for a national growth policy.

Yet, beyond the obvious significance of specific subjects, the most impressive aspect of the address may well have been its tone. For it was a speech not unlike the counsel a father might give to a family facing familiar but nonetheless baffling and burdensome crises.

Mr. Nixon has a vision of America as it should be. He wants peace abroad and an end to crime at home. He wants a balanced budget and he wants a clean and tidy environment. He knows that this is also the sort of country other Americans overwhelmingly want. So on Thursday he asked these other Americans, as a father might ask his family, to join him in perfecting what is now an "unfinished land."

To get where Mr. Nixon would go, of course, will require more than a knapsack and willingness. It will require some governmental trail-blazing. This was apparent in Mr. Nixon's emphasis on the need for reform of governmental institutions.

This reference, obviously, allowed him to mildly scold Congress for sitting on administration legislative proposals. But Mr. Nixon's remarks were very much to the contemporary point when he said that "we must adopt reforms which will expand the range of opportunities for all Americans."

"We can fulfill the American dream only when each person has a fair chance to fulfill his own dreams," the President said. "This means equal voting rights, equal employment opportunity and new opportunity for expanded ownership. In order to be secure in their human rights, people need access to property rights."

Mr. Nixon underscored also the urgency of improving the quality of national life. In addition to the water cleanup measure, Mr. Nixon promised to set aside more parkland, and to clear away some of the spewings of the ubiquitous autos. On crime, he said that law enforcement "is one area where I have ordered an increase rather than a cut" in the budget.

Mr. Nixon, of course, can carry America nowhere without the cooperation of Congress. Certainly, in the fight against inflation and for a balanced budget, he will need the help of Congress. As he pointed out, there will be a vastly increasing Gross National Product for congressional log-rollers to play with. The GNP, in fact, will go up by \$500 billion in the next 10 years, the President said—an amount greater than the entire growth of economy from 1790 to 1950.

As for the abiding, nagging, overriding American issue, the war in Vietnam, the President cited progress toward peace. But most significantly, he asked for a relationship between the Congress and the executive that would bar partisanship where matters of peace and security are concerned.

All in all, the President gave a balanced address. He noted the problems, and asked Americans to join in attacking them—to help, as he said, to perfect the unfinished land. It is a sound challenge.

POLLUTION REDUCTION

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population of which I am chairman, is acutely aware of the need to obviate the insidious problem of environmental pollution. The task force's hearings have convinced me that this problem can be dealt with only through

CXVI—93—Part 1

the joint and cooperative efforts of both Government and the private sector. I, therefore, want to commend the latest combined effort of the Nixon administration and the major airline companies to abate air pollution.

On January 20, at a meeting called by the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, and the Transportation Department, officials of 31 airlines met with members of the Nixon administration. At this meeting, the carriers agreed that within 90 days they would begin installing 50 new air-pollution reducing devices a month on the widely used JT8D jet engines. This is the Pratt & Whitney engine used to power the Boeing 727's and 737's and the McDonnell Douglas DC-9's.

By the end of the year, the agreement calls for the installation of the pollution reducing devices at a rate of 200 per month. The Honorable Robert Finch, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Honorable John Volpe, Secretary of Department of Transportation, announced that the plan, which involves about 3,000 engines, would be substantially completed by late 1972. This is the same target date set by Secretary Finch at a Government-industry meeting last August 28. At that time, the airlines proposed the end of 1974 as their estimated date of completion. Not until yesterday's meeting was the earlier 1972 date agreed upon as a deadline for completion.

These JT8D engines account for about 70 percent of smoke pollution from jet airlines. The new pollution reducing devices, according to Mr. George Warde of American Airlines, will almost completely eliminate smoke pollution emanating from these engines. Mr. Warde also mentioned that so far his company had no plans to pass on the costs to passengers. This voluntary agreement is a propitious sign that not only the administration is actively moving ahead to ameliorate the pollution problem, but that airline companies are eager to accept their responsibility in the environmental spectrum.

I include the articles from the January 21 New York Times and Wall Street Journal which discuss this advance against air pollution to be printed in the RECORD.

THE AIRLINES ACCEPT POLLUTION DEADLINE (By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON.—The nation's major airlines agreed today to meet the three-year deadline proposed by the Nixon Administration for eliminating most of the smoke pollution from jet aircraft.

After a two-hour meeting with representatives of 31 carriers, it was announced by Robert H. Finch, Secretary of Transportation, that the carriers would begin within 90 days to install 50 new-design fuel burners a month on the Pratt & Whitney JT8D engines that power the Boeing 727's and 737's and the McDonnell Douglas DC-9's.

By the end of this year, the plan calls for installation of the new burners at the rate of 200 a month. The two Secretaries said that, "depending upon the availability of the devices," the program—involving about 3,000 engines on nearly 900 planes—would be "substantially completed by late 1972."

This was the target date proposed by Secretary Finch at a Government-industry meeting last Aug. 28. At that time the airlines, with the Air Transport Association as

their spokesman, proposed completing the installation by the end of 1974. Until today they had stuck by that counterproposal.

The two Secretaries emphasized that new jet engines in aircraft now under construction were designed to be "virtually smokeless."

The Pratt & Whitney engines of the short-haul aircraft account for about 70 per cent of smoke pollution from jet airliners.

There is little doubt that the needed new burners, or combustors, will be available for the installations, scheduled to take place when the engines are "down" for routine overhaul after an average 5,000 hours of flying time. Pratt & Whitney has been waiting for firm orders to step up the production of the new combustors, which has been running about 50 a month. By the end of this year, Secretaries Finch and Volpe said, production will reach 200 a month.

CAUSE OF SMOKE

The smoke trailing from the jet engines is caused by incomplete burning of fuel in the present combustors. The new combustors, according to George Warde, American Airlines' senior vice president for operations, have undergone 100,000 hours of test time and almost completely eliminate smoke plumes.

Mr. Warde put the total cost of the new burners at \$13-million to \$15-million. This has been the estimate used by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Earlier the Air Transport Association had put the cost at \$30-million.

Mr. Warde said that he could not say whether the costs would "show up in the ticket fares," but that so far his company had no plans to pass on the costs to passengers. "We feel we must be good neighbors," he said.

The Air Transport Association and John H. Shaffer, head of the Federal Aviation Administration, have emphasized that only 1 per cent of the nation's air pollution is caused by jet aircraft.

However, officials in H.E.W.'s National Air Pollution Control Administration and Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, have countered that the jet plane pollution considerably exceeds 1 per cent in areas near big airports.

SENATOR CITED NEW YORK

Senator Muskie said last Dec. 10, when he introduced a bill to give the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare the authority to set emission standards for aircraft, that in New York "planes dump one and one-half tons of pollutions per day"; that Los Angeles "gets almost one ton per day"; and that Washington gets 1,200 pounds. Nationally, he said 78 million pounds a year are emitted from jet engines.

The voluntary agreement represents a victory for Secretary Finch, who is responsible for air pollution controls and who has been holding firm for the 1972 target. Last December Mr. Volpe and Mr. Shaffer announced that the Federal Aviation Administration would soon issue regulations for jet aircraft emissions. The airlines favored action by the F.A.A. in the hope that its regulations would give them more time.

At that time Mr. Shaffer said that jet aircraft pollution "is one environmental problem that's not as bad as it is obvious" and that "jet exhausts are almost entirely non-toxic."

The industry acceptance of the H.E.W. deadline was attributed by officials here to three things: mounting public pressure for action on pollution; the threat of Federal legislation setting standards and penalties for violation, and, perhaps most important, two suits filed under recent laws passed by the Illinois and New Jersey legislatures.

The airlines, officials said, are worried lest other states enact similar legislation.

Last July Illinois passed a law providing a \$5,000 fine for a company whose planes violate smoke pollution standards, and a \$200 fine for each landing by a plane emitting smoke. New Jersey's earlier law provides a \$2,000 fine a day for each plane violating its regulations.

New Jersey last August filed suit against seven airlines using Newark Airport. Since then, two other lines have been combined in the suit. In November, Illinois filed suit against 23 carriers.

Attorney General William J. Scott of Illinois and Deputy Attorney General Theodore A. Schwartz of New Jersey were present at today's meeting.

At a news conference later, both said they thought the December, 1972, deadline was realistic and would be acceptable to their states.

At the same time, they said their states would not withdraw their suits because they would like to have the date nailed down by court order and not simply left to a voluntary agreement with the Federal Government.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 21, 1970]

ADMINISTRATION PERSUADES AIRLINES TO SPEED INSTALLATION OF AIR POLLUTION-REDUCING GEAR

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon Administration arm-twisted the nation's airlines into undertaking a speeded-up program to reduce air pollution produced by jet aircraft.

At a meeting yesterday called by the Health, Education and Welfare Department and the Transportation Department, officials of 31 carriers agreed to begin within 90 days installation of air-pollution reducing devices on the widely used JT8D jet engines and complete most of the job by late 1972.

The airlines earlier had volunteered to finish the task by late 1974, but Administration officials made it clear that unless the companies acted with greater speed they would face the prospect of legislation to force them to complete the modifications more quickly.

The engine is made by United Aircraft Corp.'s Pratt & Whitney division and is used to power Boeing Co.'s 727 and 737 jet aircraft and McDonnell Douglas Corp.'s DC9.

"We are pleased at this step in the public interest that is being taken by the airlines," said HEW Secretary Finch and Transportation Secretary Volpe in a joint statement. "We are moving ahead to improve the quality of the environment, and this is an important task towards cleaner air."

The antipollution step involves installing a new combustor, the chamber in which fuel is ignited, in about 3,000 JT8D engines in use on short-term and medium-haul aircraft. The installation will be made as the engines undergo an overhaul after an average 5,000 flying hours each. The airlines said this schedule will permit them to "substantially" complete the job in late 1972.

HEW officials said they believe that 80% to 90% of the engines would be equipped with the new combustors by then and that all engines would be converted by mid-1973. The department said the limiting factor is the rate at which Pratt & Whitney can produce the new combustors. The company promises to turn them out at a pace of 50 a month starting in February, and to increase the rate to 200 a month in less than a year.

Government officials said that if this timetable can be met by industry, there won't be any need for legislation empowering HEW to set restrictive standards for jet-produced pollution. Democrats on Capitol Hill are pushing such proposals, however, and may continue with their campaign despite the industry's concessions to HEW.

An Air Transport Association official said the agreement announced yesterday "doesn't differ greatly" from the timetable indicated by the airlines in the recent letter from the

association to the Federal Aviation Administration. The letter gave late 1974 as the earliest possible date for all carriers to complete the job. The spokesman said that plan recognized that the bulk of the airlines would finish installing the new equipment by the end of 1972, but some didn't want to be committed to doing the job until sometime in 1973.

"Substantially all" the lines could complete the work by the end of 1972, if no serious problems occur, he said, but there's no assurance that difficulties wouldn't crop up.

An airline-industry source concedes, however, that there's "a little bit of crash program" involved in the agreement. The leeway for resolving snags has been removed under Government pressure, he says, and while many lines will finish the job by the end of 1972, he wouldn't want to promise that the task would be "substantially" finished by then, because of possible problems.

Government air-pollution experts estimate that the JT8D engine accounts for an estimated 70% of jet-engine pollution. Although the total of all jet pollution amounts only to 1% of the nation's air pollution, HEW experts say the problem is extremely severe in and around jet airports.

Government and industry sources put the cost of modifying the engines in the range of \$13 million to \$15 million.

THE COMMUTER RAIL CRISIS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the shocking and dangerous deterioration of service and safety on the Penn-Central's commuter lines in the New York area has long been a matter of grave concern to me. Until very recently neither Penn-Central's management nor the New York State government has seen fit to assure commuter services that would be up to modern standards and expectations. This has engendered feelings of frustration and desperation among commuters and public officials alike, but the outlook for positive action is still cloudy at best.

An editorial in the White Plains Reporter Dispatch of January 17, 1970, indicates the depth of feeling of this issue and because the New York situation has implications of a nationwide character, I present the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

FRUSTRATION OVER THE RAILS

The apparent deterioration of passenger service on the Penn Central commuter lines in the county has residents who depend on that service worried, angry, bitter and frustrated, to judge by their many complaints and anxious but accurate detailing of their woes.

What is indicative of the problem, more than anything else, is the number of commuters who have stoically borne with occasional inconveniences over the years and who now have, as we hear many times over, "had it." When the citizen who has always understood the burdens of running a railroad and the factors beyond its control—when this citizen finally feels the border has been passed beyond acceptance of and rebellion against his fate, the time has come for all of us to do a little worrying ourselves.

For Westchester and rail transportation grew up together and if the railroads come

close to hopeless inefficiency and intolerable inconvenience, the county must suffer, too.

Our commuters are relatively well-to-do people. They are mobile. They can conceivably move from Westchester in droves, back to New York City or even to Long Island—where the charge (at least) has been that the state is giving favorite treatment to the Long Island Rail Road. Or they can continue to switch to automotive transportation, which will put an increasing burden on our highways and aggravate the parking problem at home.

Or the flight of business from New York City can accelerate. If this business goes elsewhere it can take its executives with it, away from Westchester. If it tries to move to Westchester and is willing to pay high prices for land and building here it could well set off a speculative rush and an explosive urbanization here that could spoil our best laid plans for orderly planning and growth.

A third possible effect of continued deterioration of the Penn Central could be an overall adverse effect on values of land of the suburban type. Assuming New York City remains a hub of commerce, families coming to the New York area from elsewhere in the nation may shun Westchester, despite its many other advantages, because of the bad reputation of its mass transit.

These dismal predictions may never come about, but they are being talked about and they should not be dismissed out of hand. Neither should we, or our legislators, be lulled by the probable infusing of new leadership and money to be provided by and through the Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

The old story that it is the squeaky wheel that gets the grease may be a cynical way of approaching the problem, but some Westchester legislators have at least gotten the message or reached their own parallel conclusion. The other day they raised the specter among their Republican colleagues in Albany that they might withhold their votes from a GOP-sponsored congressional reapportionment plan if the county's transportation problems are not given prompt and constructive attention.

They are well-advised to do so, as are all of our disgruntled commuters well-advised to keep up their bombardment of their own Albany representatives. Regardless of what may come at some future time in transportation aid for the county, every day that passes with the miserable commutation conditions we are forced to endure means that much less of a good place Westchester becomes to live in, and that much more disillusionment among the citizens of our community who are the life-blood of our good living.

THE SCHOOL CRISIS—NATION-WIDE THREAT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the destruction of public education in the South has been all but completed, and the same result is but a short time away in virtually all of the heavily populated areas of the country.

The forced integration of schoolchildren is totally illegal. It is manifestly undemocratic. It has proven conclusively that it harms the children of both races. It creates situations which make education impossible.

The people know this—the people of both races. And they are insisting on

their right to freedom of choice—the people of both races.

If parents, children, educators, and responsible local citizens—of both races—all oppose forced mixing of the children, then it is fair to wonder just who it is that wants this done? And why?

When the American people arrive at the answers to these questions, they will solve their school problems directly and emphatically. And make no mistake—they will deal appropriately with those who have, for their own purposes, destroyed public education and endangered the Nation's children.

I include news clippings indicative of the disorders, crime, vandalism, and other unrest within the destroyed schools, together with letters to newspaper editors in my remarks:

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, Jan. 20, 1970]

EXTORTION LAID TO PUPILS HERE

Two Dunbar South seventh grade students have been charged on juvenile citations with extorting money from other students. Charged are Elaine E. Kent, 12, of Harlem Lake and Leroy Thompson, 13, of 2743 Lafayette Street.

Both were released to the custody of their parents.

Sheriff's Capt. Al Senfleber said the girl is accused of trying to extort money from another girl by threatening her and the boy is accused of threatening a boy to obtain money.

Senfleber said the extortion seems to have been done on an individual basis and not as part of an organized plan. "It's the type of thing where one bully sees another do it and tries the same thing. It's a nickel and dime operation—the top is a dollar or two," he said.

Investigator Frank Wanicka said "We have information about other cases, but in a lot of cases, the victims are too scared to make a complaint or testify," he said.

A total of nine eighth and ninth grade Negro students were arrested last week at Cypress Lake Junior High School on similar charges in what was described as a loose-organized ring which had been operating for several months.

Senfleber said the extortion was discovered during the investigation of a break-in at Dunbar South sometime over the weekend in which nothing was taken but rooms were ransacked and windows broken causing an estimated \$200 damage.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, Jan. 19, 1970]

DAMAGE IN MILLIONS—SCHOOLS HARD HIT BY VANDAL LOSSES

WASHINGTON.—Reacting to a wave of vandalism, burglaries and arson, many of the nation's public schools are becoming scholastic fortresses.

A national survey indicates that some of the largest school systems have turned to barbed wire, floodlights, police dogs, heavy iron grills, plastic windows, and an array of alarms and electronic surveillance systems to cut the cost of vandalism, now estimated in scores of millions of dollars each year.

The survey, conducted last year by the Baltimore public school system and released by a U.S. Senate juvenile delinquency subcommittee, said the 36 school system answering a questionnaire reported a \$6.5 million vandalism and arson loss in the 1967-68 school year.

"The Baltimore study reads like something out of a World War II movie," a Senate aide said. "It is one of the firmest indications we have had that the problems of school vandalism and violence are getting out of hand."

Orlando F. Furno, an assistant Baltimore

school superintendent and head of his system's research and development office, said he believes the vandalism study, which is now being updated with statistics and new prevention techniques from the 1968-69 school year, is one of the few ever attempted in the United States.

Recommending that state school departments begin collecting such data, Furno said Baltimore undertook the survey to give its schools the benefit of the experience other school systems have had with combating vandalism.

"There's no panacea. I can tell you that," Furno said in an interview. "The problem is simply too widespread and too complex."

The survey reports that in the 1967-68 school year alone, New York City schools suffered 243,652 broken windows with a replacement cost of \$1.21 million.

In the same period that city reported 2,757 school larcenies which cost it \$1,219,912. There were 196 school fires blamed on arson which did \$278,585 in damage.

Los Angeles reported 5,183 incidents which cost it \$940,124; Baltimore reported 747 incidents of vandalism costing \$716,602; Milwaukee 11,060 incidents costing \$406,699; Washington, D.C., 43,728 incidents costing \$410,463 and Newark, N.J., 27,457 reports of vandalism at a cost of \$346,391.

Most of the schools responding to the Baltimore questionnaire placed emphasis on school-community relations programs designed to ease misunderstanding and local tensions and, hopefully, cut the vandalism rate.

But most of the school systems also said they have taken concrete steps as well.

Furno said some schools report they have installed closed circuit television systems to scan approaches to schools and certain inside areas. He said also some schools are experimenting with the use of police dogs inside the schools after closing time.

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 27, 1970]

POLICE PATROL ANNAPOLIS HIGH AFTER ATTACKS

(By William Taaffe)

ANNAPOLIS.—Two uniformed policemen patrolled the halls of Annapolis High School yesterday after reports that "outsiders" have intimidated teachers and students there in recent weeks.

Anne Arundel Schools Supt. Edward Anderson said the policemen would remain indefinitely, paid for extra duty by the school board. "I'm not going to let the school be overrun by outsiders, period," he declared.

School Principal Albert W. Fowble said he requested the police about two weeks ago after one teacher and a number of children were struck by outsiders.

An increasing number of non-students, some in their 20s, have harassed teachers and students lately, Anderson said, with some arrested for disorderly conduct.

For months, two policemen in civilian clothes have patrolled the school's grounds and parking lot, where nonstudents were "coming in with their cars, drinking—this type of thing," he said.

Anderson was sharply criticized yesterday by an NAACP official, Walter Blasingame, for the timing of the deployment. About 200 Negro students walked out of a class meeting Friday, demanding black studies.

Blasingame, chairman of an NAACP state education task force, was quoted as saying police were sent "to intimidate black students into submitting to a school system that is not sensitive to their needs, wishes or opinions."

However, he withdrew his remarks after conferring with Anderson, saying he was unaware Fowble had asked for police two weeks ago.

Annapolis High has about 1,800 students, Anderson said, about 20 to 25 percent of whom are Negro.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, Jan. 21, 1970]

SERIES OF FIGHTS—RACIAL RIOTS CLOSE LONG ISLAND SCHOOL

BELLPORT, N.Y.—A black student calls the town racist; a white girl says, "The blacks are trying to take over." Neither is going to class this week because racial tensions have closed the high school and disrupted life in this Long Island community.

Tensions came to a head last Thursday over a memorial program for Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and erupted Friday morning in a series of fights between black and white students. Administrators ordered the school closed.

Since then the school's 72 teachers have announced seven demands they say must be met before they return; white students have posted three demands, and a public meeting on the situation was interrupted by a brief scuffle.

In response the school board has named a new acting principal, begun an administrative shakeup, ordered split sessions and called for "emergency measures" to deal with "those who disrupt the educational process."

No date has been set for the reopening. Meanwhile the question remains: What has caused the tensions that have crippled the 1,100-student school?

Board President Charles Gould said he feels "there is a small group of disruptive students who wish to see the school closed. I feel they play on the prejudices of conflicts of the others to inflame whatever hostility exists."

Gould said he first thought it was a communications problem, but "after four months of unrewarding attempts to establish a dialogue, I think everybody is now talking too much and not thinking enough."

Michael Friedman, director of the Bellport-Neighborhood Opportunity Center, believes the underlying causes are attitudes in the adult community and "lack of communication" on the student level.

"The blacks think the whites are getting everything, the whites think the blacks are," he said. "No one's really getting anything from anybody."

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, Jan. 14, 1970]

TELEGRAMS RAP SCHOOL MIXING

JACKSONVILLE.—Hundreds of telegrams protesting an anticipated Supreme Court order directing immediate desegregation of public schools in five Southern states were sent from Florida Sunday.

Mainly they were addressed to members of Florida's congressional delegation, but some also went to the court and to the White House, Western Union spokesmen said.

In Jacksonville more than 1,000 telegrams had been processed for customers saying they were upset by the desegregation movement. Offices in Tallahassee and Orlando handled similar telegrams.

The Supreme Court Monday is expected to order immediate desegregation in districts serving 300,000 white and black children in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana and Mississippi.

Some public schools in Florida were expected to be among those involved.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, Jan. 15, 1970]

SHOOT TRAITORS

EDITOR, NEWS-PRESS:

It now is a known fact that the Communist party through the Black Panthers, hippies, SDG are here to overthrow this country. These groups are hired, encouraged by the Communist party to get a revolution here in U.S.

The Black Panthers or Apes are daily trying to kill and ambush any officer who tries to stop them. In Chicago the police killed

a couple of them and now they are trying to convict the police who killed them. My blood run cold when I read about these law officers going to trial for doing their job. They should all get medals. These dirty traitors and slackers use the war in Vietnam and also equal rights as an excuse for their riots, robbery and murder.

Director of the FBI after a careful investigation stated that we were in trouble within our country and if it does not stop we are bound to face serious trouble. Ever since Chief Justice Warren handed down decision after decision in favor of the Communists in 1954 the trouble is worse year after year. There are one man who rules Cuba, a handful of men rule 600 million people in China, another handful of men rule 200 million people in Russia and nine old Washington men rule 200 million people in U.S.

They control us the same as they do in all the Communist countries. These old codgers gave orders for and are responsible for deserters, slackers, cowards, traitors, rioters, robbers, war dodgers, deserters and killers to run loose in U.S. while our boys are being killed in Vietnam.

Now this church organization wants to send money to Canada and Sweden to bring these traitors, deserters and cowards home. They should all be shot, like they did in the Revolution War, Civil War and W.W. I.

GEORGE C. ANDERSON.

NORTH FORT MYERS.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press,
Jan. 20, 1970]

ANSWER NO

EDITOR, NEWS-PRESS:

On Jan. 13 I read in the News-Press an article about the Supreme Court trying to decide whether or not to allow Communist agents to practice law or take public office. Is there any doubt in anyone's mind as to a question like this?

I, as a man of 15 years service with the United States Army, dedicated to the freedom of this country, say no. There is little doubt in my mind, or in the minds of thousands of others like me, who through patriotism or dedication, my answer is no. These people have no place in public office, or practicing law in our United States, to where they can influence others.

There are those who have given their lives for our cause and now the Supreme Court wants to say is in effect that it was all for nothing. That 70,000 young men died for nothing, fighting to keep our country free from communism.

Are we, the people, going to let this thing happen? The answer is yours.

GEORGE A. OSTRANDER.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press,
Jan. 18, 1970]

WRITE CONGRESSMAN

EDITOR, NEWS-PRESS:

The editorial about the Supreme Court and the Congress was encouraging. We need more of them; stronger ones.

We can be thankful there is still left enough freedom of speech to allow an opinion against the Supreme Court; and editorials reminding us that the power in this nation resides with the people if they will only use it.

If each voter who complaints would write one letter each, just one letter each week, to his congressman and one of his two senators, we could get our country back from the liberals, the Communists and the Mafia. We could get the U.S. out of the U.N. and the U.N. out of the U.S. We could get the school problems back into the hands of the states, where the Constitution placed them. We could get the power to coin and regulate money back into the hands of Congress; out of the hands of the private bankers who own

the Federal Reserve System and its phony money.

For example: one of my recent letters, a very short one to Congressman Ford of Michigan, resulted in a serious and considered reply from Congressman Ford, who is working on a program to rid us of Supreme Court Justice Douglas. The letter contained this paragraph: "Now that a decision has been made on Judge Haynsworth, our investigation of Justice Douglas will be continued. New information which appears to be significant has come to our attention."

Let's all write, right now. Anybody 14 years old and who has a pencil can do it.

JAMES O. EVANS SR.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press,
Jan. 14, 1970]

RESTORE RIGHTS

EDITOR, NEWS-PRESS:

States' rights must be returned to the state by the federal government who are penalize we taxpayers in the matter of segregation of our schools and under the ruling that we can not receive federal aid for our schools unless we do completely integrate and yet the federal aid to our school system by the federal government is our very own money and not that of the federal government which we pay through federal income taxes.

That civil rights have been declared unconstitutional even in the first Civil Rights Act of 1866 and also down through the year, that civil rights must be earned by these seeking civil rights as we do by all immigrants who seek entrance into this nation.

That this is the one freedom we fought for down through the years and unless we fight for that freedom, we shall soon be a victim of the federal government, that no government, no president of these United States, no public official has the right to tell us where we shall send our children to school or to bus them from one geographical location to another to balance interracial balance.

That even the President so stated in his application for election and after election that this would not be perpetrated against a free people, that our wishes will be so recognized for under the Civil Rights Act, while not intentional, it has placed the minority ruling the majority and the stupid part is that it was for more votes, whereas with over 43,000 registered voters in our county alone less than 6 per cent represent the minority or only 2,800 registers and even less voted and we want voters who know what they are voting for and why and it takes intelligence to vote and it must be for the majority and not the politicians who have placed us in this position.

H. KENNETH SHUTTS.

[From the Miami Herald, Jan. 19, 1970]

BASIC RIGHTS FOR LIBERALS ONLY?

I wonder if liberal-thinking people really believe in what they preach. They always refer to the Bill of Rights, the Constitution or the Civil Rights Act to justify their position on, for example, Allen Ginsberg's rights to use four-letter words in a public place or Rap Brown's right to speak of overthrowing the government, or some protesters' right to burn the American flag or Judge Atkins' ruling on Dade's school integration, while in the next breath they knock a parents' right to decide the education his child will receive or Spiro Agnew's right to speak about slanting of the news.

They speak with sarcasm when someone talks about love of God, flag or country. It seems the Constitution can be held up to support their liberal point of view, but don't let someone who disagrees with them try holding up the same document. This is the way the SDS works on college campuses. In

the name of the "right to protest" they deny others their right to an education.

I can imagine the howling if the federal government came to the news media and said "since radio and TV use the air ways, which are controlled by the government, and since the newspapers are transported between the states, they come under our control, so now say you will print and say thus and so."

To cite an example closer to home, Dade's teachers, and in the near future, students, will be transferred around the county strictly on the basis of color. A black teacher will be moved because he is black. A white teacher will be moved because he is white.

If this is not a classic case of racial discrimination, I don't know what is.

I don't see our more liberal newspaper writers, such as Larry King, protesting. I don't see Tobias Simon or the ACLU jumping into action to challenge this overt act of discrimination. Where are the Fulbrights, Kennedys' McGovern and McCarthys? I don't see the New Party of Florida protesting in the streets.

I suspect the answer goes something like this: "In order to accomplish what we call integration, we will have to practice some discrimination, but in this case the ends justify the means."

If we are to have one set of laws for all people and all situations, as the liberals so often say, then let's start practicing what we claim to believe.

JAMES A. BURNS.

WHAT HAPPENED TO DEMOCRACY?

Fifty years ago, people were begging to come to America, the land of freedom and democracy. What happened to this free country? What happened to this democracy?

Is it a democracy when the government tells you that your child must be bused to a school five miles away, when your neighborhood school is just around the corner?

One of the main reasons we chose our home was because it was close to school. Since we have eight children this was very important. Now the government is saying my children might have to go to a school in a neighborhood where even the police are hesitant to enter.

MRS. A. CAPRIO.

PEMBROKE PINES.

MR. NIXON RAISES SIGHTS

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of Saturday, January 24, 1970, for the perusal of the Members of this body. It is my feeling that it deserves your attention. The editorial follows:

MR. NIXON RAISES SIGHTS

President Nixon's State of the Union message has been as uplifting to the hearts and aims of Americans as it was politically astute. For he has issued that call for rehabilitating the nation's physical environment which everyone wanted to hear and in which each citizen knows he has personal responsibility. And he has urged the harnessing of the United States' cast energies and abundance—a gross national product colossally increasing by \$50 billion in the next 10 years—to creating a richer and deeper life, a sounder reflection "of the goodness and grace of the American spirit."

The President is correct, surely, in seeing

inflation, crime and pollution as three central perils to the American dream as the nation approaches its 200th anniversary in 1976. And he is right in stressing the simple truism that national wealth will not bring national happiness—that there needs to be a moral and spiritual idealism, even the inspired outlook for service and wider horizons which will, for instance, bring to youth a sense of excitement and to all a feel of national destiny.

Foreign policy was left by the President largely to a later "State of the World" message. But the President won the applause of the assembled Congress by forecasting, once Vietnam is wound down, a decade of uninterrupted peace for this country, by stressing reduced foreign commitments, and by noting his efforts toward meaningful arms talks with the Soviets and new dialogue with China.

With so very much needing to be done to enhance the quality of life, President Nixon has singled out, as Republican priorities: total welfare reform, a "new federalism" which returns some responsibilities to the state, and an expanded range of opportunities for "all Americans" including equal voting rights, employment opportunities and ownership prospects.

Democrats will accuse the President of stealing their policies. His program has a very wide reach and, as he frankly remarked, this is an election year. The Democrats have developed antipollution measures and have aimed to tackle hunger and poverty. The President's contentions is that he has submitted two score bills dealing with welfare, crime and other major issues—on which the Democrat-controlled Congress has yet to act decisively.

Realistically, the biggest menace to ordered American progress is inflation. President Nixon sees the chief cause as government overspending—\$57 billion more outgo than income since 1960. This lays the ground for the argument that a Congress which ups health and education expenditures well beyond the Nixon budget is still dabbling dangerously in inflation. The Democrats' reply no doubt would be that more economies could be found over at the Pentagon.

But there was a helpful, unifying thrust to Mr. Nixon's address, especially in its antipollution launch. His aim to return population and dynamism to rural communities is challenging.

Basically, the next decade, in the President's view, is a time to redirect energies, growth and attitudes into higher visions and more practical approaches. He now has set a hopeful course. And that is the first necessary step.

TRIBUTE TO OUR JAPANESE-AMERICAN CITIZENS

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on November 29 and 30, 1969, the State of Arkansas paid tribute to the gallantry of Japanese-American troops who served in both the European and Pacific areas in World War II. A flag raising ceremony was held at Rohwer, Ark., to mark the rededication of two cemetery monuments where the Rohwer War Relocation Camp once stood. More than 500 persons turned out for the dedication ceremony at this little community where 10,000 Japanese Americans were interned during World War II.

The monuments honor the men who came from behind the barbed wire to fight and die with the famed 442d Infantry Battalion in Italy and France and the aged Nisei who died and were buried on this lonely prairie during the dark days of the war.

Arkansas is the first State to officially honor Japanese Americans. I was gratified that one of my colleagues in the Congress, the Honorable BILL ALEXANDER, joined me in participating in this dedication ceremony in my congressional district.

Our State was especially pleased to honor the presence and contributions made during these ceremonies of Minister Bunroku Yoshino of the Japanese Embassy. The Honorable Mike Masaoka delivered two brilliant and heart-stirring messages during this 2-day event. Mr. Masaoka is president of the Japanese-American Citizens League.

I would, also, like to take this opportunity to pay special tribute to Green Thumb workers who were responsible for cleaning up the cemetery and carrying out a special beautification program at the site. Here is an instance of an important part of Arkansas' history that would have gone unhonored had it not been for Green Thumb. Indeed Arkansas should be proud of this organization. Under the able leadership of Mr. Lewis Johnson, Jr., it has executed many worthwhile projects in our State. This is certainly a government program where the taxpayers are getting a dollar's worth of return for every dollar invested, by encouraging productivity among our older citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point a feature story on the Rohwer Concentration Camp that appeared in the November 30, 1969, edition of the Pine Bluff Commercial and a news article on the dedication ceremonies featured in the December 12, 1969, edition of the Pacific Citizen, which is published weekly by the Japanese-American Citizens League in Los Angeles, Calif.:

"THEY PLAYED A LOT OF CHECKERS"—JAPANESE HAD GRIM EXISTENCE AT ROHWER
(By Kathy Gosnell)

("Rumors had been spread among the evacuees when we left California for Arkansas two years ago, which said: 'Down in Arkansas there are multitudes of mosquitos about the size of dragonfly which flies around the camp and get a pint of blood a bite; the giant river Mississippi will flood all over the camp and it will make houses afloat like boats down into a rough current.' Such rumors made all of us scared. But when we first saw Dr. Hunter in the center on the next day of our arrival October 2nd, 1942, all of these rumors flew away, because Dr. Hunter, our big brother and friend, was with us in the camp."—K. T. Khiraishi, Rohwer Relocation Center, 1944.)

ROHWER.—The town of Rohwer, 13 miles northeast of McGehee, listed a population of 86 in the last census. But it once had a population of 8,500.

The inhabitants were Issei, Japanese immigrants to the United States, and Nisei, their American-born children who were United States citizens.

And Caucasians to guard them—nearly 50 in all.

A medium-sized city of tarpaper surrounded by barbed wire and guard houses was located near here on some swampy land owned by the federal government in the

summer of 1942, under the direction of the War Relocation Authority.

(At 1 p.m. today, state officials, Nisei veterans and representatives of the Japanese Embassy will attend ceremonies to dedicate the cemetery at Rohwer.)

The inhabitants of the camp at Rohwer began to arrive in September, 1942.

They were escorted to the city, called Rohwer Relocation Center, by soldiers.

Most of them, according to a former center assistant project director, Dr. Joseph B. Hunter of Little Rock, came from the Los Angeles area and Stockton, California.

The Issei and Nisei faced all the usual problems involved in making a new collection of people function effectively as parts of a city, Hunter said.

As the assistant "in charge of the people," he said, he was most concerned with problems of city administration—government, sanitation system, medical facilities, schools and roads.

There were other problems, too, Hunter said.

The people had no money and it was almost impossible to earn any.

"We ran a 1,000-acre farm," Hunter said, "but we were not able to sell anything. That would compete with the regular markets." So they raised their own food.

The center administrators hired some inhabitants to staff the hospital and dental clinics set up in the camp. But the top salary they could pay was \$19 a month.

Others could be paid no more than \$8 a month, Hunter said.

The living quarters were, at best, grim.

"It was a regular Army camp," Hunter said. "There were regular barracks in sections. They had 250 in squares with a central laundry and washhouse and mess hall."

"We lived in one big room and then our daughter came and we got another one," Hunter said.

"Built-in beds were the only furniture," he added.

The first project of most families at the camp was making furniture from scrap lumber, Hunter said.

Hunter lived at the camp with his wife, Mary, his teen-age daughter, Betty, and, for a short while, his son, Robert. Robert was away most of the time attending Harvard University at Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The inhabitants kept busy, Hunter said, even though there was little for them to do.

"A lot of old men had their first vacation," Hunter said. "They played a lot of checkers."

The center quickly acquired the civic organizations of other cities—Boy Scouts, a church with Sunday School classes, a YWCA. A few differences persisted, though.

"They wouldn't let the women do Red Cross work, such as making bandages," Mrs. Hunter said.

"We had the best schools in the state," Hunter said. "All the teachers were federal civil service employees."

This meant they received top salaries, he said.

The superintendent of the school was Dr. John A. Trice, who later was superintendent of the Pine Bluff School District from 1957 until his death in 1967.

"There were a lot of marriages," Hunter reminisced. "There were so many young people and the boys were going off to war."

Nisei were first barred from service, but later were allowed to enlist and serve in Europe.

Many times, Hunter said, young women from the camp would travel to Camp Shelby, Mississippi, to attend the USO functions for Nisei soldiers. Some of the soldiers came from Rohwer and Jerome, he said.

These were members of the famed 442 Regiment, the "Go-For-Broke" unit composed entirely of Nisei, which won numerous honors for courage in the process of proving their loyalty to the United States.

A concrete monument, the replica of an

Army tank, stands in the cemetery at the center. It was erected in 1945, in memory of the 30 Rohwer soldiers of the regiment who died overseas.

Another concrete monument was also erected at the cemetery, in memory of the 24 center residents who died there.

These Japanese civilians also had difficulty proving their loyalty. They lived behind barbed wire, forbidden to make any contribution to the war effort.

At first, there was a lot of ill will in McGehee and other cities in Southeast Arkansas against the Issei and Nisei, Hunter said.

One Japanese was shot at while surveying part of the center property, he said. A camp guard was killed by a shot from a troop train passing on the railroad next to the camp. Apparently, Hunter said, some soldier thought he was firing at a Japanese.

Rumors of ill treatment reached Japan, Hunter said, and diplomatic officials asked the Spanish Consul at New Orleans to visit the Jerome and Rohwer camps to investigate.

Packages of tea were sent to the center residents from Japan.

Later, the people opened their homes to the Japanese, he said, as they got acquainted with them and as profits flowed from the center into their businesses.

Hunter, a Methodist missionary, came to work at the center at the request of a parishioner, E. B. Whittaker of Los Angeles.

He had just returned from six years in Japan, spent in Tokyo and Akita, in northern Japan.

Whittaker, who was director over both the centers at Rohwer and Jerome, hired Ray D. Johnston of Dyess to run the Rohwer camp.

Besides Hunter, there was an assistant director in charge of the farm, James F. Raines, and an assistant in charge of fiscal affairs, Francis Manghan, an employee of the Soil Conservation Service.

Hunter condemns the government action to evacuate all persons of Japanese ancestry from the West Coast.

"They had the evacuation because of pressure from businessmen taking advantage of the fear," Hunter said.

The business leaders used "propaganda" to whip up feeling against the Japanese in order to get rid of "competitors," he said.

The military decision to evacuate the Japanese and their American-born children was rather slow in coming.

Through December and January, the West Coast was described as calm, and few incidents occurred between the Japanese communities and the white residents.

However, the funds and credit of Japanese aliens were frozen by government order, and many families had to subsist on the cash in their pockets.

No disloyal act or espionage or sabotage was ever proven against the Japanese, despite widespread rumors, pronouncements from public officials and news accounts to the contrary.

However, the clamor from public officials and businessmen increased. The attorney general of California, Earl Warren, who later was Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, went on record urging the evacuation of all Japanese. Groups such as the Associated Farmers also issued statements requesting the evacuation.

Despite the reports from the FBI and the Justice Department, which found no evidence of treason among the Japanese, alien or citizen, Army officials in charge of West Coast security acceded to pressure and ordered the evacuation.

More than 100,000 people of Japanese ancestry were sent inland to live in 10 relocation centers. About 8,500 were sent to Jerome and a similar number were sent to Rohwer.

They remained until they could find jobs elsewhere, until those of college age could find a college that would take them, or until the camps were closed.

The Jerome center was abandoned in June, 1944, and Rohwer closed its doors in November, 1945.

ARKANSAS HONORS NISEI AT ROHWER

ROHWER, ARK.—The melancholy strains of "Taps", played by a high school bugler and echoed by a bandsmate, in the bottomlands of southeastern Arkansas at the site of the cemetery of the former War Relocation Authority camp at Rohwer, on Sunday afternoon, Nov. 30, climaxed two days of activities marking Japanese American Memorial Days.

The commemorative events began on Saturday noon, at a luncheon at the Marion Hotel in Little Rock, the capital of Arkansas, when Lt. Gov. Maurice Britt, who won the Congressional Medal of Honor while fighting alongside the 442d in Italy, read a proclamation setting forth Nov. 29 and 30 as Japanese American Memorial Days. He was acting on behalf of Governor Winthrop Rockefeller, who was unable to participate because of the death in California of his mother-in-law.

PROCLAMATION

The official proclamation noted: After the attack on Pearl Harbor on Dec. 7, 1941, two War Relocation Centers were established in Arkansas . . .

Many of these Japanese Americans demonstrated their loyalty to the American cause by volunteering to join the war effort as members of a special combat team . . .

This effort resulted in the death from combat of more than 40 men from the two Arkansas Relocation Centers, and . . .

These Japanese Americans confirmed the faith and trust placed in them with unparalleled records and gallantry in all branches of the military services and in all theaters of war (and called upon) each and every citizen (to) join with me (Gov. Rockefeller) in paying homage to these Americans who, under great duress, exhibited their patriotism not as a matter of race or ancestry, but as a matter of the mind and the heart.

Gov. Britt, who lost an arm in the action that earned him the nation's highest military award, presented a copy of the Proclamation to Mike Masaoka, Washington Representative of the Japanese American Citizens League.

Then, following a luncheon address by Minister Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Bunroku Yoshino of the Japanese Embassy in Washington, both the Japanese Government official and JACL Representative Masaoka were conferred certificates by Arkansas Secretary of State Kelly Bryant naming them as "Arkansas Travelers".

DUMAS BANQUET

Saturday evening, at the Pickens Country Club in Dumas, a small farming community 110 miles southeast of Little Rock about 20 miles from Rohwer, a commemorative banquet was held before a sell-out crowd of more than 250.

State Senator M. Gilbert and Mayor Billy Free were in charge of the banquet. Among the invited guests were Minister Yoshino, Governor Britt, Secretary of State Bryant, Attorney General Joseph Purcell, New Orleans Japanese Consul General Chikatoro Hashida, and a delegation from the Chicago Nisei American Legion Post No. 1183, led by Post Commander Tio Fujiwara. The others, all past post commanders, were Joe Sagami, Harry Yamamoto, Tak Hiral, Nick Nishibayashi, Kaz Hori, Carl Ogawa, Richard Hikawa, and Larry Oshima, the only one who volunteered from Rohwer itself.

Gov. Britt paid high tribute to the gallantry of the 442nd, noting that they were volunteers for combat duty and that they earned the respect of all other combat infantrymen in Italy and France.

He declared that in times like these, when so many are questioning whether they

should serve their country in the armed services, it might be well to remember that the Nisei of the 442nd had more to question about their country than most of today's youth, and yet they volunteered from American-style concentration camps to prove their faith in the ultimate justice and the opportunity of the American way.

Minister Yoshino recalled for the audience that a week before an historic event had taken place in Washington, when the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Japan agreed to the reversion of Okinawa. He noted that such a return of occupied territory by the victorious nation to the defeated country through peaceful negotiation was a rare occurrence and that it might well set a precedent for future international relations within the community of nations.

Yoshino declared that this agreement concerning Okinawa marked the end of World War II defeat insofar as the Japanese were concerned and signalled the beginning of a new Pacific age where there would be greater political, cultural, and trade cooperation between the two countries of this new Pacific era. He saw the commemorative services in Arkansas as an indication of the continuing good relations between the United States and Japan.

PRINCIPAL SPEAKER

JACL spokesman Masaoka was the principal speaker, recalling the days of hysteria and suspicion that followed the attack on Pearl Harbor and of the arbitrary evacuation orders and American-style concentration camps called relocation centers.

While conceding that they were quite different from the Nazi camps for the extermination of Jews, he argued that in a nation with America's tradition these WRA camps were even more intolerable and dangerous in terms of their implications.

At the same time, Masaoka declared that the wartime and postwar treatment of Japanese Americans demonstrated that, though democracy sometimes resulted in abuses and excesses, it also had within its system the capacity to right wrongs and correct abuses.

He also stressed that, while the Japanese American experience did not necessarily point the only way to the resolution of racial tensions, it might well suggest that reliance to legislatures and courts of law were not outmoded even today in the context of the problems of the discontented, the disadvantaged, and the questioners.

He closed by reading the Japanese American Creed, which he said helped sustain Japanese American leaders in the time of their greatest travail and inspired their postwar efforts to gain acceptance and equality of opportunity.

DESHA HIGH SCHOOL SERVICES

Following Sunday morning brunch at the Delta Country Club in McGehee, which is about ten miles from Rohwer, at which Masaoka was again called upon to speak, the special Japanese American Memorial Services were held at the Desha Central High School in Rohwer.

Among the honored guests were Gov. Britt, Secretary of State Bryant, Attorney General Purcell, Chief Justice of the Arkansas Supreme Court Carlton Harris, Speaker of the Arkansas House of Representatives Hays McCurken, local community officers, Chamber of Commerce officials from Dumas and McGehee, and American Legionnaires from nearby posts.

Lewis Johnson, Jr., state director of the Green Thumb program of the Farmers' Union, who was personally responsible for developing the two-day testimonial project to Japanese Americans, introduced Congressman David Pryor of the Fourth Congressional District, in which Rohwer is located, as the master of ceremonies for the memorial services.

Congressman Pryor noted the significance

of these special events, declaring that these Japanese Americans who volunteered to "fight and if necessary to die" to prove their loyalty to their country "marched for us" in helping to defend democracy in World War II.

He recalled that the number of volunteers from the Rohwer camp was among the highest of all the ten WRA centers and he explained the meaning of the 442nd's slogan "Go For Broke" in the context of what the Nisei volunteers were fighting for.

Pryor summarized the record of the 442nd in combat and stressed that all Americans today might well ponder the significance of what they had accomplished for their group under the most difficult and trying of circumstances.

Then, the Chicago Nisei American Legion Post color guard posted the Flag, and the Desha High School band played the National Anthem.

Sheriff Robert Moore, who was in charge of security at the Rohwer center, in a moving invocation said, "We pray for forgiveness for any wrongs we have done them," and Governor Britt called the wartime evacuation "a blot on the history of this country" and cited the rededication of the monuments at the Rohwer cemetery as an example of the new relationship not only between Japanese Americans and other Americans but also Japan and the United States.

CHICAGO COMMANDER

Commander Fujiwara of the Chicago Nisei Post, in an emotion-packed speech, recalled that in 1961 he and some of his fellow Legionnaires had driven down and participated in the dedication ceremonies. He remembered how a few of the local Legionnaires had discovered the weed-covered cemetery with its crumbling monuments and had cleaned and repaired the area. He also paid tribute to the Green Thumb organization that had beautified the plot and to the State of Arkansas for designating the region as an historical site. He said that these demonstrations of goodwill proved the friendship and humanity of the people of the Rohwer area and of the State of Arkansas.

Congressman Bill Alexander, representing the neighboring counties to the north, commented on the Evacuation experience as one that few Americans were familiar with, but one which all should know to appreciate what the Japanese Americans had to overcome in their own country. He declared that their story was one that would give renewed faith in America.

Minister Yoshino noted that only a quarter of a century ago Japan and the United States were mortal enemies, but now both were staunch allies joined in cooperative efforts of mutual benefits to both nations. He said that the Japanese could take pride in the fact that Japanese Americans proved to be such loyal Americans in World War II and that they contributed so much to the present high status of United States-Japan friendship.

He expressed the fervent hope that both countries would provide leadership for peace and prosperity in the Pacific, citing the Okinawa reversion agreement as another and latest example of how friendly nations could work together for the common good of both countries and for all mankind.

HODDING CARTER II

JACL Representative Masaoka began his main address by presenting Hodding Carter III of Greenville, Miss., who accepted on behalf of his father, the famous Pulitzer Prize winning journalist whose wartime editorials calling for fair play for Japanese Americans set the pace for subsequent editorials in the nation's press and who is currently in a New Orleans hospital, a bronze medallion commemorating the centennial

of Japanese immigration and Bill Hosokawa's book, "Nisei: The Quiet Americans".

He said that Hodding Carter II was typical of those few Americans who had the courage of their convictions and faith in American principles and were willing to speak out when it was not popular for fair play and justice for suspect Americans.

Masaoka added that he hoped Japanese Americans would vindicate that faith by now speaking out on behalf of fair play and justice for less fortunate Americans.

He spoke briefly of the Japanese Immigration Centennial, noting that what was inscribed on the monument at the Rohwer cemetery to those Issei who died while in camp was symbolic of the early Japanese immigrants.

"To him who sleeps eternally here. A descendant of glorious Yamato. Who came in his prime. With hopes and ambitions. Heroic to battle. The fortunes of life. Peace and bliss be yours. 1944."

Masaoka then paid tribute to the Nisei who volunteered in spite of their mistreatment, noting that as many served in the Pacific as served in Europe. He emphasized that he was proudest of the fact that many, if not most, of the combat decorations won by the Nisei GI, whether in Europe or in the Pacific, were for saving the lives of other men, and not for killing the enemy.

NISEI HEROISM

He retold the epic story of the rescue of the Lost Texas Battalion in the Vosges Mountains of northeastern France and matched that with the heroic sacrifice made by G-2 Sergeant Hachiya who was killed by American troops while trying to return to the landing forces on the island of Leyte in the Philippines.

He read the inscriptions on the cement monument to the Nisei war dead of the 442nd who volunteered from Rohwer, saying it expresses the hopes and aspirations of all Japanese Americans then. "In memory of our sons, who sacrificed their lives, in the service of their country. They fought for freedom. They died that the world might live in peace. October 20, 1945".

And by request, he re-read the Japanese American Creed.

Rev. J. B. Hunter, a former missionary in Japan and an assistant WRA director at Rohwer, gave the benediction, recalling the suffering and the sacrifices made by the Japanese American evacuees to prove what no American should have been required to prove—his loyalty to his country. He asked that there be no such repetition of that wartime treatment and called for vigilance to guard against a similar tragedy.

CEMETERY SERVICES

After the indoor services, the more than 500 Arkansans who attended, as well as some few Issei who had come down from southeastern Missouri to participate in tributes to their former friends and neighbors in the Rohwer camp, moved on by private cars and busses a mile to the cemetery site.

A dirt road led off the paved highway to a small lot, lined by trees and cleared of all weeds. There, within an enclosure bounded by a simple log fence, are the individual markers of more than 40 Rohwer residents who died while in the center. Each had a small wreath. In front of the small plot are two obelisk-like monuments, one topped by a star being in honor of the Nisei volunteer dead and the other topped by an American eagle in flight being in honor of the Issei dead.

Lewis Johnson, Jr., officiating, the simple but eloquent services were quickly concluded. First, as the Desha High School band played appropriate music, Governor Britt and Minister Yoshino placed floral wreaths in tribute to the monuments to the Nisei war dead and the Issei dead, respectively, followed by Con-

sul General Hashida and H. Okada and Jim Yenari, both evacuees now living in New Orleans and formerly from Gardena and Los Angeles, respectively, and by Commander Fujiwara and JACL Representative Masaoka.

FLAG PRESENTED

Commander Fujiwara then presented an American Flag that had flown over the Capitol of the United States to Gov. Britt, who accepted it on behalf of the State. The color guard of the Nisei Post then "ran the Flag up the post and then halfway down in official mourning," as martial music was played. Meanwhile, it was announced that Congressman Pryor was going to present another Flag that will fly over the United States Capitol in Washington to the Nisei Post.

An honor firing squad composed of Legionnaires from local posts fired three volleys in salute to their departed comrades. Masaoka read the JACL Hymn, and "Taps" was played, with an echoing strain, as the two-day memorial honors to Japanese Americans ended.

Thus did a State of the Old Confederacy become the first in the nation to pay such official homage to the wartime experiences of Japanese Americans and demonstrate that, in spite of the passage of some 25 years, its citizens remember the WRA camps and its implications for all Americans today.

DAVID O. MCKAY

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 26, 1970

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, it was my personal privilege to join with several other Members of the House of Representatives in a resolution expressing our sympathy and condolences to the David O. McKay family on the death of this religious leader, the president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

As a youth of 17 I first met David O. McKay who was then an apostle of the church. During all of the intervening years he has maintained that first impression in my mind as a man of God, and in the church over which he presided he was revered as a prophet, seer, and revelator. Perhaps a more appropriate memorial to him on this occasion would be quotations from his pronouncements and views on the home, church, and state.

The importance of the home:

The safety, the perpetuity of our government, or of any republican form of government, depends upon the safety and permanency of the home. Herein we get a glimpse of one thing in which this people may be the saviors, in a way, of this great nation. The home is the place where the perpetuation of the principles of liberty as well as the instructions in the gospel of Jesus Christ should be given to the children. When the home breaks up, the children begin to wander off into sin. Then the law must reach out to bring them back and try to teach them principles of service and of true government; but, oh, how helpless, how helpless the state when the home has failed.

No success, however great, can compensate for failure in the home.

His witness for Christ:

Easter should be a day of thanksgiving and divine worship. It is not a day for rejoicing because of the opening of springtime, not merely an opportunity to display beautiful

hats and fine clothing—it is an occasion for the expression of gratitude to God for having sent His only begotten Son into the world, to be "the way, the truth, the life," to declare the eternal truth that "Whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life."

When Christians throughout the world have this faith coursing in their blood, when they feel a loyalty in their hearts to the resurrected Christ, and to the principles connoted thereby, mankind will have taken the first great step toward the perpetual peace for which we daily are praying. Reject him and the world will be filled with hatred, and drenched in blood by recurring wars.

As Christ lived after death so shall all men, each taking his place in the next world for which he has best fitted himself. The message of the resurrection, therefore, is the most comforting, the most glorious ever given to man, for when death takes a loved one from us, our sorrowing hearts are assuaged by the hope and the divine assurance expressed in the words:

"He is not here; he is risen." Because our Redeemer lives, so shall we. *I bear you witness that he does live.* May each recurring Easter emphasize this truth, and fill our souls with the divine assurance that Christ is truly arisen, and through Him man's immortality secured, and may the day soon dawn upon the world when the manifestations of brute force and the false ideal that might makes right be supplanted by the charitable, peace-loving spirit of the Risen Lord.

His reverence for the Constitution and its guarantees of liberty:

Education for citizenship requires more emphasis upon the advantages and blessings of the American Way of Life. Next to life itself freedom is man's most cherished possession. . . .

Communism is antagonistic to the American Way of Life. Its avowed purpose is to destroy belief in God and free enterprise. In education for citizenship, therefore, why should we not see to it that every child in America is taught the superiority of our way of life, of our Constitution and the sacredness of the freedom of the individual. Such definite instruction is not in violation of either the federal or the state constitution.

Teach that free enterprise is the right to open a gas station or a grocery store, or to buy a farm if you want to be your own boss, or to change your job if you do not like the man for whom you work. Under Communism you work where you are told, and you live and die bossed by hardfisted bureaucrats who tell you every move you dare make. Free enterprise is the right to lock your door at night. In Communist countries the dread secret police can break it down any time they like. . . .

Education for citizenship demands more emphasis upon moral and spiritual values. Our government was founded on faith in a Supreme Being as evidenced by the Mayflower Compact, the Declaration of Independence, by George Washington and Benjamin Franklin in the Constitutional Convention, and by a hundred other incidents prior to, during, and following the birth of this Republic. Said the Father of our Country, "We have raised a standard to which the good and wise can repair; the event is in the hands of God."

God and individual freedom are fundamental principles in our glorious Republic, and our obligation is to keep in our schools a reverence for Deity and respect for the dignity of the individual man.

I love the Stars and Stripes, and the American Way of Life. I have faith in the Constitution of the United States. I believe that only through a truly educated citizenry can the ideals that inspired the Founding Fathers of our Nation be preserved and perpetuated.

I believe that four fundamental elements in such an education are:

1. The basic essentials of oral and written composition—arithmetical, social studies and science.

2. Loyal leadership as found in men who "cannot be bought or sold, men who will scorn to violate truth, genuine gold."

3. Open and forcible teaching of facts regarding communism as an enemy to God and to individual freedom.

4. More emphasis on moral and spiritual values.

MARTIN LUTHER KING—TRUTH REMAINS SUPPRESSED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have called on the Department of Justice to make available to the American people the evidence concerning the activities and associates of Martin Luther King. Former Attorney General Ramsey Clark now joins in the call inferentially, asking that the Department admit that certain officials and other private individuals have been permitted to sample the evidence.

A former Government official, who claims to have had access to the material in his official capacity, launched an attack on FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, suggesting that tape recordings of bedroom conversations should not be permitted to exist, presumably because of a violation of privacy or of privilege.

It is appropriate to remark, as all lawyers know, that there is no privilege in bedroom conversations when the parties are not married to one another. And it is appropriate to note that there is a true public interest in the true facts of the life and activities of a Communist dupe and tool whom the Red-black machinery is attempting to fashion into a national and international hero.

A letter to the editor of a Florida newspaper last week indicates that the people will not be fooled.

And the current presence of Ralph Abernathy in Stockholm to receive more money from the notorious Gunnar Myrdal, who was the purported author of the Communist-prepared propaganda sheet on which the Supreme Court based its infamous Black Monday ruling in 1954, makes the argument for full disclosure compelling. The left obviously would not wish to conceal good news, and should not be permitted to conceal or destroy adverse evidence.

I include pertinent clippings in my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 27, 1970]

CLARK RAPS FBI ROLE IN PROBING KING

NEW YORK.—Former Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark says the government should say if it's true that FBI tapes from listening devices installed in the late Dr. Martin Luther King's hotel rooms were played to publishers, senators, and others.

In an article in the current issue of McCall's magazine, Clark said: "Since his murder, rumors have spread that tapes from bugs,

secretly installed in hotel rooms used by Dr. King were played to publishers, senators and others.

"The people of the United States should know whether this is true. Their government should tell them.

"The motives for such acts by the FBI, if true, are terribly dangerous. The purpose could only be to destroy a great leader and as a consequence to divide the nation."

Last year, Clark suggested that FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover retire after it was disclosed that the FBI had tapped King's phones. Hoover had explained that former Atty. Gen. Robert F. Kennedy had proposed it.

Clark said that when he was attorney general, Hoover repeatedly asked for authorization to tap King's phones. He said he refused all such requests, including one two days before King's assassination.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 27, 1970]

ABERNATHY RECEIVES \$50,000 IN SWEDEN

STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN.—The Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, successor to Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. as head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, has received a check for \$50,000 from Swedish donors to the organization.

The check was handed to Abernathy yesterday by Prof. Gunnar Myrdal, chairman of the Swedish Martin Luther King Foundation. Abernathy will lecture at Gothenburg and Lund before leaving for Atlanta, Ga., Saturday.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, Jan. 21, 1970]

HOMAGE TO KING

EDITOR, NEWS-PRESS:

To pay homage to Martin Luther King in any laudatory form is an absolute contradiction to the tenets of dignity, respect and humility inculcated in the Constitution of these United States and in those persons who live under it, for it and honor it.

If honor is due to be bestowed on any man of African descent, the choice of Booker T. Washington or that eminent and self-effacing scientist Dr. Carver would be so correctly representative of greatness that Martin Luther King would be relegated to the historical niche he so appropriately qualifies—that of a sanctimonious loudmouth; a rabble rouser, a jaybird, a desecrator of established law, a leader of people (under the guise of non-violence) who became violently riotous and destructive, without any semblance of sanity or reason.

The Department of Justice, alarmed by this controversial pseudo-divinity, saw fit to keep him under surveillance for several years. A transcript of his contacts with unsavory and subversive characters would be a chapter of interesting revelations.

Under the spell of tribal instincts and the exhortations of this word-weaving mystic, the colored segment (along with some namby-pamby whites, who too neither spin nor weave) have been mesmerized into a labyrinthine maze of unqualified demands, of unwarranted hatreds and of specious expectations for a complete welfare state, borne by the white man, to perpetuate slothfulness, illegitimacy and disregard for the attributes of decency.

You and I, black and white, who have loved and respected this America find it now in the throes of emasculation of its past virtues and glory. The sufferance of conniving political regimes and the treacherous departures of the Supreme Court outside of its prescribed constitutional authority indeed lessens our comprehension of what we have gone to war for over these many years.

JAMES F. PIERCE.

CAPE CORAL.

FIRES IN THE LIVING ROOM

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on October 31, 1969, the National Commission on Product Safety released the alarming information that TV sets are responsible for 10,000 fires a year.

At that time I commended the commission on "its continuing excellent service to the public." The commission, an independent investigatory body without enforcement powers, provided the inspiration for passage in the first session of this Congress of the Child Protection Act, of which I was proud to be a sponsor. We also voted to extend the life of the commission in the first session.

Our faith in the continuing high quality work of this body is well justified. On Monday, January 26, the commission released the results of its independent survey of hazardous television receivers.

This information should be made available to the widest spectrum of consumers and in this interest, with the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I submit for the RECORD the commission's release, and two newspaper accounts of the commission's findings as published this morning in the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Wall Street Journal:

COMMISSION RELEASES INFORMATION ON COLOR TV HAZARDS

The National Commission on Product Safety today released the brand names and model numbers of color television receivers which it said exceeded the industry average for fire hazards.

At the same time the Commission, a fact-finding and study panel lacking regulatory agency powers, wrote involved manufacturers urging them to take steps to rectify potential hazards in any of the listed sets and citing recall, repair or replacement of faulty components as appropriate actions.

The letters to the electronic firms acknowledge that publication of model numbers would burden servicing facilities and that some of the listed models might not have defective components.

"Nevertheless," wrote Chairman Arnold B. Elkind, "we believe it essential that this information be furnished to the public and that appropriate action be taken . . . rather than risk the consequences of fires in color television receivers."

Approximately 22 million color TV sets are in use today. The smoke and fire incident ratio for color versus black and white TV is about 40 to 1.

The industry average of 0.120 incidents per thousand color sets was developed from information submitted to the Commission by manufacturers on the number of smoke and fire claims reported to them involving their products.

John I. Thompson and Co., technical engineers, were employed by the Commission to analyze the data. The firm ascertained the industry mean by dividing the number of fire incidents reported by the number of sets sold.

The Thompson Co. then advised the Commission that the following manufacturers, in descending order, exceeded the industry average: Lear Siegler (Olympic), Packard Bell, Magnavox, Sylvania, Philco-Ford and RCA.

Other manufacturers also reported incidents, but their aggregate incident rate was below the industry average. These were in descending order: General Electric; Admiral; Motorola; Emerson; Warwick (Sears); and Zenith.

The following is a list of 122 models which have had 3 or more incidents per 10,000 sets sold—more than twice the industry average.

Admiral—Models AK5598; C5311.
Emerson—Model 21T01.
General Electric—Models M902; M900; M961; M960; M280; M912; M258; M946; M920.

Lear Siegler (Olympic)—Models CK5413; CK5374; CK5368; CC3352; CC326; CC5359; CC5355; CC3345; CC3337.

Magnavox—Models U554; U504; T542; T540; T560; T539; U556; U546; U553; T541; T549; T543; T508; T538; T537; T507; T557; T558; T547; T534; T561; T562; T544; T568; U532; T566; T509; U524; T514; T552; U506; U505; T550; T548.

Motorola—Models 23RL325; 23CL328BS; CL803CS; WL851; CU610CW; CU612; 23CL325.

Packard Bell—Models CSW504; CSW402; CSW804; CSW500; CSW501; 25CD2; CSW702; CSW806; CSW602; CSW502.

Philco-Ford—Models Q5528; P6000; P5230; P6404; R5652; R5609; R6520; Q6420; Q5488; R6508.

RCA—Models GG739; HH864; HG885; HL850; HG889; GL736; GF731; GL748; GG721; HH844; HL872; JH640; GG607; GF753; GG643; GG661; GG733; GF636; FF555; GG667; GG843.

Warwick (Sears Roebuck)—Models 3123; 41912; 4190; 41952.

Sylvania—Models 25LC47; 25LC24PW; 25HC83; 25LC46; 25LC122B; 25HC71; 25LC19; 25LC113; 21LC36; CF481; 25LC114C; 21LC21; 25LC10; 21LC35.

The Commission's suggested recall involves more models of Magnavox than of any other manufacturer, but that company advised the Commission that each of its identified models was made during 1964 and 1965 and that "it has had no reports of comparable problems for later models."

Seventeen manufacturers representing more than 95 percent of the TV industry submitted information to the Commission during its fire hazard survey. The study was undertaken last October following consumer complaints, newspaper reports and Congressional inquiries. Since data submitted by four Japanese manufacturers were not comparable to that of U.S. manufacturers, Japanese brands were not included in the Commission survey. Industry-wide lack of uniform record-keeping prompted the Commission to suggest and the industry to agree to a more uniform system of recording information.

A Commission staff spot-check of major city fire departments which ascertain specific categories of causes of fires revealed varying numbers attributed to TV sets: 361 in New York in 1968; 215 in Chicago in 1969 (including radios); 13 in Houston since October 1967; an estimated 60 in Omaha in 1968; 43 in Denver in 1968; 131 in San Francisco since 1967; 112 in suburban Los Angeles in 1968. The Commission says that a conservative estimate relates about 10,000 fires each year to TV sets.

At a meeting between the Commission and TV industry representatives October 31, manufacturers agreed to assign top technical experts to a crash program to develop maximum safety standards aimed at preventing fires in color receivers.

Meantime, the Commission had pinpointed such TV component parts as flyback transformers, switches and yokes as possible causes of smoke and fire hazards in color sets.

When the industry presented the Commission with its proposed standards to minimize fire hazards in color sets, the Com-

mission sent the proposals to an independent engineering firm—Tracor, Inc. of Austin, Texas—for evaluation.

Tracor advised the Commission that even further improvements should be made to the proposed upgraded standards, particularly in three fire-prone areas—flyback transformers, capacitors and yokes.

The Commission commended the industry for its efforts and urged that the additional proposals be taken under consideration.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 27, 1970]

U.S. PANEL LISTS COLOR TV SETS AS FIRE RISKS

WASHINGTON, January 26.—The National Commission on Product Safety identified Monday 122 models of color television sets which have been exploding or catching fire at an above-average rate.

The Electronic Industries Association immediately accused the commission of creating an unfair competitive advantage for some manufacturers by releasing the information.

The commission, which has been conferring with the industry for three months and recently chided manufacturers for not moving fast enough said the nation's 22 million color sets have been igniting at the rate of 12 per 100,000.

FIRMS NAMED

The commission said the sets it identified were catching fire at the rate of 30 per 100,000.

The commission said Olympic television sets manufactured by Lear Siegler Corp., averaged the highest rate in the industry. Nine of the firm's models were identified as potential hazards.

The other firms identified as exceeding the industry average were, in descending order: Packard Bell, Magnavox, Sylvania, Philco-Ford and RCA.

Five firms were identified as having an incidence rate below the industry average, even though certain models caught fire at the 30-per-100,000 rate. Those firms were, in descending order: General Electric, Admiral, Motorola, Emerson, and Warwick (Sears).

QUALIFIES LISTINGS

At the same time the commission released the names of the sets, it dispatched letters asking the manufacturers to recall, repair, or replace faulty sets.

Commission chairman Arnold B. Elkind noted that some sets on the commission list might not be fire hazards.

"Nevertheless, we believe it essential that this information be furnished to the public and that appropriate action be taken . . . rather than risk the consequence of fires in color television receivers," Elkind said.

The television industry had undertaken what it called a crash program after the commission estimated in October that as many as 10,000 color sets were catching fire every year, some even while turned off.

The commission and industry pinpointed the causes of the fires. The industry proposed protection standards which the commission said last month did not go far enough.

Tracor, Inc., an engineering firm hired by the commission, complained that the industry's new standards still permit temperatures hot enough to initiate combustion and materials to support combustion.

U.S. SETS ONLY

The commission said its survey of fire hazards covered 17 manufacturers representing 95 percent of the industry. The commission did not analyze data submitted by Japanese manufacturers, the commission said.

In assailing the commission's action, Jack Wyman, staff vice president of the electronics association, said in a statement:

"This data was not furnished in order to permit the commission to assign ratings, by name, to the various companies about relative frequency of alleged incidents."

UNDUE ALARM

"Television sets are safe products," said Wyman, calling the problem of fires infinitesimal compared to the number of sets in American homes.

The commission report "will result in unduly alarming the public about the relatively limited problem," he said.

List of manufacturers and model numbers of the television sets identified by the commission as catching fire at an above-average rate:

Admiral—AK5598, C5311.
Emerson—21T01.
General Electric—M902, M961, M901, M960, M280, M912, M258, M946, M920.
Lear Siegler (Olympic)—5413, CK5374, CK5368, CC3352, CC326, CC5359, CC5255, CC3345, CC3337.
Magnavox—U554, U504, T542, T540, T560, T539, U556, U546, U553, T541, T549, T543, T508, T538, T537, T507, T558, T547, T543, T561, T562, T54, T568, U532, T566, T509, U524, T514, T552, U506, U505, T550, T548.
Motorola—23RL325, 23CL328BS, CL8030CS, WL851, CU610CW, CU612, 23CL325.
Packard Bell—CSW504, CSW402, CSW804, CSW500, CSW501, 25CD2, CSW702, CSW606, CSW602, CSW502.
Philco-Ford—Q5528, P6000, P5230, P6404, R6552, R5609, R6520, Q6420, Q5488, R6508.
RCA—GG739, HH864, HG885, HL850, HK889, GL736, GF731, GL748, GG721, HH844, HL872, JH640, GL607, GF753, GG643, GG661, GG733, GF636, FF555, GG667, GG843.
Warwick (Sears Roebuck)—3123, 41912, 4190, 4195.
Sylvania—25LC47, 25LC24PW, 25HC83, 25LC46, 25LC122B, 25HC71, 25LC19, 25LC113, 21LC36, CF481, 25LC114C, 21LC21, 25LC10, 21LC35.

[From the Wall Street Journal,
Jan. 27, 1970]

PRODUCT SAFETY BOARD URGES 11 TV MAKERS TO RECALL 122 MODELS—U.S. GROUP INVESTIGATING FIRES IN UNITS SAYS SIX CONCENTRERS' COLOR SETS TOPPED INDUSTRY AVERAGE

WASHINGTON.—The National Commission on Product Safety urged 11 major television-set makers to recall 122 specific color models to check for potential fire hazards.

A commission spokesman estimated that the proposed recall would involve "several hundred thousand" sets, although an exact figure was unavailable. There are currently 22 million color TV sets in the U.S.

The Government commission, which has been studying color TV-set fires, also reported that sets made by six of the manufacturers generally exceeded an industry average of 0.120 fire or smoke incidents per 1,000 color sets sold.

The six companies whose sets exceeded the industry average were said to be, in descending order: Lear Siegler Inc., maker of Olympic sets; Packard-Bell Electronics Corp., a subsidiary of Teledyne Inc; Magnavox Co.; the Sylvania subsidiary of General Telephone & Electronics Corp.; the Philco-Ford subsidiary of Ford Motor Co., and RCA Corp.

The commission also said six other compa-

nies reported TV-set fire incidents at rates below the industry average. The lowest rate was reported by Zenith Radio Corp., followed in order by Warwick Electronics Corp., maker of Silvertone brand sets sold by Sears, Roebuck & Co.; National Union Electric Corp., maker of Emerson Sets; Motorola Inc., Admiral Corp., and General Electric Co.

The 122 models the safety commission asked to be recalled were those which data indicated have averaged three or more fire incidents per 10,000 sets sold—more than twice the industry average. Except for Zenith, the list included at least one set made by each of the manufacturers reporting fires. The list included 34 Magnavox models, 21 RCA models, 14 Sylvania models and lesser numbers of models made by the other companies.

The commission said it had been advised by Magnavox that each of its listed models was made during 1964 and 1965 and that the company hasn't had any reports of comparable problems for later models.

JAPANESE MAKERS OMITTED

Data submitted by four Japanese manufacturers wasn't included in the study because the information wasn't comparable to that provided by U.S. companies, the commission said.

The Electronic Industries Association, a Washington-based trade group, immediately issued a statement sharply criticizing the commission's report as misleading and unfair.

"Television sets are safe products," said Jack Wayman, a staff vice president of the association. "We regret that the commission has persisted in its decision to point the finger at particular manufacturers in this highly competitive business" and to initiate publicity "which will result in unduly alarming the public about this relatively limited problem," Mr. Wayman said.

The association didn't respond to the commission's proposal that the specified TV sets be checked and, if necessary, repaired.

In New York, a Sylvania spokesman said the company hadn't any comment on the specific point of recalling color sets. Sylvania issued a statement saying that four of five hazardous incidents involving its products occurred in sets made before 1966, "the early era of color TV." Since then, the manufacturer stated, it has used more sophisticated components with the result that the incidence of fires "diminished almost to the vanishing point."

"In the report submitted by Sylvania, there were only two incidents for sets produced in 1968, and none for sets produced in 1969," the company continued. It said it had reported in full its records of such incidents and that they represented fewer than three sets of every 10,000 sold since the beginning of 1965. Servicemen have been authorized to replace components that don't meet "our high standards of safety," Sylvania said.

ADMIRAL QUESTIONS STUDY

Admiral Corp. said it hadn't seen the commission's announcement and declined to say whether it will recall the models cited by the commission. However, in a prepared statement it did say, "The models mentioned

specifically by the commission were produced in 1966 and 1967. Many of the alleged incidents haven't been confirmed, and some were found not to have been caused by our product. We question the method of computation used in preparing the analysis data provided by television manufacturers and believe the interpretation of it is misleading."

An RCA spokesman said in New York, "RCA will evaluate promptly and thoroughly the findings of the commission and immediately take whatever action is appropriate."

A spokesman for Philco-Ford said, through the commission attributes the problem to specific components, the data the company submitted "reveals we don't have any specific problems with any of our components." In five years, he said, only 16 liability claims have been made against Philco-Ford color TV sets in connection with fire or smoke. Some have been dismissed, and others are still in litigation, he added. The spokesman said the concern had presented its position to the commission in a letter.

At Lear Siegler, Bill Roach, assistant to the vice president of the commercial products group, said the concern hadn't seen the commission's release yet. "We don't believe the sets are dangerous or harmful at all," he also said.

Sears-Roebuck, which purchases most of the color sets made by Warwick Electronics, said, "We feel many, if not most of these (faulty sets) have already been inspected and repaired. We are following through on the others." A spokesman said the basic problem was with a faulty on-off switch bought from a sub-supplier. Warwick is 59%-controlled by Whirlpool Corp.

Here is a list of 122 color-TV models, which the National Product Safety Commission reported as having had three or more fire incidents per 10,000 sets sold:

Admiral—Model AK5598, C5311.
Emerson—Model 21T01.
General Electric—Models M902, M900, M961, M901, M960, M280, M912, M258, M946, M920.
Lear Siegler (Olympic)—Models CK5413, CK5374, CK5638, CC3532, CC326, CC5359, C5355, C3345, CC3337.
Magnavox—Models U554, U504, T542, T540, T560, T539, U556, U546, U553, T541, T549, T543, T508, T538, T537, T507, T557, T558, T547, T534, T561, T562, T544, T568, U32, T566, T509, U524, T514, T552, U506, U505, T550, T548.
Motorola—Models 23RL325, 23CL328BS, CL803CS, WL851, CU610CW, CU612, 23CL325.
Packard Bell—Models CSW504, CSW402, CSW804, CSW 500, CSW501, 25CD2, CSW702, CSW606, CSW602, CSW502.
Philco-Ford—Models Q5528, P6000, P5230, P6404, R6552, R5609, R6520, Q6420, Q5488, R6508.
RCA—Models GG739, HH864, HG885, HL850, HG889, GL736, GF731, GL748, GG721, HH844, HL872, JH640, GG607, GF753, GG643, GG661, G733, F636, FF555, GG667, GG843.
Warwick (Sears-Roebuck)—Models 3123, 41912, 4190, 41952.
Sylvania—Models 25LC47, 25LC24PW, 25HC83, 25LC46, 25LC122B, 25HC71, 25LC19, 25LC113, 21LC36, CF481, 25LC114C, 21LC21, 25LC10, 21LC35.