

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

STATEMENTS BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRIORITIES COMMITTEE OF THE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COUNCIL

HON. FRED R. HARRIS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 6, 1970

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I recommend to all Senators a series of eloquent statements made by Members of this body recently during hearings before the National Priorities Committee of the Democratic Policy Council. Taken together, this superb testimony argues forcefully for a new commitment to re-order this country's priorities—for a commitment to end the resource-wasting, humanly debilitating war in Vietnam, cut unnecessary defense spending, and apply a much larger share of our national resources to terribly urgent domestic needs.

I ask unanimous consent that these excellent statements be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL PRIORITIES AND THE DEFENSE BUDGET

(Statement by Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, February 24, 1970)

It is a great pleasure for me to address the Committee on National Priorities of the Democratic Policy Council. Your work takes place, I think, at an important time in our history. The testimony you hear, and the recommendation you will make, will have a powerful influence this year over the decisions of the Congress in responding to President Nixon's request for authority to commit Federal tax dollars. And this year, for the first time in our history, the request has exceeded \$200 billion.

This nation is finally beginning to realize that we need to allocate our resources in a systematic way. We must set our national goals and then decide upon strategies to reach them. We must determine what roles are to be played by the different levels of government and what roles are to be left entirely to the private sector.

From the standpoint of the federal government, national priorities are set by the decision to allocate federal tax dollars among competing national needs. The President's budget requests, sent to the Congress this month, reflect in detail the priorities of his Administration. The appropriation bills, when they receive final approval by the Congress, will reflect the judgments of the Congress on the President's priorities.

This requirement for Presidential request and Congressional approval of the commitment of federal tax is an important aspect of the checks and balances in our federal system of government. At its optimum, the system should come into balance only after the resolution of a variety of tensions between the two branches. For if there is no tension, but only passivity, public debate will be stilled, and these vital decisions made without close scrutiny and public accountability. The sound operation of government requires critical analysis, not complacent consensus.

We are in the middle of a dramatic example of the benefits of this healthy tension.

The Congress in December passed an appropriation bill for health and education containing \$1 billion more than the President requested. At the same time, the Congress reduced by more than \$5 billion the President's total budget request of some \$189 billion, out of its concern for the dangerous inflation in the economy. The President vetoed this bill, calling it inflationary. The Congress failed to override the veto, and now has a substitute bill in the final stages of approval. This substitute bill also has more money in it for health and education than President Nixon requested, and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare has indicated the likelihood of another veto.

There is, of course, a lot of politics on both sides in all this back-and-forth between Congress and the President on the funds for health and education. But through it all, there runs one simple thread, a thread readily apparent to those taxpayers and voters who watch this public debate. This is the question of priorities, of priorities among competing needs. The Congress put a priority on reducing the President's total \$193 billion budget request by \$5 billion; it also put a priority on allocating the funds it did approve differently than did the President, adding \$1 billion to health and education and subtracting it from other functions.

By insisting upon this allocation, in the face of a threatened second veto, the Democrats in the Congress are doing what Democrats have always done—putting their priorities on people, and on the day-to-day problems people face in their lives. Inflation ran at a dangerous rate all through 1969; the Congress thus reduced the President's budget by \$5 billion. Health and education costs are rising; the Congress thus shifted \$1 billion from other functions to support for health and education. These two actions by the Congress reflect the traditional concerns of the Democrats, and I look forward to other opportunities for comparable actions this year.

Your work on the Committee on National Priorities can be of large assistance to us in the Congress. You can gather the facts. You can analyze their meaning. You can synthesize the different lines of argument. You can clarify the issues. But most important of all, you can stimulate that healthy tension between the Legislative and Executive Branches which is so vital if government decisions are to be subjected to close scrutiny and informed public debate.

In the past decade we have, as a nation, grown increasingly aware that our priorities must be changed, as the times change. Changing these priorities is not an easy task, however, because powerful and entrenched vested interests often have an enormous stake in resisting change. One clear example of the difficulty of dislodging vested interests lies in the Federal Highway Trust Fund, which each year channels some 5 billion tax dollars into highways, but virtually nothing into subways and other public transportation. For years, sociologists, planners and other experts have produced devastating criticisms of this imbalance. But the highway interests are powerful, and mass transit has thus suffered. Now, after 15 years, the highway interests are discovering that they cannot simply construct super highways, to bring suburbanites into center cities, without regard to mass transit. It is public outcry and public pressure which is finally bringing this change and slowly dislodging the vested interest.

Only the same quickening of interests and sharpening of pressures can break the hold of other vested interests on federal funds

which should be spent on people—on their schools, their health, their parks, their air, their water—in short, on the quality of their lives.

We saw, last year, a dramatic example of the impact of this quickening interest and sharpening pressure when the nation turned its attention to the budget for the Department of Defense. The January, 1969 request of the Congress for Defense totalled \$77.7 billion, nearly double the request for 1960. The sheer size of this figure shocked the nation, and spawned an intense examination of what these billions would purchase. President Nixon revised President Johnson's request \$2.5 billion downward, to \$75.2 billion. The Congress cut \$5.6 billion more off the request, and we ended up with a Defense appropriation of \$69.6 billion.

Along the way last year, while these cuts were being made, Americans learned of a \$1.5 billion cost overrun for a single new \$3.5 billion aircraft project; of cancellation of a \$3.2 billion military manned space station project after \$1.5 billion was already spent on it; of inadequate audit and accounting procedures; of duplication and overlap; and in general, of a lack of hard-eyed supervision of Defense costs. Senate Majority Leader Mansfield said in January of 1969 that he hoped we could trim \$10 billion from the Defense budget. The difference between the requests in 1969 and in 1970 are at just about that amount. *Fortune* magazine's careful analysis in August 1969 concluded that even further and major cuts could be made without in any way jeopardizing our national security.

This year, President Nixon has asked for a defense budget of \$69.3 billion. Senator Mansfield said on February 2 that he hoped we could make "a similarly large cut" in this request. Consequently, despite Secretary of Defense Laird's statement last Friday that this year's request is a "rock bottom budget," I would expect that careful analysis will show members of Congress a number of places where major savings in the Defense budget can be made. We can then consider whether to apply these savings to other critical areas of need—such as health and education—without generating new inflationary pressures.

Any realistic public figure is aware that when he challenges the defense budget, he will be the object of many easy charges of "selling out America's security," or of "seeking unilateral disarmament," or "misunderstanding the gravity of the Communist threat." I say these are easy charges because they are only slogans—slogans reflecting our years of living on the edge of terror in the cold war. As slogans, they may have represented valid concepts in the 1940's, or 1950's, or even the 1960's. But times, change, and if we do not adapt our thinking to the realities of the changing times, then we calcify. What we need in our treatment of national defense, and the defense budget, is a new realism.

This new realism does not require us to abandon all our old concepts. But it does require us to look closely at them, and all the decisions and actions they have generated. President Nixon recognized this in his foreign policy posture statement of last week. Concepts, words, slogans, postures, all valid in recent times, must not automatically be considered valid today. And the men and women who have both the interest and the courage to ask the tough questions should be applauded, not vilified. So what we need, and what I hope would be forthcoming from the Administration, is a candid discussion of our national defense posture, and the budget

we need to support it—not in terms of old slogans, but in terms of new realities.

In assessing our defense budget, we must begin of course with the war in Southeast Asia. I need not recount here the mistakes we have made in Vietnam, the costs we have borne, the suffering we have inflicted. The critical point now is what the future holds. Some analysts have suggested that we may have to keep 100,000 or 200,000 troops in Vietnam indefinitely, at a cost not only of continuing American casualties, but also of billions of dollars each year. Just to keep one U.S. soldier in Vietnam for one year costs \$13,000. I do not believe we would have to pay such prices, if our emphasis were on political negotiation and an end to the violence rather than total reliance on Vietnamization. We have given greatly to the present South Vietnamese regime. Indeed, perhaps never in history has so undeserving a government received such generous assistance from another nation. We must now insist that South Vietnam make its own peace through negotiations.

Aside from Vietnam, the military and political developments of the last two decades make possible other reductions in defense spending—if we are willing to be realistic. The United States has already constructed at enormous expense, a powerful second-strike capability. For the foreseeable future our Polaris submarines, supplemented by our land-based missiles, will remain an effective deterrent against nuclear attack. Thus, there is no clear need at this time to spend vast sums of money to deploy new strategic weapons systems.

We should not repeat the mistakes of the fifties and sixties, when we overreacted to cold war fears and helped to stimulate the spiraling arms race. In my view, the Administration's Safeguard system is just such an overreaction.

This year, as last, the request for funds for Safeguard will more than likely be the linchpin of the investigation and debate surrounding the defense budget. This morning, Secretary of Defense Laird presents to the Senate Committee on Armed Services the Administration's case for these funds. He has already indicated that it will be a request for an expansion of the ABM beyond that narrowly approved 6 months ago by Congress.

Last year, I believed that Safeguard was a waste of money. Nothing I have heard or learned since then has changed my views.

It may well be true that what Defense planners call the "threat" is greater this year than last. This greater threat might encompass the continued Soviet deployment of large, multiple warhead ICBMs of increasing accuracy. In fact, if the Soviets keep up the deployment rate of the last few years, they may even, some years from now, have as much offensive nuclear power as we do. Another aspect of the threat may be an increased tempo of Communist Chinese ICBM activity. But since they have yet to test launch an ICBM, a serious Chinese threat is clearly a long way off. Furthermore, Secretary Laird's argument that the credibility of our Asian commitments will be reduced as soon as China has any capacity to inflict nuclear damage on this country is unpersuasive. The Soviet Union has had such a capability for years, but, since we have retained our powerful second-strike capabilities, no one seriously doubts the credibility of our vital commitments in Europe, Latin America and elsewhere.

Most of us are well familiar with the arguments advanced last year against the Safeguard; that it signals another escalation of the arms race; that it will not work as designed; that Soviet evasive techniques will neutralize it; that it can be overwhelmed; that its enormous cost is not justified; that it will prejudice the SALT talks; that it defends an obsolete system; and that

it is itself obsolete since it will not be even 20 percent operational for 6 more years. It is inconceivable that in those 6 years, the Soviets cannot design and develop techniques to render the Safeguard meaningless. These arguments will again receive full treatment, I am sure.

But last year we did not fully explore the suitability of the other responses to an increased threat. These would include more Polaris submarines; mobile ICBMs; a system designed for point defense; camouflaged ICBM silos; lasers; and many others. It should be plain that I am not suggesting that we adopt one or another of these alternative steps. What I am suggesting, though, is that this year we have new, stronger and more basic arguments to oppose Safeguard than we did last year.

There are other aspects of our strategic defense policies which require re-examination. For example, there seems little reason, in this age of the missile, to spend some 10 billion dollars on yet another manned bomber fleet—one which costs \$30 million per plane. Nor do large expenditures on a bomber defense system seem warranted.

Let me cite a few other examples:

We have about 7,000 tactical nuclear warheads stored at various locations in Europe. Other than the grave questions of first use, accidents, and control, the question which deserves public discussion is: would our security be any less with 6,000 such warheads in Europe? With 3,500? With 1,000?

We have nuclear weapons of all types stored in various nations around the world, as Senator Symington has pointed out. Presumably, we do so with the continuing consent of the host nations. But the President has formally refused to tell the Senate Foreign Relations Committee both which are the host countries, and under what conditions the weapons are stored there. Just what is it that the Administration is trying to hide? In his November 3, 1969, speech on Vietnam, President Nixon said:

"The American people cannot and should not be asked to support a policy which involves the overriding issues of war and peace unless they know the truth about that policy."

President Nixon intended that statement for the public and for Vietnam policy. But it is just as true for Senators and for strategic nuclear policy—and for our alarming involvement in Laos.

The political developments of the last two decades are as significant as the strategic developments. No longer can it be said that there is a monolithic Communist power stretching from Europe to the Far East, and poised to strike at the United States or its allies. The Soviet Union and Communist China are heavily preoccupied with their own ideological and border disputes. They show little inclination to engage in an armed confrontation with other nations. Furthermore, many of the non-communist nations of Europe and Asia, which were destitute at the end of World War II, are now prosperous and vigorous enough to contribute even more to their own defense, and to the defense of their regions. The U.S. spends about 9 percent of its Gross National Product on defense, as an illustration; the NATO nations spend 5 percent.

The Administration has recognized these changes. But it has not yet made any substantial changes in our own military posture. We continue, for example, to deploy 320,000 troops in Europe and 250,000 of their dependents, at a yearly cost estimated to run between \$12 and \$15 billion. I do not suggest that all these troops be withdrawn. Some must remain to demonstrate to both NATO and the Warsaw Pact that any conflict in Western Europe will inevitably involve the military might of the United States. But certainly we do not need 320,000 troops to serve this "tripwire" function. We should

withdraw the majority of these troops, and let the increasingly prosperous nations of Western Europe contribute more to their own defense.

Similarly, I doubt that the danger of Soviet invasion of Western Europe is sufficient to warrant production of the main battle tank. I think we should re-examine whether it is worth paying over a billion dollars for these new tanks.

In Korea, as in Europe, we have troops—two full divisions totalling 56,000 men in point of fact. This seems a much larger force than necessary to our national security. For almost twenty years we have armed and trained the Army of the Republic of Korea, at a cost of nearly \$3 billion in grant military assistance funds to pay for the bulk of their army's operating costs. That army should now be capable of meeting any threat from the North. We need only deploy a small number of troops—if any at all—to demonstrate our commitment to South Korea's independence.

Also in Asia, the Defense Department has paid nearly \$40 million in the past three years to the Government of the Philippine Civic Action Group, or PHILCAG. PHILCAG was a force of some 2,000 non-combat Philippine military personnel stationed in Vietnam, who were supposed to give credence to the belief that the non-communist nations in the Pacific Theater stand with us in Vietnam. If we did not use this \$40 million to pay the salaries of non-combat Philippine soldiers in Vietnam, but instead used it for salaries of policemen; we could put about 6,500 additional policemen on the streets of Washington, D.C.

Indeed, the whole question of U.S. support for foreign armed forces requires re-examination. The budget request includes over \$1 billion for the support of non-U.S. military forces—\$450 million for personnel, \$660 million for equipment. Some of these expenditures are associated with Vietnamization, some are not. Unfortunately, it is not considered in the national interest for the American public to know how much we pay to which countries to keep their armed forces going. But I would like to suggest that it may well be worth examining—in public—which countries get how much, and then balancing the merits of that use against, say, spending the money on new schools here at home and letting the taxpayers in other countries pay for their own armies.

Substantial savings can also be obtained by a closer examination of our naval needs. At present we maintain a fleet of fifteen attack carrier task forces, even though the Soviet Union does not have a single attack carrier, and also has far fewer overseas bases than we do. Charles Schultze, the former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, indicated in testimony before the Joint Economic Committee that the size of our carrier fleet was the most questionable item in the military budget. The cost of each task force, which includes the aircraft carrier plus supporting ships is about \$400 million per year. This is more than the budget request for the entire legislative branch of the government, including the Senate, the House, the Capitol, the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, the General Accounting Office—all the salaries and other costs. Yet, as Mr. Schultze suggested, the reason we have 15 attack carrier task forces may be purely historical. "In the Washington Naval Disarmament Treaty of 1921, the U.S. Navy allotted 15 capital ships. All during the nineteen twenties and thirties the navy had 15 battle-ships. Since 1961 (with temporary exception of a few years during the Korean War) it has had 15 attack carriers, the 'modern' capital ship. Missions and 'contingencies' have changed sharply over the last 45 years. But this particular force level has not." Clearly, when an attack carrier task force costs \$400 million each year, it needs more than an his-

torical justification. If, as Secretary Laird recently announced, we are not policemen of the world, do we really need 15 attack carriers?

Another questionable item in the Navy's budget is the anti-submarine warfare carriers. Former Secretary of Defense McNamara conceded that this is "a relatively high cost system in relation to its effectiveness." It can only be made more effective at great expense, and therefore its deployment should be promptly re-examined.

We should also examine whether both the Navy and the Air Force are presently planning to procure tactical aircraft which use far more sophisticated and expensive equipment than is really necessary. There is a danger that both services are paying exorbitant amounts for "gold-plated" new planes which perform only marginally better than their predecessors. At a time when austerity is the watchword, this seems a good place to start being austere.

Since the federal budget is being sharply cut in so many areas, no aspect of military expenditures should be free from scrutiny. For example, the budget request includes \$809 million for military family housing. Unquestionably such a program is necessary. But we are expending only \$575 million for the Model Cities program. Is this the right allocation of the 1.4 billion dollars which the two programs together total?

Each B-52 flight from Guam to South Vietnam costs \$50,000, including munitions and fuel. The budget request for the Bureau of Water Hygiene in HEW, which is responsible for setting standards for all the nation's drinking water, was cut by \$400,000 from last year. Thus, it would take only eight fewer flights to make up the difference. Has anyone, anywhere in the government, made a decision that eight flights are more important than the quality of the nation's water?

Department of Defense officials have a number of special prerequisites, all of which bear close scrutiny. For example, the Secretary of each Cabinet department is assigned a limousine, as befits his status. One exception is the State Department—the senior agency—which gets two. *But Defense gets ten.* Cabinet departments are also assigned additional chauffeur-driven cars for the use of sub-cabinet officials. Agriculture, Justice, Labor and HEW each get four such cars. *Defense gets seventy-six.* The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has a car; the Associate Justices do not. The top three officials in the Senate and in the House have cars; the other Senators and Congressmen do not. The startling aspect of these figures is, of course, the special treatment accorded the Department of Defense.

I would like to cite a few more examples which help to illuminate how we have set our priorities in past years.

The public relations budget for the Department of Defense is \$39 million this year, as the Department itself admitted. These funds are not for public information, or for recruitment—but for promotion around the country of the Defense Department's programs. The total request this year for civil rights enforcement activities in the Department of Justice is only \$5 million, or one-eighth of the amount for public relations in the Department of Defense.

Last year's budget sought a sum in ammunition which breaks down to \$22 million for each Vietcong or North Vietnamese in and around North Vietnam; but sought only \$44 for each school child in America.

This year's budget is about \$1,000 for each American. Four-hundred of this goes for defense, only \$4 goes for fighting crime.

The foreign aid request totals about \$2 billion, about a third of which will be spent in Southeast Asia. More than a third of all overseas AID personnel work in Vietnam. Department of Defense spends about \$45

billion to maintain our overseas commitments. It is hard to dispute the arguments of many critics that we appear more interested in making war abroad than supporting peace.

I think I have demonstrated that the President's budget request for the Department of Defense is not rock bottom. Further major cuts can and will be made perfectly consistently with an enhanced national security. The question is quite properly posed: how do we know where to begin? And how do we know when we have cut far enough?

One particular suggestion has always had considerable merit, in my judgment. The budgets for all cabinet departments—except Defense—are subjected to an intense adversary process in the Bureau of the Budget. In this process, each subdivision of each department must justify its program budget requests not only on the merits, but in comparison to other similar programs in any other department. The Defense budget does not face this type of adversary process at any point in its long path to final approval. Instead, it is scrutinized within the Department of Defense, and then reviewed by a joint Budget Bureau-Defense team. It is almost as if the whole process were established to prevent an independent, tough-minded scrutiny. The suggestions for remedying this clearly inadequate situation usually embrace enlarging the extent of adversary examination of Defense budgets. It is hard to understand why the Defense budgets should be exempt from the same scrutiny applied to other budgets.

But beyond this technical change in the manner Defense budgets are prepared within the Administration, there are certain other steps we should take when this budget is presented to Congress. What I now want to suggest is a methodology for approaching the Defense budget context of a discussion of national priorities. This methodology rejects any special treatment for the Defense budget; instead, it seeks to stimulate adoption of a new realism toward what our national security requires, and a new realism toward balancing the priorities accorded all the different national needs.

We must first set goals. Surprisingly, there is general agreement on most national goals of broad scope. For example, it is national policy that each American should have a decent home and a suitable living environment. It is national policy that the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty be eliminated. It is national policy that each American have equal employment and educational opportunities. It is national policy that our shores shall be protected from invasion. It is national policy that each American should have high-quality health care and be able to pursue a retirement life of dignity and security. It was national policy to land a man on the moon in the 1960's. An inventory of Congressional and Executive declarations of national policies or national goals will show that virtually every aspect of our lives is covered by one or another of these goals.

After we set these goals, *we must decide upon strategies* to reach them. This is a most difficult task, not only because it requires a decision as to the roles to be played by the different levels of government, but also because of the need for a decision on the division between government and the private sector. To illustrate, national defense is a responsibility of the Federal government; education is the responsibility of a mix of individuals and of governments of all levels; automobile manufacturing a responsibility of the private sector; and child-raising a responsibility of individual families. Strategies of course change from time to time, to reflect new conditions. We are witnessing just such a change as the Congress debates proposals for shifting both the nature and the burden of our welfare system.

Once we do have the strategies, then on the

Federal level *we must decide how many Federal dollars each Federal function gets.* This is the meaning of the term "national priorities" as I have used it today, and the one most appropriate to those involved in the federal budget making process.

Secretary of Defense Laird pointed out in his posture statement that:

"The federal government has not, in the past, been very well organized across the board to analyze basic problems of resource allocation."

All of us know this to be true. And all of us know, too, that we must change it if we are to restore some better balance to this country's approach to its future.

Despite all the rhetoric about the reductions in the size of the Defense budget, there has still been no fundamental re-examination of the concepts lying behind the Defense budget. Most of the reductions in defense spending over the past year are due to reductions in the scale of the Vietnamese war and cancellation of certain military projects of marginal value. Yet a fundamental re-examination is the key to reducing the budget's size without endangering our security.

All the issues I have raised—the future course in Vietnam, the deployment of Safeguard, the need for 15 air carrier task forces, the troop levels in Europe and Korea—should be part of this re-examination. I am confident that the result of the analysis will be substantial reductions in defense spending.

Because it may be helpful to the members of this Committee to have a concrete example of how specific cuts in the defense budget can save many billions without prejudice to our national security, I have abstracted a table from *Fortune* magazine of last August. This table shows specifically how the defense budget could be reduced by over \$15 billion. I have attached this table to the end of my statement.

This brings me to an important point. Unless countervailing measures are taken, insistence on cuts in military spending will have a substantial adverse impact on many companies and employees. As a Senator from Massachusetts, I am acutely aware of the financial and intellectual resources which have been invested in defense and defense-related industries. When we reduce our military expenditures, these resources must be protected and must be converted to the most socially useful purposes.

This economic conversion cannot be accomplished automatically. That is why I intend, in the near future, to introduce legislation which will help prepare the way for conversion of defense research and development activities to socially-oriented civilian R&D. This legislation will require gradual reallocation of federal R&D spending 80 percent of which today goes to Defense, AEC, or NASA, from military to civilian uses. It will provide educational programs for scientists, technicians and management personnel who must re-direct their activities and for the Federal, state and local officials who will define the new market for socially oriented research and development. Finally, the legislation will provide special financial and educational assistance to the small defense firms which are faced with the necessity of conversion.

I recognize that there are some who will oppose the large-scale conversion of our resources. They will argue that any substantial reduction in our military spending will constitute a risk to our national security. But I do not believe this is so. On the contrary I believe that if we examine our national situation with a new realism we will see that we are truly taking risks only if we fail to reduce and reallocate military spending.

First, we are taking the risk that millions of Americans will die unnecessarily because of inadequate health care. The nation's chief

advisor on health affairs, Dr. Roger Egeberg, has stated that we are at best a second-rate nation in the health field. This is no overstatement. For example, it is now widely known that the United States ranks only 14th in infant mortality rates. What is perhaps not so widely known is that if our mortality rate was as low as that of Sweden, 50,000 fewer American children would die each year.

In every other statistical category the United States lags far behind: 12th in maternal mortality; 11th in life expectancy for females and 19th in life expectancy for males. There is simply no reason to believe that we could not be doing far better—that we could not be saving hundreds of thousands of lives each year—if we allocated more resources to health care.

Another risk we take if we fail to reduce and reallocate military spending is that air, water and noise pollution will make our environment uninhabitable. The President's much publicized 37 point program is, as many have pointed out, not nearly good enough. In some areas, it actually reduced the federal effort against pollution. If we want to continue to enjoy the benefits of industrial technology, but without unacceptable adverse side effects, massive expenditures will be required.

And if we do not reduce and reallocate military spending, we take the risk that the plight of our cities—poor housing, poor schools, inadequate transportation and high crime rates—will grow even worse. We have already seen new housing fall victim to the fight against inflation, a fight in part made necessary by high military expenditures. We have seen the reading levels of our school children drop. We have seen the lack of mass transit clog our highways and prevent inner city residents from finding employment. We have seen general poverty, as well as understaffed courts, prisons and police departments, result in a staggering increase in crime. We need new expenditures in all of these areas, and we need the benefits of technical and managerial skills currently employed by the military.

Finally, if we do not reduce and reallocate military spending, we take the risk that millions of our citizens and particularly our young people will lose faith in their country and the values for which it stands. We must remember that we are bound together as a people not by brute force, or ethnic homogeneity or geographic compactness. We are bound together by a common faith that ours is a nation which is trying to assure to all its citizens the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. If that faith is shattered, we will have lost what no weapons and no armies can ever secure us.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this nation is ready to reorder its priorities. I hope that this Committee, this Party and this Congress will help to lead the way.

Defense budget cuts

(Adapted from tables in *Fortune* magazine, Aug. 1, 1969)
[In millions]

	<i>Savings</i>
1. Reduce general-purpose tactical nuclear force-----	\$1,000
(There are now 7,000 tactical nuclear warheads in West Europe alone.)	
2. Eliminate one and a half NATO-oriented divisions-----	1,125
(There will be 20½ active Army and Marine divisions at year-end. The U.S.-NATO forces cost \$14½ billion a year and are in and of themselves more powerful than any force except the Soviet Union's)	

3. Eliminate two Asia-oriented divisions-----	1,500
(There are 56,000 troops in Korea; 45,000 in Okinawa; 40,000 in Japan; 30,000 in the Philippines; 49,000 in Thailand; 10,000 in Taiwan; and half a million in Vietnam.)	
4. Eliminate three tactical air wings, two in NATO, one in U.S.-----	1,360
(We have now 8,500 active tactical aircraft, 800 more than in 1965.)	
5. Reduce attack aircraft carriers from 5 to 1-----	2,440
6. Reduce antisubmarine (ASW) carriers from 8 to 4.	
(Includes annual operating costs of \$440 million and investment of \$500 million)	
7. Reduce the strategic bomber force from 550 to 275 planes-----	750
8. Reduce amphibious ships-----	365
9. Savings in procurement and more efficient use of manpower-----	7,520
(Includes elimination of AMSA, cuts in shipbuilding, hold-down in officer rotation, and use of less expensive avionics.)	
Total-----	17,000

(NOTE.—This table includes the \$1.5 billion sought this year for Safeguard.)

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE, FEBRUARY 24, 1970

The Committee on National Priorities is engaged in a bold and difficult experiment: whether it is possible for a political party to examine and define those issues which are of most immediate importance to a complex and rapidly changing society—and to translate those issues into a set of priority actions which are responsive to society's needs and realistic in terms of our available resources.

I do not underestimate the difficulty of the task, and I do not underestimate the talent of your committee. You must lay bare the tough choices we must make if we are to restore our national sense of purpose, and if we are to show some progress toward achieving the promise of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution.

As American society has become more complex, our political institutions have reached a critical turning point. It is more and more essential that the political process work for all Americans, but it is harder and harder to make it work.

The time has come for Democrats to make a choice—between a party where the decisions are made at the top and passed to those below, or a party where those at the top listen and respond to the goals and aspirations of all its members.

Only political leadership that listens and responds will be able to pull America together and make democracy work. We must recognize the value and vitality of diversity. We must be sensitive to the human problems and aspirations of all Americans. We must find ways to bring out the best in all of us.

These are the tasks that face a responsive and responsible political party. These are the promises that the Democratic Party has made. And this Committee on National Priorities is proof that we mean to keep those promises.

The environmental conscience which has gripped the nation holds great promise—not only for our air, our water, and our land, but also for the future of people searching for a better life together.

We have realized the meaning of life in a world of limited natural resources. It is a small step to the realization that we also live in a world of fragile human resources.

We cannot survive the continuing strain of an undeclared war on our future. We must

lay down our weapons of self-annihilation. Martin Luther King once said that "through our scientific genius we have made of the world a neighborhood; now through our moral and spiritual genius we must make of it a brotherhood."

We must forge a wholesale change in our priorities and our values. We must redefine our standard of living, reflecting the knowledge that both our human and natural resources are at stake.

Our time to meet this challenge is short. We must reorder our priorities—and, in doing that, we must abandon the snail's pace of the present administration.

Too many Americans receive health care in shamefully meager doses—and at prices they cannot afford. But here the budget gets cut.

Too many Americans live in the misery of substandard housing in teaming urban ghettos or desolate rural slums. But here the budget gets cut.

Too many children fall farther and farther behind in the learning race, while 28 per cent of our young people never graduate from high school. But here the money is vetoed.

And too many Americans are laid off from their jobs, while the cost of living continues to climb. But here the President says "hands off."

The President has vowed to stop the abuse of our natural resources. But his vow is not matched by the figures in his budget.

Our air is clogged with dirt and choked with poisons, yet the budget request for air pollution control is less than last year's appropriation.

Our water supplies are contaminated, our marine life is imperiled, and some of our rivers have become fire hazards. But the budget request for water pollution control is less than the program authorized by Congress in 1966.

While rats prey on uncollected garbage in our cities and abandoned cars deface the rural landscape, this year's budget request for solid waste disposal is less than last year's appropriations.

As our gross national product approaches one trillion dollars, the relentless, vicious deterioration of our human and natural resources continues. It is a sham to say we cannot afford the protection of our environment—just yet; or the fight against hunger and poverty—at this time; or homes and medical care for our people—for a few years. We can afford these domestic programs now—and fight inflation at the same time—if we admit that there are less important priorities we cannot afford. The administration's balanced budget reflects unbalanced priorities. Look at this "balanced" budget for fiscal 1971. That budget "balances" \$275 million for the SST against \$106 million for air pollution control. It "balances" \$3.4 billion for the space program against \$1.4 billion for housing. And it "balances" \$7.3 billion for arms research and development against \$1.4 billion for higher education.

These "balances" are not sacrifices we are forced to make in the battle against inflation. They are examples of the wrong money, at the wrong place, at the wrong time.

National priorities are meaningless if the national budget does not reflect them. We must revamp the budget itself.

First, we must make more than token changes in the level of military spending. We cannot have guns and butter in the manner we have always thought possible. We must examine every request for military spending with a new skepticism, asking not whether there is a less expensive military substitute, but whether there is a more effective non-military substitute. We must replace the spiraling costs of new weapons and greater overkill with genuine, persistent ef-

forts at arms control. We must take honest risks in pursuit of peace and disarmament.

Second, we must set priorities which protect total human environment—our air, water, and land resources, our health, our homes, and our communities—not priorities which lead to faster planes, mightier weapons, and more ventures into space.

Third, we must make it clear that the unemployment caused by recession is no cure for the rising prices of inflation. Wage and price guidelines are preferable to having men and women thrown out of work.

Finally, the Democratic Party must insist that the Federal Budget reflect the priorities we proclaim. There is no room in our society for empty promises and false commitments.

These are the issues of people and peace. They are good ideas, they are good priorities.

But good ideas do not keep forever. Something must be done about them, or they become the seeds of revolution.

In 1976 America will mark its 200th anniversary. Two centuries ago Americans fought a revolution—not for the sake of hollow promises and empty slogans, but to insure for themselves and their children the opportunity to build on the basis of their common dreams.

We have built a great nation on the basis of those dreams, but we have not yet built a society where each citizen has an equal chance to reach his own potential, where life is acceptable for all Americans.

We may not reach those goals by 1976. We may never reach them at all. But at least we owe that chance to ourselves and to those who gave birth to this nation. At least we must help to insure that we are moving again in the right direction.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE,
FEBRUARY 24, 1970

Let me begin by saying how much I support the review of national priorities your Committee is conducting, and how grateful I am to be able to participate in it.

This review is long overdue. America can no longer afford to let the Pentagon have a hammerlock on federal revenues, while programs such as education, and health that seek to meet our nation's pressing human needs are forced to fight for the leftovers. This approach, which has characterized the budget making process no matter which political party has controlled the Executive Branch, must be changed.

The Senate began a serious review of national priorities last summer when it analyzed and debated for two months a military authorization bill containing such far reaching and expensive commitments as the anti-ballistic missile system, the new manned bomber, and additional nuclear-powered aircraft carriers. While this exercise did not produce any immediate modifications in the Pentagon's plans, it raised a number of fundamental and yet-unanswered questions about military requests. I, for one, was hopeful that the President's pronouncements and budget requests would reflect this emerging dissatisfaction with past priorities.

Obviously, this has not occurred. Since that historic Senate debate took place, the President has vetoed an HEW-Labor appropriations bill containing an additional \$1½ billion for desperately needed education and health programs and submitted a Budget that includes no important reductions in military procurement goals, and proposes—of all things—to escalate spending for the ABM by reportedly adding \$600 million or more for phase II of the system.

While the President has reduced the cost of Vietnam both in terms of funds, and more importantly, lives, and has reduced his budget requests for the Department of Defense from last year's level, he has not acted to control Pentagon spending for non-Vietnam purposes. Thus, new weapons systems with

limitless capacities to absorb funds are receiving high priority and under the Administration's budget would steal the "peace dividend" our human programs so desperately need.

I am deeply concerned about this set of national priorities that places hardware above humans. The Budget's heavy emphasis on start-up costs for ABM's, MIRV's, and SST's will cripple needed nutrition, health, education and environment efforts this year, and threatens to continue stunting human programs throughout the foreseeable future. History warns us that a renewed arms race and its predictable cost overruns will both shake the delicate balance of terror in our nuclear world, and starve other government programs of needed funds.

America must not ignore either of these warnings. We must begin at once to shift our resources from a fascination with military gadgetry to high priority investments in human beings.

Let us begin with young children. Of all areas of unmet human needs, our unwillingness to provide help to deprived children is perhaps our most tragic and costly mistake.

There are at present about 6 million disadvantaged children under age six. Most of them are growing up without adequate nutrition and health care, and without the active mental and intellectual stimulation that is necessary during these early years.

As a result, many of these children are very depressed, withdrawn, and listless. Child development specialists who have worked with some of the children report that it is difficult in the beginning to get them to smile or show interest in anything around them. Young children in many of these homes are considered well-behaved if they sit quietly in a corner during the day, instead of talking, playing, and exploring.

Yet the critical effect of the first years of life has been well documented. We know, for example, that about 50 percent of an individual's intellectual development takes place between conception and age 4. These early years are the formative years; they are the years in which permanent foundations are laid for a child's feelings of self-worth, his sense of self-respect, his motivation, his initiative, and his ability to learn and achieve.

We know, moreover, that a child's intelligence is not fixed once and for all at birth, and that children are most eager and often most able to learn during their early childhood years. As Dr. Benjamin Bloom, an authority in early childhood learning, concluded:

"As time goes on . . . more and more powerful changes are required to produce a given amount of change in a child's intelligence . . . and the emotional cost it exacts is increasingly severe."

I would like to underscore the role that inadequate nutrition plays in perpetuating this cycle of poverty. As a member of the Select Senate Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, I have had an opportunity to hear expert testimony about tragic and permanent effects of nutritional deficiency during pregnancy and the first few years of life. Presently, there is no Government program that deals adequately with the critical nutrition needs of infants from the period before birth until they reach school age. Pediatricians have pleaded eloquently before the committee for national recognition of the disaster—mental as well as physical—which befalls undernourished infants.

For example, Dr. Charles Lowe, chairman of the Committee on Nutrition of the American Academy of Pediatrics, testified before the Nutrition Committee that:

"Severe malnutrition suffered during childhood affects learning ability, body growth, rate of maturation, ultimate size, and if prolonged, productivity throughout life."

Dr. Lowe stated further that:

"In effect, the quality and quantity of nutrition given during the first formative years

of life may have the effect of programming the individual for all the years of his life. Malnutrition during the last trimester of pregnancy and certainly during the first months of life may seriously compromise ultimate intellectual achievement."

Fortunately, most American children have the benefit of a stimulating, secure environment in their early years. Most of them receive the physical and mental nourishment that is necessary for full development.

But poor children under age six arrive at school without these same advantages. Many of them may have suffered irreparable damage in their early years. Many have not received sufficient nutrition, health care, and intellectual stimulation.

Research reveals quite clearly the costly and lasting effects of deprivation in these early years. It reveals, for example, that as early as 18 months of age, disadvantaged children start falling behind middle-class children in tests of language development, and general intelligence. It reveals, furthermore, that this intellectual gap between poor and non-poor children that appears so early in life tends to grow larger over time.

I want to emphasize the point at which differences begin to occur between the abilities of poor and non-poor children. This point is not birth. Testimony which I have heard—particularly examples from projects in Mississippi and the District of Columbia—suggest that nature distributes intelligence fairly equally among infants, poor and non-poor alike. It is only later—typically between the ages of one and three—after hunger and deprivation have made their impact—that differences in abilities begin to develop.

Records show, for example, that poor, black infants in the Mississippi Delta who scored an average of 115 on a Developmental Quotient test at age one had fallen to an average DQ of 85 by age 4. This decline can be prevented. The Infant Research Project in Washington, D.C., by providing tutors for children in the early years, was able to maintain the IQ's of impoverished children at an average of 105 from age 1½ to age 3, while the average IQ of a control group of poor children who did not receive tutoring fell 17 points in this period. This is not just another "interesting statistic". It represents the difference between a person's ability to do satisfactory college work or only marginal high school work.

We know how to prevent a great deal of this deterioration from occurring. Hundreds of projects such as the one I mentioned in Washington, D.C., and the Parent and Child Centers that are providing Head Start experiences to poor children below age 3 are producing very promising results. Even the study by Westinghouse Learning Corporation which found that an eight week summer Head Start program for 5 year old poor children does not save a child for the rest of his life—and has been cited by critics of child development efforts as proof that "nothing works"—recommended "offering intervention programs of longer duration, perhaps extending downwards toward infancy".

I believe the evidence is indisputable that comprehensive early childhood programs must be made available, on a voluntary basis, to all impoverished families with young children—beginning with medical and nutritional assistance to pregnant women and infants. Our present failure to do so is causing human misery, and wasting human ability.

The alternatives are very clear—more generations of school dropouts, functional illiterates, unemployables, welfare dependents, and more expensive yet necessary programs like the Job Corps that seek to remedy these problems later in life.

The most humane, economical and efficient way to give every citizen a fair opportunity to exercise his rights is by preventing poverty from causing this near irreparable damage during early childhood.

Substantive child development programs could have a tremendous impact on the quality of American life. They could give poor children the tools to gain a better life. They could insure that opportunities can be seized, and rights can be exercised by all.

Just last week the Senate concluded a long debate on the problems surrounding de facto segregation arising from adventitious events such as residential patterns. One can try to dismiss these problems summarily by citing Fair Housing laws, and saying that the poor can escape the problems of ghetto life by moving elsewhere. I fought hard to get this legislation passed preventing racial discrimination in the sale and rental of housing, and I think it is important. But I realize that other factors, such as poverty, unemployment, and the lack of low income housing outside the ghetto can make these laws irrelevant to the poor.

Equal opportunity requires more than open housing, integrated schools, or fair employment practices. Equal opportunity requires an equal start—from the very start. Making substantive child development programs available to poor families is one very important way to insure their equal start.

I was encouraged last year when the President declared a "national commitment to the crucial early years of life." I thought this commitment might mean that a greater urgency and higher national priority would be attached to early childhood efforts.

A year has now passed since this declaration was made. Unfortunately, the rhetoric rings hollow. Despite some bureaucratic window-dressing, and modest funds for research, the Budget recommends a mere one per cent increase in Head Start funds. As a result, this promising program, including its Parent and Child component, will continue reaching less than five percent of the poverty stricken children who need it.

It haunts me to think of the millions of children whose potential is being severely compromised simply because we are unwilling to make the necessary investments. Our indifference to the needs of poor children, whether measured in humane or financial terms, cannot be justified.

We absolutely must change national priorities which allot only one half the funds to Head Start as are allotted for the hurried deployment of phase two of an untested and potentially dangerous ABM system.

CHANGING NATIONAL PRIORITIES

(By Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, February 24, 1970)

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate the opportunity which has been given to me by the National Policy Committee to outline my views on the priorities of our Nation. I am most heartened by the establishment of this Committee on National Priorities within the Democratic Party. In the past, I have believed that our Party has paid too much attention to the personalities in politics, much to the detriment of party policy formulation. I believe the existence of this Committee would change that imbalance and that these hearings and the recent publication of Democratic Party policy statements are healthful signs of a reviving Democratic National Party, a reinvigoration which I hail.

National priorities concerns our perspective as to the conscious and unconscious commitments of our country's human and fiscal resources. It is an issue which has generated much debate, but little action. I think it is time for us to eschew the rhetoric of national priorities and take a hard look at what a change in national priorities demands.

From my perspective, I think we can take that hard look by first examining realistically our present national priorities; second, by assessing the actual limitations on a change in national priorities; third, by justifying what we think our new priorities should be and how they can be attained; and fourth,

by examining the role which the Democratic Party should play in changing priorities.

I. OUR PRESENT NATIONAL PRIORITIES

The best indicator we have of the country's priorities is the way it spends its money in the private and public sectors. I think it might shatter some illusions about what are national priorities if we analyze briefly some of our country's overall financial commitments.

The most commonly understood indicator of national priorities is the Federal budget. The fact that national defense, veterans payments, and interest costs from present and past wars consume more than 50% of Federal expenditures have been the reason why many of us assume that the Federal Government's number one priority is warfare and its various aspects.

If income security trust funds based on direct contributions of individual taxpayers are excluded, expenditures for health, education and community development make up not more than 15% to 20% of the Federal budget, and thus, human investment can be seen as a poor second priority to warfare investments.

In view of the many needs of our society, this ratio is certainly unacceptable; however, since government expenditures only represent 20% of the Gross National Product, it is important that we view the question of priorities in the wider perspective of national product accounts.

While Federal defense related expenditures have been increasing over the past years, I think that it is significant that defense expenditures have declined from 9.1% of the GNP in 1960 to 8.8% of the GNP in 1969 while Federal grants-in-aid have increased from 1.4% of the GNP in 1960 to 2.1% of the GNP in 1969.

In absolute terms, between 1960 and 1969 Federal grants-in-aid for such programs as education and manpower, public assistance and community development increased from \$6.8 billion to \$18.9 billion. For the same period, domestic transfer payments for such programs as Medicare, retirement benefits and unemployment benefits increased from \$20.6 billion to \$48.2 billion. Between 1963 and 1968, public and private expenditures for health, education and welfare nearly doubled by increasing from \$100 billion to \$163 billion.

Overall, between 1960 and 1969, Federal expenditures have increased from 18.4% of the GNP to 20.7% of the GNP, and expenditures for personal consumption have declined from 65% of the GNP to 61% of the GNP. This decrease in the percentage of personal consumption and increase in the GNP percentage of government expenditures can be partially attributed to the fact that in 1969 taxes on personal income amounted to 12.6% of the overall personal income, the highest proportion since 1948.

The impact of this change in funding patterns can be understood by reference to some community accepted random social indicators.

For example, in this period between 1960 and 1969, the number of persons classified as poor by the Social Security Administration decreased by an estimated 18 million persons, there was more than a significant decline in infant mortality rate, the death rate from hypertension and hypertensive heart disease declined by more than 20%, and the number of handicapped persons being rehabilitated doubled.

I think the first point that I wish to make about present national priorities is clear. *Under the leadership of the Democratic Administration in the 1960's, this country began to shift its priorities and it made this shift by increasing government expenditures and reducing the level of personal consumption.* This is corroborated by the Council of Economic Advisers who report that there will be very little Federal money available for new initiatives until 1975 due to long run

implications of the program commitments made in the 1960's.

II. LIMITATIONS ON CHANGING OUR NATIONAL PRIORITIES

This alleged lack of money available for further new initiatives underlies my second major point regarding our present national priorities; that there are limitations on further changes. Any further changes will be more difficult.

There are two direct ways of shifting priorities: either increase all programs—some more than others, as we did in the 1960's; or cut back on selected programs to add other more desirable programs, as no one has done yet.

The gradual shift in priorities which occurred during the 1960's did not really hurt any one particular interest group. We had guns and butter. Tax increases were somewhat mitigated by increases in the level of individual income. The shift in the 1960's was relatively easy as compared to what a change in the dimensions of our present commitments will involve in the 1970's. I question whether in the 1970's the country will be willing to support either the increased taxes or cut backs in nonpriority programs on Federal and State levels which will be required, if we are to have a strong shifting of priorities.

With the present mood of the country, do you think the public is willing to pay the extra required taxes by forgoing the outlays for new cars, color televisions and cosmetics? We must not forget that America's number one priority is still, despite high taxes, personal consumption, which is more than 60% of the GNP.

There is also some doubt in my mind whether the political estate is willing to support a shift of priorities by the cut back method. For example, if priorities are to be shifted in the 1970's by cutting back in absolute terms rather than simply making smaller proportionate increases in the defense and space area, this may mean a recession in our defense and aero-space industries, a lot of high paid executives out of jobs, and many Congressmen, Senators and Governors pressing to keep Federal defense and aero-space contracts flowing into their states, I would hope a Democratic Party committed to a shift in national priorities could resist such pressures.

However, even if we assume that the public and political reluctance to significantly change the dimensions of our national priorities could be overcome, there are some other serious economic and manpower limitations which must be considered.

Our present rate of real economic growth has nearly ceased and manpower shortages in such priority areas as health are barely improving. Without a 4 percent growth rate and sufficient manpower to be employed in our priority areas an actual change in priorities becomes even more difficult.

III. WHAT OUR PRIORITIES SHOULD BE

The question now is where do we go from here. I, for one, think we, as a country, must begin to make the hard choices. Within the limitations I outlined, I think there are a number of human investments we must make now in order that the 1980's will not also see the country restricted in the commitments it can make, by decisions made in the previous decade.

Our first priority—end the war

The first investment necessary is, in a sense, a negative investment; we must stop investing our human and material resources in wasteful wars not related to our national interest. We, as Democrats, must wear the hairshirt of the Vietnam war and admit our own mea culpa. We were responsible for the escalation of our commitment and engagement and we must now take the lead in seeking our withdrawal from this miserable war.

Guiding domestic choices

Besides reducing defense expenditures to, I would hope, about a quarter of the controllable Federal budget, we must be prepared to make some hard choices among competing domestic programs.

First, we must look at our Federal programs as investments in our country's well being and attempt to discover the programs which would represent the greatest loss in opportunity costs if such program investments were delayed.

We should be doing this by weighing the costs of given programs against their expected benefits within a time span in which we expect to receive those benefits. I am impressed by the fact that one study using this type of analysis has showed the rates of return in education to range from 11% to 19%. I am doubtful whether any public works project, any space project, or any arms development project can show such a high rate of return. Senator Proxmire has done an excellent job in developing this idea of comparing the cost-benefit value of various government programs.

Second, we must weigh the impact of our Federal programs on the social economic structure of the country and the environment. For example, I have always been impressed by the impact of the Interstate Highway System on this country.

To eliminate traffic jams we built better and bigger roads which in turn increased the demand for more cars and resulted in more traffic jams, more air pollution, and more commuters. Moreover, as a partial consequence of the Federal highway program we encouraged the suburban exodus of middle income people from the inner cities, thus leaving cities with a reduced tax base and poorer citizens who cannot pay for the extra services they particularly require. Also, the competition of the Interstate Highway System practically eliminated the railroads from the passenger business, even though rail service was the more economical mode of public transportation for the country's treasury and the least harmful to its ecology.

A second priority—Increased education and manpower funding

From my experience as Chairman of the Senate Education Subcommittee and as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, I have been convinced that the priority investments which meet the tests I have outlined and which have the best return for the economy and country as a whole are our education and manpower programs. The Senate took the first step toward this priority commitment last week by its passage of our bill providing \$35 billion in aid to elementary and secondary education and related programs through fiscal year 1974. I think it is of utmost importance that, as a second step, these programs in conjunction with manpower programs designed to aid youths between the ages of 16 and 24 years be fully funded.

Moreover, I think a priority commitment to educate must insure that every young person who wishes to continue to higher education, whether at the junior college level or the college level, be provided the financial assistance he needs from the Federal Government to assist him. I am hopeful that my Basic Education Opportunity Grant legislation, on which I have already started to hold hearings, will be the vehicle for that assistance. This proposal would give an individual student who wished a higher education, and was in good standing in an institution of higher education, a grant of the difference between \$1,200 and the income tax paid by either him or the person or couple that carried him as a dependent. This would help not only the poor who pay no income tax but also the hard pressed middle American family whose income is between \$7,000 and \$7,500 and who pays an income tax of \$600.

This would be accompanied by a cost of instruction grant to the institution receiving the student. And from the viewpoint of a good investment; this certainly meets the criterion! For instance, the Federal government has already received more in additional taxes on increased incomes resulting from the World War II GI Bill than we ever paid out to the veterans.

Two other areas of education which I believe must be given special emphasis are medical education and early childhood education for disadvantaged children. We are not going to be able to meet the health inadequacies of this country until our schools begin to at least double their output of doctors, nurses, dentists, and paramedical specialists; and we are not going to be able to break the vicious cycle of the poverty unless we are able to reach the young with educational programs, in that very crucial period between the ages of 3 and 6 when so much of their intellectual development occurs.

A third priority—A national health care system

Following education, my third priority commitment would be the establishment of a National Health Care System based on a national health insurance plan, preventive health services, and comprehensive health planning.

Our present nonsystem of health care is inadequate by every standard. We rank far down the list in comparison to other countries in terms of infant mortality rates, longevity rates, and rates of illnesses, such as heart disease. Our present nonsystem is characterized by an over emphasis on acute disease treatment to the detriment of preventive care and on an overdependence on the invisible hand of the free marketplace in the equitable allocation of health resources. The rich and the poor are the ones who suffer the least in regard to the cost fluctuation of the market—but the middle Americans are the ones really being squeezed and suffering.

The Federal Government must take the lead in reorganizing the nation's health delivery system and health financing system such that every American, as a matter of right, will be given a minimum level of health care. A healthy citizenry makes for a more productive citizenry better able to contribute to the achievement of the country's other priority needs. The right to equal opportunity and the right to enjoy the abundance of this country are meaningless rights to sick and incapacitated citizens. A commitment to a new health care system must be a national priority as an essential human investment.

There are other priorities which should be considered, such as housing, transportation, urban development, environmental regulation and resource control. However, I do not emphasize those items because I believe our first priorities must be people-oriented programs.

We must first put our dollars in those programs which have the greatest direct benefit to the people, as people, and secondly, fund those programs which only indirectly effect their living environment. Moreover, I believe that improvements in the area of what I would call living environment problems can be best made with a minimum of public sector expense if certain innovations and structural reforms can be made in both the private and public sectors through the private market mechanisms. It is this question of innovation and structural reform which I think represents the toughest underlying problem in our discussion of national priorities.

Innovation, structural reform, and planning

The changes in priorities I have been discussing to this point represent, basically, changes within that 20% of the GNP which

represents government expenditures for goods and services. An actual change in terms of real priorities is going to demand more than increased levels of government funding for human investment programs; it will demand major innovative and structural changes within the overall socio-economic and political framework of the country; it will demand a close examination of the impact of the remaining 80% of the GNP which is not made up of government purchases of goods and services, but of consumer expenditures, business investments and savings.

Our first step should be to look at institutional reasons for our present problems.

In many ways, our institutions have been both the promoters of a new colonialism and the victims of an old colonialism. They have made us the prisoners of the past and the dictators of the future. Generations past have determined our commitments today as we determine the commitments for generations in the future with little regard for their concerns. Both our present and future living conditions are determined by processes and structures established many years ago with little regard as to their utility today or in the future. The Federal structure is nearly 200 years old. The Corporate business structure is nearly 100 years old. Our freedom to change priorities for the present is impeded by the structural decisions of the past.

If we are to be serious about national priorities, I think we must ask ourselves the following questions about the institutions and processes through which we plan to make our changes.

Do our present processes allow for the proper consideration of the future impact of today's decisions?

Do the institutions for implementing these decisions have the capacity for future and present control?

Can our institutions of change allocate resources on a rational and priority basis?

From the viewpoint of Democratic theory, do our institutions have the feedback ability necessary to correct themselves in instances of mistaken allocations?

And, most important of all, do our institutions allow the greatest amount of freedom possible for the development and expansion of individual conscience and opportunity?

I am not confident that there are very many institutions in either the private or public sectors which can answer these questions, but I would like to offer a few suggestions as to how some progress can be made along the lines I suggest.

We would consider the formulation of a *National Resources Planning Budget* for the nation as a whole. As a first step, each major corporation and public body could be asked as to what their individual plans for future growth are and what resources this future growth will demand. The constituency of each sector, whether stockholders or voters, would hopefully be given an opportunity to comment on individual plans. These individual plans could be then synthesized on the National level and published through, possibly, a joint planning subcommittee of the Council of Economic Advisers, Council on Urban Affairs, and the National Security Council.

The overall integrated national plan would have no mandatory effect. It would be published annually for information purposes only. The plan would serve as a feedback process through which planners in both the private and public sectors could become aware of overall shortages and future demands on the country's fiscal, natural, and human resources in order that necessary adjustments can be made in their own plans. Its chief purpose would be to provide some future vision for the decision makers of today.

As a concomitant to the National Resources Planning Budget, the Congress could,

in conjunction with its approval of the usual annual line item budget, require the Executive Branch to publish annually an updated five-year plan outlining future Federal program requirements in terms of manpower, dollars, and expected benefits for approval by the Congress.

A second suggestion I would make is that consideration be given to the establishment of *Megalopolitan Service Authorities*.

Due to the nature of our federal system of government, it is quite difficult for the various individual states and very numerous individual local governmental units to take advantage of economies of scale. Despite the fact that many governmental units are located within integrated economic and social areas, they must provide fragmented and inadequate services because of the limitations on their tax base and jurisdictional authority. The result is that, although three levels of government may agree that something must be done about a problem, there exists no mechanism to solve that problem.

As I pointed out in my book "Megalopolis Unbound," this problem is particularly acute for transportation in the Megalopolis of the East Coast which stretches from here to Boston, and is becoming more acute in emerging Megalopolises along the Great Lakes and the California and Florida coasts.

While I have been particularly interested in past years with developing a solution to the intercity rail passenger problem through the establishment of a Megalopolitan Authority for the East Coast to run rail passenger service, I think this concept can be applied to other problems which are beyond the resources of individual governmental and private units.

I would like to see Megalopolitan Authorities established through which local and state governments might contract for the provision of not only transportation services, but a number of services such as joint purchasing agreements for municipal equipment, the provision of data processing services, specialized regional planning services, public administration training services, and maybe even the provision of basic services like sewerage treatment, rubbish collection, and fire prevention.

These Authorities would be built upon interstate compacts and intergovernmental agreements, and it would be my hope that the Federal Government on the basis of its greater tax base would provide their initial capitalization and a basic annual subsidy for the functions of the authorities which were interstate in nature, such as ground transportation. With such support, I think it is possible that such Authorities could do for our urban areas with services what the Tennessee Valley Authority did for the Border States thirty years ago with economic and resource development. An excellent example is what the Port of New York Authority has contributed to the three states of New York, Connecticut and New Jersey.

A second area where I believe there is a need for some structural innovation and another area which has been the focus of my writing efforts is the development of our ocean resources. In my book, "Challenge of the Seven Seas," I outline some of the reasons why I believe that new legal and institutional structures are needed to prevent anarchy in our development of ocean resources.

In the international field we must give priority to the creation of an international regime to control the development and use of the resources of ocean space, the 70 percent of the earth's surface lying beyond our territorial seas and immediate coastal shelves.

Domestically, let us move ahead with the creation of a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency. We need to do with the oceans what we did with space through the National Aeronautics and Space Adminis-

tration. While the immediate prestige benefits might not be as great as for outer space, I believe the long-run payoff in economic terms from developing ocean space would be far greater.

A third area where I would suggest some process reforms is in our national financing mechanisms. I believe that our priorities for urban development, transportation and housing can be met through the private money market if we consider a number of changes in the public sector's posture with regard to private industry.

I would hope that we could look to ways in which the government support of research and development, the government's use of tax-exempt bonds and guarantees, and the government's regulation of industries could be used to make investments in our domestic needs more profitable for industry.

I, for one, think it would be possible to reconvert the aerospace industry into a new housing and urban transportation industry if the Federal Government was willing, first to provide the research and development assistance for housing and transportation that it has for aerospace; second, to create the necessary financial support for community development banks, and tax-exempt guarantees for the bonds of those banks and for the Megalopolitan Authorities involved in transportation; and, third, to consider changes in antitrust and trade laws that would allow certain amount of industry cooperation in the financing of their public service ventures.

A fourth way in which I believe our national finance mechanisms can be influenced to serve our national priorities is through the full use of the democratic foundations of the corporate structure, and this leads me to my final major point regarding the role of the Democratic Party in changing national priorities.

IV. THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN CHANGING NATIONAL PRIORITIES

Our Party, as an organization, must take a vigorous role in advocacy of changes in national priorities. To do this, I would make the following suggestions: First, I believe that we, as a Party, should encourage the stockholders of the country to vote and support Corporation Directors who are willing to have their companies invest their resources in domestic priorities such as housing, transportation and urban development. I suggest this because we must not forget that, as John Kenneth Galbraith has noted in his writings, the Federal Government has a direct impact on only 20 percent of the Gross National Product, while the 500 major corporations in the country have a direct influence on an estimated 50 percent or more of the Gross National Product.

I would urge the Democratic Policy Committee to give a similar consideration to the issuance of a policy statement on the public service role of the private sector as it did with its recent statement on the Federal role in solving our national problems.

Second, I would suggest that the Committee on National Priorities give consideration to the creation of counterpart National Priorities Committees on the state and local level of the Democratic Party to act as a catalyst for priority planning by state and local government and area business and to develop public support for a change in priorities.

If we are serious about changing national priorities, we must involve as many people as possible in our effort. For, if we do not have the support of people for a change in priorities, the political support needed in Congress for Federal sector changes will never develop, let alone the needed changes in the private sector.

Third, I would suggest that the Democratic National Committee and the Democratic National Policy Council hold a joint session in January of 1971 to develop a consensus with-

in the Party on its priorities policy and on its future role as a national political party. Some thought might even be given to holding a National Convention for this purpose. Vietnam and civil rights have torn our Party apart within the last ten years, and I think there is a real danger that if we do not pull our Northern and Southern wings together and unite on a common ground, we will not only be out of control of the White House and 32 of the Governor's Mansions, but we will also be out of control of the Congress and in for a long run as minority party. If we do not shape up, the people are going to ship us out.

As a closing summary I would like to re-emphasize that I believe any further shifts in national priorities will be difficult, but I think it is imperative that we must at least shift our priorities to our human investment programs and attempt to achieve our other priorities through structural innovation, process reform and the involvement of the private sector.

To achieve these ends it is essential that the Democratic Party as an organization, undertake an aggressive promotion of the need for a change in national priorities.

Perhaps, my suggestions are too ambitious for the times, but I have outlined ideas which I think should be discussed, and I hope my thoughts have assisted the Committee in its thinking about National Priorities. I appreciate the opportunity to have presented my views.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION GOALS (Testimony by Senator VANCE HARTKE, Feb. 24, 1970)

Tom Wicker of the *New York Times* recently wrote that the three major domestic issues on which President Nixon had evinced the least understanding were pollution, transportation, and hunger. The pollution of our air and water, and the hunger of our urban and rural poor, are problems that have received wide attention, if little action. But transportation as a major issue has received neither attention nor action. We have ignored transportation, not because it inherently lacks significance, but because we have failed to comprehend and communicate the relationship between transportation and other social problems—poverty, urban decay, and environmental degradation.

The tendency of most Americans to think of transportation as the "ho-hum" movement of cars, trucks, trains and airplanes. In reality, however, transportation is the most vital and pervasive activity of society, a circulatory system by which people and goods are moved about and the nation continues to function. From the earliest days of human civilization, access to transportation facilities has structured the location of communities and the centers of economic activity, and has determined the physical shape of urban areas. Nowhere has society been built around transportation more thoroughly than in the United States, where towns were born along the tracks of our railroads, and where great ports were built inland from the navigable waterways that crisscross the continent.

Although transportation has shaped our society, given rise to our cities, and linked our several states together, we have in the past allowed our transportation network to grow in an unplanned and uncoordinated fashion. The various modes of transportation—railroads, automobiles, airplanes and ships—have developed independently of one another, and the government agencies that promote and regulate transportation have been fragmented along modal lines. Little effort has been made to integrate the modes, and little thought has been given to how transportation might be planned to structure regional or national development in a desirable fashion.

In the past, the costs of non-integrated

transport have been largely obscured by economic progress, just as the costs of pollution have been largely ignored in the pursuit of economic growth. Today, however, we face a transportation crisis that demands a reassessment of our transportation policies and a fresh look at transportation's relationship to other human activities and values.

The most obvious feature of our present society is that it has come to be dominated by the automobile. The benefits of automotive transport have primarily been those of unmatched personal mobility for our people. Yet the symptoms of our transportation ailments today are congestion and pollution. Congestion surrounds our airports, engulfs our city streets, and blocks our major highways. Air pollution comes pouring out of the exhaust pipes of cars at a rate of over 75 million tons per year. "Land pollution" in the form of more highways slicing through cities and open spaces continues at prodigious rates. Noise pollution mounts in our cities and around our major airports. These environmental and social costs of the automobile have become painfully apparent in recent years. Air pollution from automobiles constitutes a major environmental problem, not only because such pollution threatens our health, but because air pollution has also made our cities virtually unlivable. Even if we succeed, as indeed we must, in overcoming the pollution problem of automobiles, we still must deal with a more intractable automotive problem: the voracious consumption of land.

Our highways have proliferated with frightening speed, destroying much of our cities and defacing much of our open spaces. Already we have more than 3 million miles of paved roads—one mile for each square mile of land—and still we are told we must build more freeways in order to escape today's constant traffic jams. To the obvious environmental costs of such proliferation are added a host of less well-recognized social costs—widespread dislocation of people and businesses, wholesale destruction of valuable parkland and wilderness, ever-increasing volumes of noise, and a mounting death toll that makes our most common mode of travel also our most deadly.

I need not elaborate on the social and environmental impact of more cars and more highways. Studies abound showing the heavy price we pay every year in order to maintain our precious mobility. If we could continue to find such mobility in the construction of more highways, in the paving over of more cities and open spaces, I am afraid that we would continue to ignore the social and environmental costs that such construction entails.

But the crisis in transportation is not simply one of achieving mobility at the expense of other human goals. The crisis is also one of our ability to remain mobile regardless of the price we are willing to pay. Each new highway built becomes jammed with traffic almost as soon as it is opened. And the number of new highways has clearly reached the societal saturation point. A continuation of our present policies would lead us, for example, to the point where one day New Jersey will cease to be the name of a state and become the name of a mammoth super-highway between Washington and New York. And even then, automotive traffic will move at a snail's pace.

The crisis, while frightening in light of our present policies, actually may be a blessing in disguise, for it forces us to plan now for an alternative system of transportation in which the automobile will assume a more proper role. Planning transportation systems, in turn, will force us to consider questions of social policy we have ignored in the past: How do we want our population to be distributed? What pattern of urban growth is most desirable? How can transportation be made less destructive of our natural and social environment?

In the past, we have not attempted to fuse our various modes of transportation into a single coordinated system. Nor have we stopped to calculate the social consequences that lack of planning was entailed. Yet we have long had evidence that population growth and economic activity are structured by transportation—even in the distant past when trading posts were established on the banks of mighty rivers, or when towns began to spring up alongside the new railroads. Our whole society, in fact, has been shaped by transportation—but we have never stopped to consider how we could plan transportation facilities in order to shape a society better than the one we have today.

We can no longer ignore the social implications of transportation. Our present system is so congested, so expensive in terms of pollution, land, noise and human life, that an alternative will have to be created. The form and extent of our transportation planning will have a dramatic impact on how we live ten and twenty and one hundred years from now. Whether or not we take action, for example, will determine whether our cities continue to grow in a sickly sprawl, or whether designers will be able to plan more healthy new communities with access to work and recreational areas. The price of inaction, by the same token, will be a continuing aggravation of those social and environmental ills with which we are grappling today.

Once we understand the social implications of transportation planning, however, we cannot simply begin to create new transportation systems. The technology is not lacking, but the political framework is. We simply do not have governmental structures with the requisite authority and scope for planning the types of integrated, balanced transportation system that we will need in order to channel future growth.

The reason we lack such structures is that transportation problems—and logical transportation units—do not conform to state or local boundaries. Instead, transportation needs follow the pattern of population, and our people live increasingly in densely-populated "corridors" that connect many cities and cross several state lines. Within each corridor are several cities and dozens of major suburbs—which, by themselves, cannot create a transportation system that meets the needs of the entire region. And because of the number and diversity of transportation regions within the United States, the federal government cannot undertake the detailed planning and testing of transportation systems that each region needs to insure a better future environment.

The consensus on the need for regional transportation planning is emerging much more rapidly than the governmental framework within which such planning can take place. New transportation policy and new transportation systems are not, as some would have us believe, dependent upon unrealistic advances in technology. The technological problems can be overcome if political institutions can emerge for the making of coherent and coordinated policy. At the present time, no political unit—city, county, state or federal—is equipped to formulate transportation policy that is consistent with national needs. The transportation unit that is most relevant to policy—the region—has no governmental body or formal planning board.

The National Transportation Act, of which I am a co-sponsor, is an attempt to establish the type of regional control over transportation planning that is needed for rational systems to be built. By establishing regional transportation commissions charged with the planning and construction of integrated transportation systems, the act takes a monumental step toward granting Americans the ability to control their own social destiny. The regional commissioners would take into consideration such factors as

environmental quality, land-use planning, and even the locations of pipelines and power transmission facilities. By developing systems within which each mode of transportation complements all others in an overall design to meet the needs of the region, the regional commission will ensure the continued availability of federal assistance funds in demonstration projects and construction. But failure to develop such plans would lead to a halt in federal funding—justifiably so, for lack of planning in the future will hasten the already swift degradation of our cities and countryside.

The National Transportation Act, which Senator Warren G. Magnuson and I introduced last June, will be the subject of extensive hearings before the Senate Commerce Committee this Spring. We do not pretend that we have answered all the important questions in the field of transportation policy by offering this bill. We do feel that it is important for America—and important, I might add, for the Democratic Party—to begin studying transportation problems and to begin studying them now. The vast changes we hope to effect in American society, the hopes we have for the rehabilitation of our cities and the economic enfranchisement of our poor, will all depend upon the type of transportation systems we develop in the future.

In conclusion, let me restate my thesis simply. Transportation, though often overlooked, is a key aspect of America's social and environmental situation. Our present transportation system is unplanned, costly in human terms, and on the verge of breakdown. Planning for integrated, balanced transportation systems now is necessary, not only to diminish the costs of our present system, but to aid in the restructuring of American society. Although such integrated systems can be planned and technologically initiated, at present we lack the institutional framework within which to undertake such planning and initiation. Upon developing that framework—a framework that takes into account the regional nature of transportation problems—may very well hinge not only our future mobility, but our future way of life.

REMARKS BY SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN,
FEBRUARY 25, 1970

My sincerest sympathies go out to anyone who has to deal with the tangled area of priorities. I believe it was Prometheus who was the first priority maker. He stole fire from the gods and gave it to man. Man in turn used it to make tools for development, weapons for hunting and fighting, warmth for his dwelling, and later the means to advance science and industry. For all of this, Prometheus was chained to a mountain and was harassed by an eagle night and day. Such is your heritage from Prometheus—a heritage of immense promise and great risk. And to reorder the priorities of a powerful nation may cause the eagle to scream at you.

But we Democrats do not shrink from a little screaming or scratching. We have our struggles, but we have been able to recover in the past because the dimensions beyond the party were more important than the differences inside. Very frankly, I am proud to be a member of a party that fought out the issues of civil rights, the tragedy of Vietnam, and the current challenges to reclaim our own society. Those are divisive issues. But they are the ones worth having a political process to resolve. And I want nothing to do with a political party that fears the searchlight of honest dissent and debate. Nor do I respect a political leadership that places political manipulation and public relations above the national interest and the welfare of the American people.

Over the last year, one priority has clearly emerged for Democrats, and that is to provide a more thoughtful and critical response to the Nixon Administration. There may be

times when party squabbling is inevitable, but our task now is to provide a constructive national alternative. Now is the time to create a coalition of conscience and responsibility and proclaim that we shall not settle for public relations in place of progress, or manipulation as a substitute for policy.

The President promised us a peace to end the war in Vietnam. But the war continues. He promised to heal the nation's wounds, and then gave us the southern strategy, underscored by Haynsworth and Carswell. To cut down on crime, he replaced Attorney General Clark with John Mitchell. But the crime rate goes up, and in anxiety we are offered proposals that jeopardize the Bill of Rights. Mr. Nixon pledged to stop inflation. But he spends billions on the ABM and vetoes the HEW bill. His plan is to combine an intolerable level of unemployment with intolerable interest rates. That formula will spell serious trouble for its Republican architects before this year has ended. For they have found a way to give us recession and inflation in one package. I have heard of people knocking their heads against a stone wall, but rarely have I heard of them building a wall expressly for that purpose.

Of course, we Democrats are the current subject of national sympathy. The new fad is to describe the Democratic Party in disarray. All of a sudden "disarray" is the word. It is like an echo over the Swiss Alps—"disarray, disarray." This is not an easy time for any individual or any political party. It is a time of uncertainty and change.

But the test of a party's strength is not whether it has a bland grin on its face; it is whether it has the courage and the vision to look inside itself, change that that needs changing, and preserve the traditions and values that are worth preserving.

That is what the Democrats have been doing for the past year. Our Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection grew out of the Chicago convention. That convention was one of turmoil, of dissent, of demonstrations. But out of that convention was born our commission—to consider the process by which our delegates are selected, to see if there is a need for change, and to recommend ways we can change. We have gone all over the country holding hearings. We heard in open testimony any person who wanted to speak. We have accumulated 20 days of public hearings and thousands of pages of testimony from over 500 Democrats of every point of view. We met in executive session of the entire commission of 28 members for long hours. We have now completed our guidelines. They are reasonable, and they will win the respect of all elements of our party. We do have many spectrums in the party. But our object has been a set of guidelines for reform and revision that can unite our party around open and responsive procedures. That is not an easy job. It requires tedious discussion and compromise and the willingness to accept criticism. But I think we have come up with recommendations that are right and that will give us a stronger and more successful party, better able to serve its members and the American people.

The need for new guidelines is underscored by such facts as the following:

(1) In at least 20 States, there were no clear rules for the selection of delegates, leaving the matter to the whims of a handful of party leaders.

(2) More than a third of the delegates to the 1968 convention were determined prior to 1968 before either the issues or the candidates were known.

(3) The unit rule and the apportionment of delegates sweep aside minority political viewpoints.

(4) Excessive filing fees and delegate assessments excluded all but upperclass delegates in many States. Filing fees reached \$14,000 for a slate of candidates in one State.

(5) Representatives of women, young peo-

ple, Negroes, Mexican-Americans, Indians, and other groups was painfully below the proportion of these groups in the population. For example, women comprised only 13% of delegates, and only one of the 55 delegations had a women chairman. In most of the delegations, there was no one or only one person below the age of 30.

The commission guidelines for the States rule out in the delegate selection process such undemocratic procedures as closed or unpublicized caucuses, premature delegate selection, the abuse of proxy voting, and the unit rule.

We have barred discrimination based on race, creed, national origin, age or sex. We have eliminated restrictive delegate filing costs and assessments. We have called for clearly written party rules, accessible to any interested Democrat. We have called for fair representation of minority views and apportionment of delegate strength based on the concept of one Democrat, one vote.

We hear much criticism of the young today, but what many of them are saying is worth hearing. They tell us we are hypocritical to say we live in a democracy where democracy is not always practiced. We will lose their interest, their enthusiasm, their indispensable insight, if we do not hear their honest criticism. We heard them, as we heard others, before our commission. We have tried to take what is worthy as a guide for our political process.

The recently concluded Chicago trial underscores the importance of making sure that all of the institutions of our democracy function in a responsible fashion. That trial was deplorable—a disgrace to the court and our judicial system. The concept of that trial, based on the doctrine of political conspiracy, and the conduct of the trial should be matters of grave concern to all citizens who value our judicial process. The judge played into the hands of the defendants. His unfair and injudicious conduct may have done more to alienate and radicalize many of our young people than all of the defendants have succeeded in doing over a period of years. There is no doubt that the defendants sought to provoke the judge. But it is a fundamental responsibility of judges to resist any such provocation and to continue to preside in a judicious, dispassionate, firm, and even-handed fashion. That is the only way in which proper respect for our judicial system can be maintained. Yet, the judge was neither judicious nor even-handed.

He refused to allow the jury to hear one single word of testimony from Ramsey Clark, who was the Attorney General of the United States at the time of the convention. I regard that ruling as outrageous. He personally held the defendants and their attorneys in contempt, instead of disqualifying himself and referring the matter to another judge. When, as in this case, the trial judge was the object of the allegedly contemptuous conduct, then the matter should be turned over to another judge. No judge should decide matters where he is so personally involved in the controversy. In addition, it is a violation of fundamental fairness and good sense for the judge to conduct the sentencing session without giving the defendants or their attorneys any advance notice of what he intended to do.

Finally, the judge made what is to me an extraordinary and appalling ruling when he held that the government had an automatic right to wiretap or bug the defendants without any prior authorization by a court and without disclosing any of the contents of the tap or bug to any of the defendants. This doctrine poses a threat to our system of criminal trials. It is repugnant to our basic system of equal justice to all under law.

The real test of a judge is not how he conducts himself when the defendants are well-behaved and respectful, but rather, how he presides when the defendants are neither well-behaved nor respectful. The judge failed that test and failed it badly.

So let us look to the need for renewal of our time-honored traditions of personal dignity and freedom guaranteed by a legal process of dignity and justice. Insuring that another Chicago 7 Trial does not happen in this country is the special responsibility of those actively involved in the judicial process—those lawyers and judges and court personnel who know that our judicial process needs reform.

Insuring that another Chicago convention does not happen is the special responsibility of the Democratic Party. I am proud that our party, that our commission, took that issue head on—that we recognized the need for reform, and that we have already done a good year's work in trying to bring about that reform. If the judiciary had done its work, not only this past year, but through the years in taking long-overdue steps toward court reform, prison reform, rehabilitation of offenders—all those things that are needed to improve the integrity of our system of justice, we would be a year ahead. The Democratic Party is that year ahead. We are moving in the direction that we know we have to go.

And so when I read that our party is in "disarray," I know that we are on the move and that we will one day soon leave our rivals in a bygone age. I take confidence and hope in what we have done thus far and look to further improvements as we change with the times.

There are some hopeful developments, even in a time of difficult change. Let me mention one. Yesterday, the Senate passed the most far-reaching school lunch reform bill in our history. The school lunch program has been in operation for 24 years. Yet, it reaches only one-third of our 8½ million school children from poor families. Yesterday's measure would assure every poor school child at least one free hot meal each day. The Senate has clearly changed the priorities of the school lunch program so that no child need sit through his classes handicapped with the pain of hunger.

Yesterday's action on the school lunch program follows Senate passage of the Food Stamp reform bill last September. That food stamp bill—an outgrowth of the efforts of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs which I am privileged to head—would assure that every poor family in America is eligible for the food stamp program. It will make that program the principal vehicle for providing poor people with the income necessary for a decent diet.

These two bills—the Food Stamp and School Lunch reform bills—have fulfilled the Senate's responsibility to eliminate hunger in the nation. But the job is not finished. The House has passed neither the food stamp nor the school lunch bill. As Democrats, we have an opportunity to lead this fight and assure the final enactment of these two hunger reform measures. We also have an opportunity and an obligation to see that appropriations are provided to pay for these programs. The Nixon Administration has asked for less than half the money necessary to provide free lunch for our poor school children and less than one-third the amount necessary to finance the food stamp program passed by the Senate.

We should set high on our priority list a firm determination that never again shall any boy or girl, any man or woman, suffer the pangs of hunger in our land. If we can afford \$75 billion for military defense, we can afford a small fraction of that amount to defend our people against hunger, sickness and misery. Let us quit killing Asians and begin feeding hungry Americans.

One final word about priorities. What are we to say of the priorities of the Nixon Administration when this week it tells us that it will veto the education bill because it is inflationary. But it wants Congress to hurry

up and expand the ABM because presumably, that is not inflationary.

Of course, this is not only economic nonsense; it is a twisted sense of priorities. If it is inflationary for Congress to add \$400 million more for the education of our children, why is it not inflationary for Mr. Nixon and Mr. Laird to launch a \$50 billion ABM that won't work and that we don't need.

So let the Democratic Party be about the business of new priorities.

Let us turn away from a foolish war in Asia that has cursed our party and our nation for too long. Let us curtail the swollen military giant that is devouring our resources. And then, for the good of our party and the blessing of our nation, let us be about the redemption of this great but deeply troubled land.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOSEPH D. TYDINGS THE CRIME CRISIS

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before the Democratic Policy Council to outline my belief that an effective answer to the crime crisis must be at the top of our national and Democratic Party agendas.

I do not believe crime control ought to be a partisan issue. The threat of crime is too real and its cost is too high to all our citizens for crime control to be treated as a political game, in which the parties try to out-point one another. Regrettably, however, the GOP apparently intends to do just that.

The Republicans give every appearance of trying to kidnap the crime issue once and for all as the special property of the Republican Party, and to accuse all non-Republicans of being "soft on crime."

THE DEMOCRATIC ACHIEVEMENT

The plain fact is that the Democratic Party has no apologies to make on the crime issue. Every significant federal anti-crime program now on the books originated in a Democratic Administration and was enacted by a Democratic Congress.

For example, we passed the Safe Streets Act of 1968, which authorizes the hundreds of millions of dollars now passing into the states and local governments to improve law enforcement where the crime is actually committed—on the streets and in the homes and stores of Mr. Average Citizen, U.S.A.

The Safe Streets Act actually gets at the kind of "crime in the streets" which most concerns our citizens. The most controversial and loudly-proclaimed Nixon Administration anti-crime bills, like pre-trial detention and "no-knock warrants," actually have little or no application outside the District of Columbia and other federal enclaves. As President Nixon himself acknowledged in his State of the Union Message:

"The primary responsibility for crimes that affect individuals is with local and state governments rather than with Federal Government."

The most effective help the Federal Government can give the state and local governments now is to tighten the effectiveness of the Safe Streets program by doing away with the costly bureaucracy set up by the Republican block-grant amendment and to get the funds directly to the local police departments where the need is greatest.

Democratic Congresses under Democratic Presidents have put other landmark anti-crime measures on the books as well.

In the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act, we provided the backbone for whatever national progress has been made against lawlessness in our most crime-prone age group.

We also enacted the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act, the only federal attempt to help provide any control for drug-related crime. I might add that the Democratic Congress—over the Republican Administration's opposition—last year earmarked more than twice as much money for narcotics treatment as the President requested.

We put the first and only real effort at prison reform legislation on the books in the Offender Rehabilitation Act.

The Federal wiretap law was authored by Senator McClellan and passed overwhelmingly by a Democratic Congress.

The Organized Crime Program in the Department of Justice was triggered by Attorney General Bob Kennedy and continues as the major federal weapon against racketeers and corruption.

My Federal Magistrates Act of 1968 reorganized the entire first line of criminal justice in the Federal judicial system.

It was the last Democratic Administration which commissioned the national and local crime studies which have become the "bible" for improving law enforcement at the federal level and in cities and towns all across the country.

It was a Democratic President who created the National Violence Commission whose major recommendations on court reorganization and improved local law enforcement have given new impetus to rejuvenating the criminal justice system.

Finally, I took the opportunity last fall, as Chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, to commission a special Advisory Panel Against Armed Violence in the National Capital. That panel's recommendations, now being implemented by courts and law enforcement agencies, will substantially assist in reducing the serious crime problem afflicting our National Capital.

But since the Republican Party has chosen to make crime a political issue, we Democrats must respond responsibly to their regrettably partisan challenge.

First, as a house-keeping chore we must of necessity take time out to put the facts in the record with respect to what has been done and what has not been done about the crime crisis.

Second, we should propose and work for enactment of an all-out attack on crime in the United States by outlining and supporting a strong, constructive, and effective anti-crime program; a program based on concrete steps to strengthen our criminal justice system, not on political oratory.

THE REPUBLICAN RESPONSE

The plain fact is, that despite tough campaign talk, the Nixon Administration has failed to control the crime crisis. The Republican record so far is primarily rhetoric and buck-passing.

If speeches could be enacted into law, the statute books would be bursting by now with Republican anti-crime oratory. But while the crime situation grows more critical and the Administration press releases pour forth, Congress waited for months last year in patient suspense for any comprehensive crime proposals from the White House.

And we are still waiting for any Administration legislation at all on nationwide prison reform, nationwide court reform, nationwide narcotics-crime treatment programs, and for the amendments sorely needed to strengthen the Omnibus Crime and Safe Streets Act. Yet, substantial progress in each of these critical problem areas is indispensable to a significant reduction in the crime rate.

The Administration's delay in submitting even its meager anti-crime measures prevented them from being enacted in 1970. By letting half a year slip past, the Administration forced Congress to carry over into 1970 the few bills sent up.

Nonetheless, before Congress adjourned last year, the Committee of which I am chairman reported, and the Senate passed, in record time, every Nixon anti-crime bill for the National Capital. These bills are now undergoing final action in the House and I hope will become law by Easter—months late because of the Administration's own delays last year.

But if the Republican's bill drafters failed them, their printing presses did not. Instead

of sending us the bills, the Administration passed us the buck. They feverishly sought to blame Congress for the White House's own delays.

In its haste to cover its tardy tracks, the Administration invented a bizarre and sometimes bewildering numbers game, claiming Congressional inaction on a vague laundry list of bills of uncertain numbers and sometimes even less certain Administration authorship.

If the public was confused, it had a right to be. On October 9, the Attorney General said the Administration had sent Congress "more than 20" crime bills. Two months later, Chairman Bob Wilson of the Republican Congressional Committee said there were 18 Nixon crime bills.

The mystery deepened on January 26 when, in his State of the Union Message, the President said that he had sent Congress "thirteen separate pieces of anti-crime legislation."

Notwithstanding this mysterious disappearance of seven Administration anti-crime bills between October and January, however, probably the "Greatest Bill Robbery" of them all involved S. 30, the organized crime bill the Administration sought credit for all last year. That bill was introduced by Senator McClellan on January 15, 1969—five days before President Nixon even took office.

As a matter of fact, the principal Administration contribution to S. 30 was to delay its progress for months by tardy submission of the President's views on this Democratic Congress initiative. The Administration views, first requested on February 7, 1969, were not submitted until May 8. In the meantime, the Department of Justice further stalled the bill by being unprepared to testify in detail at the hearings held on it in March.

Now, all this Republican legislative legerdemain might be amusing, if it had not been so apparently successful. From the press reports and editorial columns I have seen, the Pennsylvania Avenue propaganda mill has successfully shifted the blame for all legislative anti-crime delays—and even for the soaring crime rate itself—from the Republican-held White House, where the blame belongs, to the Democratic-controlled Congress, which must stand for re-election this fall.

It is up to every member of the Democratic Party to carry the true case to the American people. You members of the Democratic Policy Committee have a particularly heavy responsibility to make effective anti-crime programs a top priority on our national agenda.

AN ANTI-CRIME PROGRAM FOR THE SEVENTIES

I recommend that the Democratic Policy Council adopt a program of tough, constructive, responsible anti-crime measures in the following areas:

1. Federal financial assistance to State and local law enforcement

First, I recommend amendment of the Omnibus Crime and Safe Streets Act to provide assistance to state and local police and prosecutors—the front line against crime.

1. The Law Enforcement Assistance Act should be funded at a level of at least 750 million dollars this year and its fund distribution formula changed to channel more funds to high crime urban areas.

2. Special federal legislation should be enacted to provide extra federal assistance to counties and cities which experience higher crime rates as a result of a spillover of criminal offenses from federal enclaves within or adjacent to such jurisdictions.

3. The Federal Government must embark on a program of research as ambitious and comprehensive as that we have conducted for years in national defense. Much of our investment will be wasted until we launch a vast effort to learn more about the causes of crime, to develop new police tools and

weaponry, to design new crime prevention devices, and to develop new communications, rehabilitation, and training systems.

4. The highest priority should be given to the program of the new National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. The Institute itself should be supplemented by creation of regional institutes which can assist every state and locality to use the new devices and techniques developed by the National Institute.

5. All firearms usable in crime, particularly handguns, should be subject to minimum registration and licensing by localities and states, or by the Federal Government.

6. Law enforcement should be added to the Selective Service list of essential occupations, so that young men entering careers in it can be deferred from the draft.

7. The Federal Government should establish a program of salary subsidies, adding to the salaries, of state and local police officers at least as follows:

Up to \$50 a month for those who are graduated by a special law enforcement academy.

Up to \$100 a month for those who hold or obtain a degree from an accredited two-year institution.

Up to \$200 a month for those who hold or obtain a degree from an accredited four-year institution.

Up to \$300 a month for those who hold or obtain a graduate degree from an accredited institution.

8. The Federal Government should go beyond the Safe Streets Act to provide an NDEA-type program of fellowships to pay the tuition, expenses, and salaries of those who attend college and graduate school, provided they agree to serve in the police profession for a reasonable number of years.

9. The Federal Government should establish a comprehensive program of grants to states and localities which wish to upgrade their salary schedules, and should encourage them to pay higher salaries to officers working in areas of high crime.

10. The Federal Government should establish a program to raise police retirement benefits, and to improve benefits to widows and orphans, including full college scholarships for orphans whose fathers are killed in the line of duty and life insurance for the families of police officers.

11. Police should be relieved from non-law enforcement functions, such as caring for alcoholics. Federal assistance should be provided to state and local public health departments to construct and staff detoxification units and alcoholic rehabilitation centers. The Federal Government should begin a program of research into the causes and cure of alcoholism, the control of which now consumes more than one-third of all police arrests.

II. Reform and modernization of the courts

The second major component of the anti-crime program ought to be reform and modernization of the courts—the keystone of the criminal justice system.

1. We should launch a broad attack on inefficiency and delay in our criminal courts, including passage of the National Court Assistance Act, training of more court personnel, improving management of our courts, and making Federal grants available to law schools and graduate schools for special programs to train prosecutors, public defenders, parole and probation officers, and court administrators.

2. The Federal Bail Reform Act should be amended or separate legislation enacted to prevent release of dangerous criminals.

3. The court reform provisions I inserted in the Omnibus Judgeship Bill to provide modern business management methods in the federal courts should be enacted.

III. Controlling drug abuse

The third major anti-crime area involves the kind of nationwide narcotics treatment

program which is essential to any attack on urban crime. Sufficient Federal assistance should be made available to every urban area to establish a comprehensive narcotics and drug abuse treatment program. Each city's program should be unified under a single authority, should include constant urine testing of its subjects, be continually evaluated by an independent panel of experts, and include the following three elements:

First, each program should encompass the entire criminal justice system, including persons on probation and parole and those in prison, in jail, and on bail. Each program must also have components for correctional institution and community-based treatment programs, including both methadone maintenance and drug abuse therapy, job counseling and guidance, and the necessary institutional facilities.

Second, every program should include an adequate juvenile drug abuse program, including appropriate narcotics-use testing in high schools and junior high schools, effective mass education programs which utilize the services of reformed addicts, and community-based treatment and counseling services for both parents and children.

Third, every program should include civil commitment procedures for known addicts, with appropriate treatment, counseling and rehabilitation facilities.

In addition, the narcotics traffic should be attacked by a massive federal effort that will turn the full attention of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to controlling the importation of, and traffic in, illegal narcotics through better intelligence and border surveillance and improved cooperation with foreign governments and international agencies like Interpol.

The recodification proposed by the President of existing drug laws should be enacted. That legislation include confiscatory penalties I suggested against major narcotics traffickers. Those penalties, designed to stop the drug traffic at the domestic source, were originally included in the model state drug abuse legislation I introduced last fall. That legislation should also be enacted for the National Capital.

IV. Making the corrections system work

Fourth, we must rapidly achieve reform and modernization of our correctional institutions—the most neglected area of the criminal justice system.

1. Our entire correctional system, both state and federal, should be reformed to provide intensive education and job training, and a comprehensive job placement program and follow-up on prisoners after they are released.

2. Legislation should be enacted to increase the number, improve the training, and raise the salaries of all correctional personnel. The state and federal governments should make funds available to achieve these objectives.

3. Adequate federal assistance should be made available for effective parole and probation in juvenile and adult courts in every jurisdiction so that judges truly have a choice between institutional and out-of-institution forms of treatment. Especially critical will be the service of adequate numbers of probation and parole supervisory personnel.

4. Correctional authorities should develop more extensive community programs providing intensive treatment as an alternative to institutionalization. Such programs of rehabilitation should emphasize basic education, counseling, and vocational training, and should be run to the fullest practical extent with the advice and participation of offenders and ex-offenders.

5. The Federal Government should give states aid for the development and operation of smaller institutions, closer to home communities. They should be operated not as prisons, but as bridges back to society. There

should be minimum standards for institutions, local, state, and Federal.

6. The Federal Government should give generous financial assistance to help states and localities replace antiquated jails, dark and forbidding police stations, overcrowded prisons, and primitive halfway houses.

7. Federal assistance to local work release programs should be greatly enlarged and include job placement upon final release from prison.

8. Federal legislation should be enacted to assist in constructing and staffing a new kind of correction facility for first offenders. Those prisons, at both Federal and state level, should be manned by the best qualified corrections personnel, provide realistic education and job training, and help place reformed inmates in meaningful, legitimate employment when they are returned to their community.

9. The Federal Government should encourage and subsidize experimental correctional programs—like those in California—which emphasize community-based job training, education, and intensive care. Special grants-in-aid should be made to states for the development of such programs.

V. Rooting out organized crime

No anti-crime effort can be complete without a massive Federal effort against organized crime. In addition to the enactment of S. 30, the McClellan Organized Crime Control Act:

1. The Federal Government should declare all-out war on organized crime. The Federal effort should include full participation by all relevant Federal agencies in a coordinated drive to gather evidence and prosecute organized crime leaders; upgrading the organized crime effort of the Federal Government by employment of additional personnel and making the Organized Crime Section of the Justice Department the coordinator of the Federal program.

2. The position of Assistant Attorney General on Organized Crime should be created in the Department of Justice to coordinate the entire Federal effort against organized crime.

3. A Federal anti-organized crime strike force should be created for every major urban area to break up organized crime at the local level.

A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON CRIME

Finally, I believe Congress should create a Joint Congressional Committee on Crime to conduct comprehensive studies of all criminal justice problems, and to recommend legislation.

APPENDIX I: ANTICRIME AND COURT REFORM LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY SENATOR JOSEPH D. TYDINGS IN THIS CONGRESS

S. 545: *Bail Reform*: To enlarge the D.C. Bail Agency and to increase its powers. (Passed Senate—July 8, 1969.)

S. 546: *Pretrial Detention*: To amend the Bail Reform Act of 1966 to authorize pretrial conditional release or detention of certain persons who are charged with the commission of serious crimes, and on the basis of clear and convincing evidence, who if released will endanger the safety of the community.

S. 547: *Pretrial and Posttrial Detention*: To restrict the pretrial release of any person who is accused of an offense punishable by death and to restrict the release of any person convicted of any Federal offense while such person is awaiting sentence or the result of an appeal.

S. 952: *Omnibus Judgeship*: To increase the manpower for the Federal Bench.

S. 962: *Grants for Law Enforcement Education*: To make grants to colleges and universities to help improve the education of law enforcement officers and to provide fellowships to those who plan to pursue a career in law enforcement.

S. 963: *Alcoholism Research*: To provide for

study of the cause of alcoholism and to provide detoxification units and alcoholic rehabilitation facilities.

S. 964: *Crime Control and Prevention Act*: Combines in a single bill all the elements contained in S. 962-979.

S. 965: *National Institute of Law Enforcement*: To establish a research center for crime control and regional crime study centers.

S. 966: *Study of Foreign Methods of Law Enforcement*: To provide grants for travel for observation and study by State and local law enforcement personnel of the operations of foreign law enforcement agencies.

S. 967: *Military Exemption for Law Enforcement Officers*: To provide deferments from the draft for policemen and correctional personnel.

S. 968: *Travel Funds for State and Local Law Enforcement Officers*: To provide grants for travel for observation and study by State and local law enforcement personnel of operations of other domestic law enforcement agencies.

S. 969: *Crime Conferences*: To provide for programs to bring together various State and local law enforcement officials for periodic meetings, seminars and consultations.

S. 970: *Grants to Increase Salaries of Law Enforcement Officials*: To provide supplements to salaries of State and local law enforcement personnel who have achieved certain educational levels.

S. 971: *Comparability for Law Enforcement Officials*: To increase salaries of certain State and local law enforcement officers to a level competitive with that of other comparable professions in a given locale.

S. 972: *Increased Benefits for Law Enforcement Officials*: To increase and expand retirement, injury and death benefits for State and local police officers.

S. 973: *Programs for Youthful Offenders*: To provide for the development and implementation of youth correctional programs.

S. 974: *Assistant Attorney General for Organized Crime*: To fight organized crime by creating an Assistant Attorney General for Organized Crime, to provide for training of State and local law enforcement personnel in methods of dealing with organized crime and to provide Federal facilities for protective housing of witnesses.

S. 975: *Compel Witnesses to Testify*: To provide for compelling testimony in certain Federal cases.

S. 976: *Felony Sentence*: To provide increased sentences for certain dangerous professional criminals.

S. 977: *Firearms Registration and Licensing Act*: To provide for better control of interstate traffic in firearms through registration and licensing.

S. 978: *Study Effects of Court Decisions*: To create a commission to study the effect of certain court decisions on law enforcement.

S. 979: *Judicial Determination of Temporarily Insane Individuals*: To provide for the commitment of certain individuals acquitted of offenses against the United States solely on the grounds of insanity.

S. 1214: *Court Reform*: To amend provisions of the D.C. Code dealing with the selection and tenure of judges in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, Court of General Sessions and Juvenile Court by creating a Judicial Nominating Commission and providing for good behavior tenure for judges.

S. 1215: *Court Reorganization to Cut the Criminal Case Backlog*: To increase the number of judges in the D.C. Court of Appeals and the D.C. Court of General Sessions and to expand the jurisdiction of the Court of General Sessions.

S. 1506: *Judicial Reform Act*: Creates a commission on judicial disabilities and tenure. Reviews and makes recommendations with regard to conduct inconsistent with the good behavior required by Article III of the Constitution.

S. 1507: *Judges' Mandatory Retirement*: Mandatorily requires federal judges to retire from regular active service upon attainment of the age of 70 years.

S. 1508: *Full Annuity for Judges who Retire after Twenty Years*: Passed Senate—October 29, 1969. Provides full annuity for judges who retire after 20 years of continuous service.

S. 1509: *Court Executive*: Creates court executives for each circuit judicial council to administer non-judicial activities of the court.

S. 1510: *Judicial Financial Disclosure*: Requires, pursuant to the rules of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the filing of financial reports by the judges and justices of the United States.

S. 1511: *Judicial Survivor Annuities*: Provides benefits for survivors of federal judges comparable to benefits received by survivors of members of Congress.

S. 1512: *Retired Judges' Compensation*: Provides each retired judge the salary of his office, for the remainder of his lifetime.

S. 1513: *Duties for Retired Judges*: Assigns judicial duties to retired judges.

S. 1514: *Judicial Councils*: Requires the judges in each circuit to attend its judicial councils which shall set forth all necessary orders for effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts within the circuit.

S. 1515: *Seniority of Chief Judge of a Circuit*: Improves the law with regard to selection of circuit chief judges and district chief judges.

S. 1711: *D.C. Court Executive*: To create the position of Court Executive to improve the administration of the D.C. Court of General Sessions.

S. 2335: *Juvenile Delinquency*: To authorize the District of Columbia to enter the Interstate Compact on Juveniles. (Passed Senate—September 18, 1969.)

S. 2601: *D.C. Court Reorganization*: To reorganize the courts of the District of Columbia, establishing the Court of General Sessions as a court of general jurisdiction and creating a court executive. (Passed September 18, 1969.)

S. 2676: *Obscenity*: To prohibit the sale to minors of certain obscene materials.

S. 2869: *D.C. Criminal Law and Procedure*: To revise the criminal law and procedure of the District of Columbia, including wiretap and search warrant procedures. (Passed Senate—December 5, 1969.)

S. 2980: *Drunk Driving, Shoplifting, Credit Card Fraud*: To establish that any driver on the streets of the District of Columbia has given his implied consent to take a test to determine the alcohol content in his body, to prohibit shoplifting in the District of Columbia, and to prohibit the theft, unauthorized use, and abuse of credit cards.

S. 2981: *D.C. Juvenile Courts*: To revise the laws of the District of Columbia on juvenile court proceedings. (Passed Senate—December 22, 1969.)

S. 3034: *Pre-Trial Detention*: To provide for 30-day pre-trial detention, in lieu of bail, for certain dangerous persons accused of specific crimes in the District of Columbia.

S. 3071: *D.C. Comprehensive Drug Abuse and Narcotics Control Act*: To provide a comprehensive program for the control of drug abuse and drug related crime through improved law enforcement, strict regulation of the distribution of controlled drugs, and prevention, treatment and study of drug abuse and drug dependence in the District of Columbia.

S. 3289: *National Court Assistance Act*: To improve the judicial machinery of our State and local courts through federal assistance and to establish a national center of up-to-date information on court management and organization. S. 3311: *Urban Crime Insurance Act*: To guarantee that residents and merchants in and around urban areas will

be able to obtain insurance to protect against losses resulting from crime.

S. 3312: *Small Business Crime Insurance*: To make crime protection insurance available to small business concerns.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HAROLD E. HUGHES, FEBRUARY 25, 1970

The last thing the American people want to hear today is a modern replay of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse.

They would like to wake up some morning to discover that Vietnam, the ICBM, Watts, the assassinations, the drug plague and the poisoning of Lake Erie never happened, that these were all parts of a bad dream.

But the truth is that these things did happen. The nightmare was real.

Hence any discussion of our national needs must be somewhat apocalyptic if it is to be true to reality.

This creates a problem for a political party, since the politics of doom has seldom been politically popular with the American people.

You don't enchant the electorate by saying the country is littered with time bombs ticking off the destruction of this free society—how ever true this may be.

People want to be told that the crises are not really that serious, that we are not doing all that badly in meeting our national problems.

There is some truth in this. The moves that must be taken to preserve our society are still within reach, although the distance lengthens with each passing day. And it is true that we are not doing all that badly. We have made significant progress in areas ranging from voting rights to Medicare.

We have even made significant progress—we Democrats have, at least—in the reform of our political party processes to eliminate bossism and make our conventions and delegate-selection processes more representative of all citizens of this modern society.

But the fact is that, across the spectrum, our problems are compounding more swiftly than the wheels of progress are moving to meet them. And the backlog resulting from past neglect is staggering.

All this adds up to the fact that the old policies, the traditional guidelines, are not working for the United States in the '70's. It will require more than face-lifting to make them work.

What is required is change—not superficial change, but major surgery.

John Kennedy's words are here to haunt us:

"Those who would make peaceful revolution impossible make violent revolution inevitable."

Are the American people, who are presently adrift on a sea of complacency, capable of accepting this strong medicine?

I frankly don't know, but I am inclined to believe they are.

In any event, I believe that we, as a responsible political party, have no choice but to carry the message to them.

If your home is burning, you have no credible course but to do your utmost to put out the fire, whatever your chances of success may be.

Apocalyptic or not, I believe we must keep driving home to the American people the reality of the crisis and the blunt fact that we have done little more than strike glancing blows at our ranking national problems.

And to the extent that we are facing most of these problems, our approach is a futile repetition of methods that have failed.

The prospect of peace in Vietnam is as remote as it ever was. We change our tactics but our fundamental policy remains the same.

The second-phase expansion of the ABM; the testing of MIRV; and the continued funding and development of a host of other acronyms of death mark the morbid perpetuation of our colossal military spending.

High prices resulting from the prodigal military outlays have put American families, who were formerly doing all right, in the hardship zone.

We are backtracking on the racial problem. Crime is on the upsurge despite the law-and-order talk.

Rural poverty and the desolation of the cities remain virtually untouched.

The destruction of our biosphere goes unabated.

Alcoholism and narcotics addiction are epidemic.

Education, health services, scientific research are slipping back.

Neither government nor private industry has done anything worth mentioning in preparing to convert our economy from war to peace.

This is all painful to relate, but this is the way it is. And beneath the current euphoria, we all know it.

It isn't that we don't have information to guide us. The reports of the Eisenhower Commission, the Kerner Commission and host of other authoritative reports languish on our shelves. We have studies, plans, and surveys running out of our ears.

We are simply locked into the policies of the past—policies of gradualism, and postponement, and of dreary dedication to solve our problems by doubling our efforts in directions already proven wrong.

At some point, we must awaken. The urgency is now.

We could use a George Washington or an Abe Lincoln in this hour, but first of all we need a Paul Revere.

We are all aware of how the nation can be aroused to a fever pitch for a fleeting moment and then slip back into complacency and business-as-usual.

When the Soviets launched the first Sputnik, we had a national furor over the education gap in America.

It quickly subsided.

When our cities were torn with riots and fire-bombs lit the sky in 1967 and 1968, we realized for a few vivid months that our nation was faced with civil war or violent revolution if we did not do something about the root causes of poverty, racism and crime in America.

But when the civil strife quieted down and the fires were quenched, we put aside the responsibility we had briefly recognized. We quickly forgot our resolution to get moving with the massive reforms that every thinking citizen knew were essential.

The American society has not always "copped out" in this fashion.

It does not need to be this way.

We can act, as a people, with immense determination and constructive purpose.

Witness how we got up off the canvas from the Great Depression.

If we were to devote—for one golden decade—the effort and resources to build a strong and just society here at home that we are presently devoting to the machinery of war, this nation could rise to heights undreamed of.

And we could do this, I am convinced, without stinting our true needs for national defense.

Obviously, the philosophy of the military over-kill and the devotion to military intervention as a prime instrument of foreign policy would have to be de-emphasized.

Personally, I believe the vast majority of our people, including the legendary Middle Americans, are nearer to accepting this reality than is generally realized.

Presently, the insatiable war machine dominates our culture, stultifies our national purpose and hogs our economic resources. Assuming substantial re-allocation of our effort and resources, what should be our goals for the '70's.

I believe most of us could come to agree-

ment on *what* our national priorities should be.

It is the urgency for fulfillment and the depth of commitment that are in question.

Above all, it is a question of whether we can lift the faces of old policies and get by or whether we must adopt drastically new policies.

I am convinced that the latter course is the imperative.

It involves risks, admittedly, but if we cleave to the status quo, we are headed toward almost certain disaster.

To illustrate the need for this willingness to venture, to take a radically different approach in keeping with the times, I would like to speak briefly about a specific phase of public health in which I have been working intensively—the area of the Drug Problem, U.S.A.

It is almost impossible to talk about a health approach to drug abuse and narcotics addiction without touching upon such other areas as crime and punishment, welfare and the alienation of our youth.

Almost everyone, from the President on down to the humblest person is aware that the Drug Problem in the United States has rapidly grown to critical proportions—and continues to mushroom in all areas of the country and in all social strata.

Civilized people in the 20th century realize that narcotics addicts and people who abuse drugs (including the most widely abused drug of all, alcohol) are sick people and not necessarily criminals. As is well known, some addicts resort to criminal acts to support the considerable economic burden of their addiction.

It would seem logical that if we recognize the seriousness of the Drug Problem in the United States and if we realize that drug addiction is a sickness, we would be determined to make a maximum effort to prevent or cure or control this sickness through public programs of treatment, rehabilitation and education. After all, if you send a narcotics addict to jail, he will eventually be released, only to return to society and to his addiction and usually to a life of crime to support his costly habit.

The fact is, however, that we are willing to spend almost any amount of public money to punish the addict, but no more than a pittance to provide the medical and rehabilitative services he needs to kick the habit.

In Virginia, where I live, the minimum penalty for a kid caught with a marijuana cigaret in his possession is three years. If he is caught giving one to a friend, he can end up with a twenty year sentence.

Excessively harsh punishment has failed to deter addicts or experimenters, yet our emphasis continues almost exclusively on tough laws and rigid enforcement.

As I have already suggested, our priority problems are interrelated and interlocking. The wrong emphasis with regard to the Drug Problem inflicts irreparable damage on our society by aggravating other problem areas—crime and corrections, poverty, education, and the alienation of youth. Parenthetically, I would warn that the youth revolt is not a superficial, passing phenomenon as many would like to believe, but a deeply imbedded social problem.

Intimidating talk, simplistic solutions, harsh discipline will not cure the alienation, and if we do not deal with it in a sensitive and sensible manner, our failure will haunt us for decades to come.

It is a ranking priority, a symbolic problem that will not begin to ease until we take the road of reshaping our national attitudes, policies and goals, including our stereotyped views on justice, crime, and punishment.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is something drastically wrong-headed and mixed-up about a civilized society that puts sick people in jail because of their affliction.

There is something wrong in a society

whose justice and corrections systems often tend to promote criminality instead of correcting anti-social attitudes.

In the hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics across the country, we have heard from dozens of witnesses who served time in penal institutions of every conceivable kind at all levels of government. Without exception, they testified that drugs and narcotics were readily available *within* the institutions, often more readily than on the outside.

There is something horribly wrong about a system that gives a decent judge no alternative other than to commit a kid on his first charge of drug possession to a typical American prison—a sewer of perversion, corruption, hate, and post-graduate criminality.

We pride ourselves on having progressed from the public hangings of 16th century England, the witch-burnings of our own colonial days, and the Devil's Island kind of exile prisons.

I seriously wonder if we are much better off today—or if our concept of crime and punishment is brutalizing our society just as the gallows, the guillotine, and the public floggings dehumanized earlier societies.

I am not pointing the finger of blame at any individual or group—although admittedly some in important positions of responsibility in our justice and corrections system are occupied by persons who are venal, corrupt, and inhuman.

It is the system that is wrong—a system that, in the name of protecting society, proliferates criminality and rehabilitates few.

And since our system calls for punishing sick people and criminals alike, a pitifully small amount of our public effort and investment goes into programs for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotics addicts, drug abusers, and alcoholics.

So we lock them up, subject them to a higher education in criminality, and then release them into society again to be serious menaces to the security of our homes, our shops and our streets.

We have blindly locked ourselves into a treadmill.

The very efforts we take to further law and order perpetuate and proliferate violence, lawlessness, and disorder.

By treating sick people as criminals, by treating those who have broken the law as animals, by concentrating on punishment—public revenge—rather than treatment, rehabilitation and the salvaging of human life, we have defeated our own original objectives and brutalized our society in the bargain.

Uncounted thousands of lives are lost each year; thousands of other lives are ruined; thousands of crimes are committed against innocent people because of narcotics addiction and alcoholism.

Each year, 25,000 people are slaughtered on our highways in accidents involving alcoholics.

Billions of dollars in economic loss are suffered by industry and government at all levels.

Yet we are unwilling to revolutionize our health programs, our justice and corrections systems along the lines the qualified professionals have repeatedly pointed out.

We have poured immense amounts of public money into our conventional law and order apparatus and we have failed to check either crime or addiction or to make society more secure.

It is time now for a major change of the entire system and of our public attitude towards crime and addiction.

It is time to spend a substantial portion of these vast resources to cure addicts and to change the basic attitudes of those who have committed criminal acts so that they will cease to be a threat to society.

It may even be time to inject some incentive into our criminal rehabilitation system. As it is now, if a young person com-

mits a minor crime that is classified as a felony, he bears the stigma of that felony throughout his entire life—unless he should benefit from a one-in-ten-thousand chance to receive an executive pardon. If such an individual has led an exemplary life for, say, 20 years, is it not conceivable that he should be fully reinstated into society?

The great priority that extends to all of our national goals is the willingness to change course completely when what we have been doing is no longer adequate to meet present and future needs.

Whether we are talking about racism or poverty or crime or drug abuse or equal rights, the basic component of our society is human life. If we lose faith in the identity, the value and the capacity of human life for change and redemption—then we have lost everything.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am well aware that I have not brought you any profound answers regarding methods to meet our national priority problems. I have simply tried to convey to you my deep feelings about the fundamental change in our attitude and approach that must be made before we can come up with any meaningful solutions to these critical problems.

In this context, I believe we are hung up on plans, gadgets, methods, and gimmicks. We are anaesthetized and diverted from course.

Fundamentally, we need a national commitment, not a bag of methodological or technological tricks. And we need to put the cold cash behind that constructive commitment before it is too late.

We can feed the hungry people in this land and give citizens decent health services, if we put our minds to it. It is simply a matter of doing it. What is in question is our *commitment* to get the job done, not our competence.

Perhaps we cannot completely solve the urban problem, but we can remove it from the priority list by investing, on a realistic basis, in saving our cities.

Money won't solve all such problems, it is often said by public officials who get themselves elected by the gutless refusal to support the funding of any constructive and humane public project.

But ask any able and experienced mayor and he will confirm the fact that adequate public funding will go a whale of a distance toward making our cities livable.

Let's not kid ourselves wondering whether or not we have the technological expertise to save our environment.

When the polite phrases have been spoken and the neat, neuter plans have been unveiled, we still know that human greed and the passion for profit is basically responsible for ravaging our environment and providing future generations with a heritage of muck.

We had the technology to destroy our biosphere; we have the technology to save it. What is needed is the commitment to save it.

We can, if we will, do a lot about the population explosion in a very short time.

We can dramatically reduce crime and drug abuse in America—but not the way we are presently moving. Not a chance. But we can change course, as I suggested earlier, and save thousands of human lives and billions of dollars in economic resources.

There is no neat, final answer to such sensitive social problems as race relations, equal opportunity and civil rights. But we could go a long way in a hurry with a decisive restatement of our national commitment—and the wherewithal to back it up.

We can do the things that we all know in our hearts need to be done in this country. We have the expertise. We have the resources. We simply need the commitment.

Maybe this would involve re-assessing the "crazy Chinese" theory which impels us to spend billions of dollars to fend off a re-

mote threat, while here, in an abundant land, people go hungry and our cities rot.

Maybe we would need to set aside or postpone the supersonic transport, which can hardly be termed a top-flight priority alongside education, equal opportunity, and public health. But we could survive this sacrifice and be no worse for wear.

What is needed is a commitment of courage, compassion, common sense and cash.

Lacking this, we stand to lose only our future.

REORDERING OUR NATIONAL PRIORITIES: THE RHETORIC OF PROMISE AND THE REALITY OF PERFORMANCE

(Statement by Senator BIRCH BAYH, Democrat of Indiana)

In his recent message accompanying the 1971 Budget, President Nixon billed his recommendations as a blueprint for "changing priorities." Citing some sleight-of-hand figures that hide from the public's view more than they reveal, the President announced that "we now begin to turn in new directions."

Behind the rhetoric of the President's promise, however, is the reality of the budget figures. The Secretary of Defense's much publicized \$10 billion cutback in military spending upon closer examination, for example, is nowhere to be found in the Nixon budget. The reality of the President's budget is a \$70.8 billion request in new obligatory authority for the Pentagon—an increase of \$1.2 billion when compared to Congressional action on the defense budget last year.

The Nixon budget, in addition, failed to include any estimates on the cost of Vietnam. That kind of budgetary magic causes one to wonder whether we are really headed in a new direction or simply in the same old direction. Surely the American public has a right to know.

The lesson of the Nixon budget is perfectly clear. A reordering of priorities, as reflected in federal spending figures, and not in words, is not automatic. It will not come automatically with a decreasing American presence in Vietnam; nor will it come automatically with a halt in the spiraling arms race. Surely it will not come about without them, but even if peace were to break out tomorrow we would have to wage a bitter political struggle to gain a greater share of federal revenues for critical domestic programs. That was made clear when President Nixon's Budget Director, Robert Mayo, described the hoped-for "peace dividend" as a "rather oddball concept."

Vietnam aside, however, the Nixon budget leaves unresolved the single most important factor determining the availability of revenues for human and social benefit programs—the size and shape of our military establishment. Today, more than at any time since World War II, that trade-off between defense spending and domestic expenditures is nearly direct. Thus, one can say with some degree of confidence that a dollar not spent on defense will be a dollar spent for education or health care. The reserve, unfortunately, is equally true. A dollar spent on defense means, in effect, a dollar less for our blighted cities.

This conflict between defense spending with its little more than 9% of GNP, and nondefense spending at all levels (federal, state and local) with its 20% of GNP, needs to be further refined if we are to fully appreciate the dollar for dollar trade off. More than half of the nondefense expenditures, for example are what can be described as "noncontrollable"—either because of normal growth or built-in Congressional power blocs. The real pressure for reducing expenditures in the face of defense requests, therefore, is in the controllable 5% of GNP that goes to human resource programs.

The tragic effects of this constant tug-of-war become even more evident when we con-

sider the General Accounting Office's recent study of defense spending. The GAO reported that as of June 30, 1969, 131 major weapons systems were in various phases of acquisition. The estimated total cost for this military hardware was put at a staggering \$141 billion. The conspicuous failure of the Nixon Administration to come to grips with this misallocation of resources by re-evaluating the importance of these programs for the nation's defense and means that the task of reordering our priorities falls to the Congress.

In view of Congressional initiative last year in cutting defense spending by more than \$5 billion that is not an altogether unhappy prospect. In determining where the President's new defense budget can be cut without endangering our national security, I am reminded of Morton Halperin's recent observation that: There is no clearly discernible relation between defense expenditures, within wide margins, and the ability of the United States to deter attacks, defend against them if they occur or use military power in support of diplomacy.

The current level of defense spending is well in excess of \$70 billion annually. Given those "wide margins" today, and with the knowledge that we already have developed an "overkill" capability, I think we can cut the defense budget further.

At this critical point in our national life, I am firmly convinced that a dollar spent on vital domestic needs is of significantly greater importance to the people of this country than a dollar spent on military hardware. The very same thing can be said, of course, for the trade-off between priority domestic spending and low priority nondefense expenditures. A realistic payments limitation in the farm price support and acreage diversion programs, for example, would produce a savings of anywhere from \$200 million to \$300 million annually without jeopardizing production controls. Another \$500 million could be saved by a more moderate manned space program.

Obviously, in reordering our priorities some difficult choices will be necessary. There is no easy way; no short-cut. But the mass of unmet domestic needs that we know exists adds up to an agenda of unfinished business that can no longer be deferred.

That agenda has already been spelled out for us in the great social and economic reforms enacted in the 1960's under Democratic leadership: the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Medicare, and the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. The elimination of poverty, providing financial assistance for the education of children from low income families, adequate health care for our elderly at reasonable rates, and a decent home for every American family—these are our domestic commitments.

Noble words, true, but are we honoring these pledges to build a better America? The fiscal 1970 appropriations bills speak louder and more meaningfully than our words, I am afraid.

Actual spending on human resource programs—including health, manpower training, housing, pollution, and law enforcement—is currently running about \$5 billion below Congressional authorizations. In housing, for example, the 1970 Nixon budget requested about \$500 million less than the authorization—and Congress misguidedly appropriated that much less. The only conclusion to be drawn from this, unfortunately, is that at the present rate of spending on housing we are very unlikely to build the 6 million federally subsidized units called for within 10 years by the 1968 Housing Act.

In reflecting on the gulf between the promise and the reality of the American Dream, President Kennedy once remarked: "We speak and what we do speaks far more strongly than what we say. What we are

sounds much more significant than what we say we are.

And to remind us that we are promising much more than we are delivering, there is:

The Kerner Commission Report's dire conclusion that "our nation is moving toward two societies, one black one white—separate and unequal." And that to reverse this deepening division "will require a commitment to national action . . . backed by the resources of the most powerful and the richest nation on this earth."

The Urban Coalition's "One Year Later," pointing out that "the nation's response to the crisis of the cities has been perilously inadequate." The building of a better America, the Coalition said, "will require a far greater commitment of our resources and energies."

The Kaiser Commission's study concluded we need a minimum of 6 million new subsidized housing units within the next decade and that unless we fully fund urban renewal and model cities legislation we will be tilting at windmills.

The Heinen Commission's Report on Income Maintenance, which found "severe poverty and its effects throughout the Nation among all ethnic groups . . ." The Commission concluded that "existing governmental mechanisms and institutions are simply inadequate" and recommended a universal income supplements program.

The Report of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. "To establish justice and to insure domestic tranquility," the Eisenhower Commission reported, requires "taking the actions necessary to improve the conditions of family and community life for all who live in our cities." It was the unanimous judgment of the Commission that "the time is upon us for a reordering of national priorities."

Mr. Chairman, I must admit to despair that with our present approach to priorities we cannot even hope to do what needs to be done—it is imperative that we make a conscious choice to turn our productive capacity toward the nation's domestic ills.

The Eisenhower Commission, for example, told us that "this nation is entering a period in which our people need to be as concerned by the internal dangers to our free society as by any probable combination of external threats." Why? Because those millions of Americans remaining outside the main stream of progress now know, on the basis of the great beginning made in 1964 and 1965, that there is a way out. There is a better way to live. They are impatient. I am impatient about our rate of social progress.

A century and a half ago, Alexis De Tocqueville explained the social dynamics of this process. "The sufferings that are endured patiently as being inevitable," he said:

"Become intolerable the moment that it appears there might be an escape. Reform then only serves to reveal more clearly what still remains oppressive and becomes now all the more unbearable. The sufferings it's true, have been reduced, but one's sensitivity has become more acute."

These are not novel observations, Mr. Chairman. They are the simple but stark facts that characterize our national life. The question for men of good will, therefore, is how do we go about changing this picture. We have heard a great deal recently about the need for Congress to create a new committee on priorities. The Policy Council itself has recommended the creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on National Priorities as a first step in a reordering of our priorities.

This could be a helpful first step, but I think we are deluding ourselves if we believe that by simply creating a new congressional committee we will win the political struggle that must accompany a change in direction. A committee on priorities is not a panacea.

In my judgment, what we need to do is find a way to overcome the Congressional roadblocks that grow out of the fragmented authorization-appropriation process and the Nixon Administration's failure to provide presidential leadership. I believe that Congress can do just that by adopting the idea first advanced by the former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Arthur Okun. What I am suggesting is that we automatically earmark a substantial portion of the so-called "fiscal dividend" to priority domestic programs.

The Okun plan has the great virtue of requiring only one political decision by the Congress. That decision is for the Congress to decide that it is necessary to compensate for the marked disparities between authorizations and appropriations for domestic priority programs. The automatic increase in federal revenues generated by an expanding GNP would enable us to fully fund already authorized legislation and present us with an opportunity to undertake a number of new initiatives, including revenue sharing with state and local governments.

On the basis of a 4½% increase in real growth and a 2% price increase, a total rise of 6½% in money GNP would produce, even with the revenue loss from the Tax Reform Act, about \$12 billion annually. Some of this revenue growth, of course, would be consumed by "uncontrollable" increases but enough money would be available to undertake a true reordering of our national priorities.

For better than two decades, the Cold War psychology has made us more aware of—and more responsive to—external threats to our national security than to any internal dangers. I believe that we are at a point now in our national life when the myriad of social problems facing the nation threaten to destroy our social fabric. The times demand not merely a greater awareness but a substantially greater response.

As the Eisenhower Commission so rightly pointed out, "it is time to balance the risks and precautions we take abroad against those we take here at home." Having balanced those risks, I am convinced we need to make a major commitment of money and effort toward the solution of our domestic ills. The President's failure to make the difficult but necessary choices to reorder our priorities and free sufficient funds to begin the task leaves the Congress no alternative but the Okun formula.

As a result of replacing the "what is left" approach with a conscious decision to move forward and fund priority domestic legislation, we would require any necessary and justifiable increases in defense spending to be met out of increased taxes. In the past, as I noted earlier, Americans have demonstrated a willingness to shoulder this burden—as long as it is necessary and justifiable. By making the relationship between defense spending and taxes more explicit, I suggest, we are likely to improve defense budgeting practices. Before asking the public to bear additional taxes, we can be certain the President would require the Pentagon to scrutinize its own programs with a view toward eliminating luxury items: Costs overruns would be a thing of the past if the trade-off was increased defense spending or higher taxes.

A periodic adjustment in the priority structure can be made by the Congress. But adequate nutrition, schools, medical care, employment opportunities, housing and a decent environment for all Americans—these important programs should no longer be the subject of presidential whim to be used as tools manipulated for political purposes. These should be placed at the top of our nation's shopping list and kept there until the unfinished business of America is completed and the American dream becomes the American reality.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUE,
FEBRUARY 25, 1970

PRIORITIES—HOUSING

During my decade in Washington, those of us in government who wrestle with the enormous problem which each elected member or official must face, generally have sought the best possible solution without regard to party even though in our search we reflected some local or regional bias or point of view. Indeed, many would argue that in the evolution of the politics of this country earlier clear differences and sharp distinctions between parties have disappeared. These differences have now been so "fuzzed up" that some political scientists and others feel there is no ideological choice. The adherents of Governor Wallace on the right, as well as the radical left, insist with equal fervor that there is no significant differences and therefore no real choice, between the Republicans and we Democrats.

Well, I am here today to tell you that there is a difference—an important difference. That difference is one of priorities and of choices. It is a question of the degree of our concern for people—particularly for the people without power, the people without influence—and too frequently the people without hope.

In a sense all government actions are a matter of priorities. All government decisions are a matter of choices.

And it is in this area that this Republican Administration has now clearly demonstrated where its loyalty and concern is directed.

While they have demonstrated their bias in a number of areas it is my purpose here today to give particular attention to what I believe has been their most disastrous area of neglect and the prime victim of their ill-considered policy.

I refer to one of the basic needs of all men—shelter—or what we more commonly refer to as housing.

There has been some talk—some speculation—that we are in the early stages of another Republican recession. Certainly this appears to be a strong possibility. But be that as it may, there is no question but that in the area of housing we are not only in a recession but in a major depression. And there is no question but that this is a Republican engineered depression.

Today we find half of our people—virtually all moderate income families—priced out of the housing market. Housing starts have plummeted from an annual rate of 1.9 million at the time President Nixon took office to under 1.2 million units this current January. This is less than half the number needed if we are to begin to meet the housing needs of our people.

The President's Economic Report clearly indicates this is no temporary condition and that we can anticipate construction of only 10 million units by the end of 1975.

The policies of this Administration, if they are permitted to prevail, will leave us with less than half of the 26 million new units which were found to be needed in the 1968 Housing Act.

Not only is new housing not being built in quantities sufficient to meet our most minimal needs, existing housing is being priced out of reach of a majority of our nations families. This is true whether you rent or buy. In the midst of this housing depression we find unparalleled inflation. The cost of housing—the largest single family expenditure requiring some 26% of the family budget is up more than 10 percent in the last year.

One of the primary costs in purchasing a home is the cost of money. This Administration's tight money policy has resulted in an unprecedented increase in the cost of home mortgages. The average interest rate on new home loans this January was 8.35 percent nationally. In the Western United States

it was over 9 percent. And on top of this many a buyer has to pay "points" which further inflate the cost of borrowing money.

Even at these fantastic rates money is not available in sufficient quantities.

And this high cost of mortgage money is an added burden which will afflict the home owner not just today but from now until that distant day, twenty or thirty years hence, when his home is finally paid for. As the Republicans have tightened the monetary screws—as they have increased interest rates—they have particularly increased the costs for long term borrowers such as home buyers.

By the economic decisions this Administration has made, it has denied to millions of Americans a basic right—the right to own a home. The Administration obviously fails to give home ownership, and decent housing, the priority it deserves.

There is little point in engaging in rhetoric about improving our environment if we are going to adopt policies so destructive to man's most immediate environment—his home.

Now I know the President will tell us the policies which have resulted in this housing depression are for the purpose of fighting inflation.

Concern over inflation is neither a new nor a partisan one. The Republican Party Platform of 1968 decried the inflation which, and I quote "robs our paychecks at a present rate of 4½ percent per year". They went on to lament the "crippling interest rates, some the highest in a century, (which) prevent millions of Americans from buying homes and small businesses, (and) farmers and other citizens from obtaining the loans they need."

Without belaboring the point, the situation today is much worse. We can almost talk of the "good old days".

I want you to know that I share fully the President's expressed concern about inflation. And I wish he would take effective action to halt it. For it does rob the paycheck of every working man. It does depreciate the value of every American's savings and that of his insurance policy. Inflation is particularly burdensome, and costly, to those who must exist on fixed incomes, whether it be retirement income or salaries and wages. It is hardest on the least organized and the lowest paid. It is particularly burdensome to farmers and small businessmen who are neither free nor able to see the price for their product or service.

We must all help fight inflation. But this Republican Administration apparently believes otherwise. Increased interest rates, in addition to cut-backs in Federal spending for education, health, and welfare programs, must apparently do the job. A tight money policy is their answer.

While bankers get richer—at an unprecedented rate—those who must borrow suffer increasingly.

Since Nixon's election the prime rate—the lowest rate at which the most secure borrower can get money—has increased 36 percent. We now have the highest interest rate in over a hundred years.

While this Republican Administration increases the burden on the sick, on children, on state and local taxpayers, and on everyone who must borrow to purchase the necessities of life, the bankers and other large lending institutions are experiencing higher earnings, earnings increasing at an unprecedented rate. For example, the First Chicago Corporation, owner of First National Bank of Chicago, reported earnings up a whopping 44½ percent this last year. Bank earnings' increases in excess of 25 percent are common.

While the Republican Party talks about the Democrats being spend-thrifts with the tax dollar, this unfettered—indeed government encouraged—increase in interest rates raised the cost of financing the National debt by

\$1.6 billion dollars in 1969. This is more than the additional amount we attempted to vote for education and health.

And all these costs to Mr. and Mrs. Average American have not only been burdensome but also obviously ineffective in the fight against inflation.

The rate of price rise has increased, not decreased, since the Republicans took over the White House. This past year it was 6.2 percent compared to the 2 percent average during the Kennedy-Johnson years.

Republican efforts have not only been misdirected—they have been accompanied by a failure in Presidential leadership. The President has refused to attack one of the prime contributors to the inflationary spiral. Indeed one of his first announcements after assuming that high office was to give the green light to big industry—to steel, copper, aluminum, automobiles, and other basic industries, as well as to financial institutions, to increase their prices.

He would not take them to the White House woodshed if they increased prices, he said. He would understand that their responsibilities were to their stockholders and to maximizing profits, and not to concern themselves with the effects such self-centered behavior might have on the rest of us. What a contrast to the leadership demonstrated by his predecessors, President Kennedy and President Johnson.

It is here then that we Democrats separate from our Republican counterparts.

How is the bill for fighting inflation going to be paid—and by whom? That is the question. This is where we divide. This is where we differ.

The Democratic Congress has empowered the President to restrict credit. The Republican President increased the cost of credit instead in his futile efforts to fight inflation. It is time he used the tools which have been provided effectively to halt inflation and to do so without such damaging effects to the housing industry.

While the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs has engaged in some worthy efforts such as "Operation Breakthrough"—I applaud the concept—the Administration economic philosophy and policies have undercut the very foundations upon which any successful housing program must be built.

This Administration is just not spending the money necessary to achieve any breakthrough in the housing field. While our Federal defense research efforts are funded at a \$7 billion a year clip, space research at \$4 billion, and agricultural research at \$600 million, the Department of Housing and Urban Development gets some \$20 million.

If we are to solve the housing problem we must have a concerted attack on the problem. It is not just government—but it requires governmental leadership.

We must also get rid of outmoded practices, for in the next 30 years we must build nearly as many units as now exist if we are going to adequately solve our problem.

This includes outdated building codes and practices. While on site labor costs have declined in recent years, I know my friends in Labor will recognize that we cannot afford to permit barriers to more efficient construction to remain in place.

Nor can we afford to insist on the use of outmoded building materials.

The economies of mass production must increasingly become available to this industry. Mobile home manufacturers are currently responsible for one-fourth of the new single family dwelling units constructed. The techniques responsible for their increasing success must become available for other types of housing.

And we need to go beyond the immediate construction of housing to exercise an increased concern for the nature of the communities we build. We see some hopeful signs in new towns like Columbia, Maryland,

but this is an area where we lag far behind many Western European countries.

Our bigger problems of community decay, of school segregation, of transportation from home to job, will not be solved unless we plan and build stable integrated communities.

Every major development must be so planned that it is a microcosm of the kind of total community we desire. Only government can do this job.

We must make provision for low and middle income housing in each of our major developments. In the past public housing has meant "barracks for the poor" built in the least desirable part of town. Housing which is the cheapest to build, may indeed, be the most expensive in the long run when costs not directly related to site acquisition and home construction are included.

There are many conflicting claims on the resources—economic, technical, and moral—of government. I know there are other very important priorities to which I understand others have addressed their attention before this body. I do not pose as an expert on the housing problem, but I do know that it is a concern of our people which is heard with increasing frequency. Any cursory examination of the problem will fully document that it is one which will be even higher on the agenda for affirmative action if this Administration's lack of attention and misguided policies are not soon corrected.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PHILIP A. HART,
FEBRUARY 25, 1970

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps the greatest bill of goods sold in this country today is that we have a free competitive economy. In fact, there may be no more competition today than 80 years ago when Congress was so shocked by the action of the trusts that it passed the Sherman Act to break them up.

Combines, cartels and illegal price-fixing have not been eradicated. Increasing economic concentration—spurred in large part by the growth of the multi-tentacled conglomerate—now gives the majority of all manufacturing assets to 200 corporations. With this comes the immunities to marketplace demands that giantism endows. The law of supply and demand is further distorted because of the inability of consumers to make rational buying decisions and because of their lack of an appeal to the board room of the corporation which is several times removed.

One estimate is that consumers yearly lose \$45 billion because of monopoly pricing. In 1969, that meant eight cents of each dollar consumers spent.

To that waste must be added overpayments because of price-fixing conspiracies. It is thought such conspiracies raise prices by 15 to 35 percent. The total dollar amount for any year could be only "guesstimated." But past experience shows that the sum is probably sizable—and the product range wide.

In Washington state between 1954 and 1964, consumers overpaid 35 million dollars for bread. If the conspiracy had been nationwide for that period, the total sum out of consumers' pockets would have been \$3 billion.

Electrical companies paid about one-half billion dollars to settle suits following their price-fixing conspiracy.

Judgments in the plumbing price-fixing cases may go as high as \$1 billion, making it the largest antitrust case of all time.

Drug companies offered a \$120 million settlement to close out suits against them for price-fixing of antibiotics.

Discovery of an international cartel in quinine and quinidine by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee brought down prices by 50 percent.

As concerned as all should be about illegal activity which takes money out of consumers' pockets, I hope I can interest you today in becoming stirred up more

about the structural changes in the economy and the barriers in the way of consumers and small businessmen who would contribute to moving us closer to a free enterprise economy.

We are caught up in the greatest merger wave in history. The result is that in 1968, the 100 largest corporations controlled assets equal to those of the 200 top companies in 1950—and of the top 1,000 companies in 1941. The top 200 companies now control 60 percent of all manufacturing assets. The distasteful democratic and social implications of this increasing concentration of economic power, to me, are self-evident. The impact on competition is still being examined and line-by-line, the book of experience is being written.

But one fact is clear: increasingly the competition which does exist centers on such things as product differentiation or the clever ad—rather than to delivering the best quality at the best price, the hallmark of a competitive system. In fact, I sometimes get the feeling in listening to testimony before the subcommittee that price competition has been moved over to the list of characteristics of "destructive competition" by many businessmen.

It is small wonder that the phenomena of the '60s—consumerism—came about.

Consumerism—like all revolutions—is merely the lava flowing from a volcano of frustration.

Consumers who sought to make the "best buy" in supermarkets, department stores, discount houses, and such were frustrated in not having the proper information to make a rational judgment. Consumers who made purchases were frustrated in attempts to get complaints adjusted. Consumers who bought warranted products were frustrated by the inadequacy of service. Consumers who responded to clever ads and bought the products were frustrated to find they didn't get what the ad had led them to believe they would.

And beneath it all, was the suspicion that when X-dollars were spent, X-dollars worth of product wasn't received.

In other words, consumers may have been the first to detect that this indeed is not a free enterprise economy. For instead of the buyer being king, he does not—and cannot—make his commands be acted on. At first this awareness was a personal—and a quiet—thing. For consumers, I suspect, were a bit embarrassed to admit that they were not able to cope with the challenge of spending their money wisely.

But gradually awareness grew that the experience was not unique—but universal. Further, introduction of such bills as Truth in Lending and Truth in Packaging gave birth to hope that it was, after all, possible for the little man to fight the big corporations. President Kennedy gave them new spirit when he declared that consumers had rights.

Congress—at least the Democratic portion—ever since has been trying to deliver protection for those rights John Kennedy spelled out. The progress has not been easy . . . nor has there been enough. But I think the ball is rolling and will continue to roll.

However, I'm concerned that we may become so busy with mopping up the lava and building fences to contain it, that we will not get to the more important job of tearing down the volcano of frustration.

It is to this demolition job that I call for dedication from the Democratic party today.

What is needed, I think, is an offensive and defensive team approach.

The defensive role is government's.

First, if we are to enjoy the free enterprise system in a form as close to perfection as humanly possible, government must use the antitrust laws to their fullest in guar-

anteeing a marketplace full of viable, and honestly competing competitors.

The concentration wave must be halted by prohibiting all mergers that may substantially lessen competition—be it in a market, the nation, or the world.

In 1968, there were 192 acquisitions of companies having assets of \$10 million or more—these would be the companies in the middle strata, which normally would be viable competitors with the promise of growth. Eighty-nine of those acquisitions were not even casually looked at by either the Federal Trade Commission or the Department of Justice. Yet they were the mergers most likely to hamper competition. In my book each merger involving companies of this size should be examined. To do so will require adequate funding for the antitrust agencies—something they have not had in the past.

Also, careful study must be made of existing concentration to determine where it is hampering competition to the disadvantage of consumers.

Competitive impact must be considered not only when matters are being studied by the antitrust agencies but each time another government agency moves—be it the FCC, the ICC, the FDA or even the State Department. (The latter agency we learned during our investigation had a significant role in aiding the quinine cartel in cornering the world market in the drug.)

The offensive team would be made up of both government and the public—divided into consumers and competitors. When the antitrust laws were enacted as the best means of protecting a competitive system, Congress saw the importance of private enforcement, as a supplement to government actions. Recognizing that government neither could—nor should—be the policeman in every commercial outlet, it encouraged those citizens hurt by unfair or anticompetitive actions to sue for relief. Treble damage provisions were included in the antitrust laws as the carrot on the stick to encourage such suits as well as to provide a deterrent to would-be violators.

Unfortunately, private enforcement has been a disappointment.

This is partly because an antitrust suit is an expensive proposition—discovery costs alone can run \$100,000 in an average suit—and the burdens of proof are extremely hard for a private plaintiff to bear.

Obviously, government must ease the path somewhat if it expects assistance from the public bringing such suits.

Several bills which would do this are now pending in Congress—and I urge your dedication to their enactment.

Of most significant impact no doubt would be action to make it easier to bring class action suits—either on behalf of businessmen or consumers commonly injured.

My proposal in this area is to open up enforcement of section 5 of the Federal Trade Act—which flatly prohibits all unfair or deceptive acts in commerce—to private class action suits, by both businessmen and consumers.

Two other bills now before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee represent the basic philosophy—that private actions are to be encouraged. These would make section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act so businessmen could sue for sales at unreasonably low cost. The other could make a judge treat a nolo contendere plea in a government case the same as a guilty plea when considering an ensuing private action. This could alleviate the necessity for the private plaintiff repeating the expensive investigatory work already done by the government.

The other type of help government must give if consumers are to be able to help chip away at that volcano of frustration them-

selves is a permanent, independent consumer organization with branches in local communities.

My proposal in this area is to establish a federally chartered, independent corporation, the Independent Consumer Council.

The Council would have three functions; to represent consumers' economic interests before governmental agencies; to disseminate product information, and to act as the ombudsman for complaints against government and mediator for product and service complaints against business.

Mr. Chairman, we hear a lot today about the "silent majority." Maybe my mailpile contains different types of communiques than the President's, but I think the silent majority has become quite vocal.

For example, in the past 18 months, the Antitrust Subcommittee has received some 6,000 letters of complaint on auto repair problems alone. One rule of thumb estimate is that those letters represent six million unhappy car owners.

If in fact there ever was a silent majority it was merely because they got tired of yelling into the wind. But the winds are changing—and they are carrying the voices of consumers loud and clear to Congress.

What those voices say is: We want a chance to get our money's worth.

It seems a reasonable request to me and one we should be committed to doing all in our power to answer.

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., FEBRUARY 25, 1970

I welcome this opportunity to testify before the Committee on National Priorities of the Democratic Policy Council and commend the Committee for its efforts to evaluate the pressing national problems.

At the outset let me suggest that any evaluation of our national problems and any recommendations that may flow from these hearings must be rooted in two simple, declarative sentences from our Nation's birth certificate:

"We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

As we all recall, the Declaration of Independence has two more structural segments. First, it discusses the need for revolution; and secondly, it recites the litany of abuses attributed to George III of Great Britain.

I do not advocate revolution and I believe that it is not in the Nation's interest to devote time and energy to the fixing of blame on the present administration. Nor do I believe we can afford merely to stake out sound political positions for 1970 and 1972. Rather, we must find workable solutions to the problems that exist now, whether they were created by the current administration, or whether they are the legacy of our Party's years in power.

And let us at least be candid with ourselves—the military-industrial complex was not created on January 20, 1969.

Our national problems are many and varied. They include:

- Vietnam;
- National Security;
- Pentagon spending;
- Domestic priorities and the domestic budget;

- The economy and taxes including burdensome state and local taxes;

- Urban problems, race relations and law and order; and

- Civil rights and civil liberties.

Read the newspapers for the last week; our national problems scream out at us.

VIETNAM

We bomb North Vietnam twice in one week;

We increase bombing in Laos to protect our troops in Vietnam;

We neither increase our rate of withdrawal nor set a date for withdrawal of all our troops;

And the CIA flies missions in Laos.

WASTEFUL PENTAGON SPENDING

ABM, that monstrous chameleon, changes from safeguard to sentinel and the doomsday concept of protecting the population against a Chinese missile strike is resurrected;

And the Pentagon budget continues to rise while defective aircraft fall.

DOMESTIC PRIORITIES AND THE DOMESTIC BUDGET

School budgets are being voted down across the country and we continue an outrageous farm price support program;

The Administration seeks additional billions for aircraft carriers and C-5A's and threatens a second veto of a pared-down education appropriation;

The Job Corps is stripped bare and the promised replacement never materializes.

THE ECONOMY AND TAXES

The economy has changed—we have come around from rapidly increasing prices and a production boom to run-away prices and a productive decline;

We apologetically recognize our tax debt to laboring America and timidly begin to close some tax loopholes.

URBAN PROBLEMS, RACE RELATIONS, LAW AND ORDER—CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

We refuse to build our model cities and react with horror to the riots that tear the ghetto down;

We pledge allegiance to the flag and promise liberty and justice for all—but—we subpoena unpublished press reports and intimidate the news media;

We arrest student demonstrators who've been deprived of an effective peaceful voice including 900 peaceful demonstrators in Mississippi who had the bad judgment of being both students and black;

And we indict whole classes by generalized press releases. Each of these areas raises vital concern.

I know you will hear testimony on all of them and I will continue to focus on them as we deliberate on this year's Legislation. Today, however, I wish to focus on one major problem in our society which is approaching catastrophic proportions.

Education.

The inadequate way in which we have dealt with education in the United States reflects not only the confusion of national priorities but also our seeming inability to perceive important means of resolving the difficulties which affect us on an individual basis.

Every American is presently feeling the impact of the continuing rise in prices, high taxes, increasing unemployment, pollution of our air and water, a shortage of decent housing, racial discrimination, the spiraling crime rate, the decline of the central city—to name but a few. Unfortunately, too many of us have failed to understand that our failures to properly support our education system has contributed materially to these problems.

What is it that education can do to cure our ills?

Education can help to wind down the spiral of higher prices by providing us with more automobile mechanics and more doctors.

Adequate federal funds for education will help property owners who can no longer shoulder the burden of increased local taxes needed to support our nation's schools.

And lower taxes can often make the dif-

ference between owning a decent home or continuing to live in cramped quarters and in an unhealthy, even hopeless, environment.

Proper training for the jobs of today—and tomorrow—will provide fuller and more productive employment.

A relevant curriculum can produce a better understanding of the extreme dangers of pollution and also train the new personnel needed to clean up the muddy waters and choking atmosphere.

Education leading to the reality of a job will give promise to those who otherwise might resort to a life of crime.

It will provide us with more and better trained law enforcement personnel.

A better understanding of one another should go a long way to counteract the destructive social and economic effects of bigotry.

And an equal educational opportunity for America's minorities and her poor will provide the basis for revitalizing the inner city where they have been forced to live.

Yes—education is in our self-interest. And it is in the interest of our national pursuits.

However, it has not ranked high enough in our national priorities. The blunt truth is that the education system in the United States is on the brink of a dangerous decline. \$1.1-billion was earmarked as an additional and vital federal contribution to the support of education in this country.

Yet, the President saw fit to veto that amount and we could not get an adequate consensus in the House to override that veto. And even with a \$364-million cut in that amount passed by the House last Thursday, the Administration has threatened to say "NO" a second time.

Nor do we seem willing to follow through on the Constitutional guarantee of an equal education for all our nation's children.

The Stennis Amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Bill, by its author's own admission, is intended to result in a delay or disruption of the progress now being made in the elimination of racially segregated, dual school systems. We cannot afford to reap havoc with the advances we have already made in overcoming *de jure* segregation while we strive to find the means to correct *de facto* racial isolation.

Whether we win or lose the controversy surrounding the past and threatened veto of increased education funds there will continue to be a need for local government officials and school administrators to have some degree of assurance that a certain level of federal funds will be forthcoming on a year-in, year-out basis. In addition, there must be some relief to the excessive burden of taxes on the residential homeowner and others in the real property tax base. And that relief must come soon.

In New Jersey and other states, property taxes are the primary revenue source for financing the ever increasing cost of elementary and secondary education. In many localities taxes on the homeowner have reached their maximum. All over New Jersey communities are voting down their school budgets because the individual can no longer afford to pay the sums necessary out of his own pocket. The Mayor of Jersey City has, in great sadness and utter dismay, announced that he will have to close that city's public schools because the property tax base has been saturated and there are no additional funds in sight. Just last week he filed suit to make the State authorities assume the full burden of Jersey City's education system.

To meet this critical and worsening problem in the United States, we must consider the establishment of a permanent method of providing substantial federal support for elementary and secondary education. Only a permanent method will do.

Beginning in 1971 and continuing thereafter on a permanent basis federal grants in aid must be earmarked and made avail-

able solely for financing primary and secondary education.

The total amount available for this single purpose would not be determined in dollars but rather by a percentage of the increases in federal revenues collected annually using 1970 as the base year. The percentage might be from 25 percent to as much as 50 percent of all increases in federal revenue depending upon the results of measuring such percentages against estimated needs of our education programs.

These earmarked funds could then be distributed to the States not just on the basis of population but, more importantly, on the basis of the needs which arise in the States.

Of course, this proposal requires further exploration. The Senate has just passed amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Acts which go a long way toward providing increased education funds where the needs are greatest. But the crisis we face demands more. The 1971 budget projects that at least \$22 billion in increased revenues will be available through 1975 for new initiatives. Furthermore, I hope that Congress will continue to exercise its good judgment in shaping fiscal policy and reduce defense expenditures where they are unnecessary and wasteful. Such action should result in freeing even more funds than are currently projected. We must give careful consideration this year of how we want that money to be spent. The needs of our educational system today should give us a clear indication where we must invest for the future.

The Commissioner of Education, Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., stated recently:

"Unless we take action now to accelerate the pace of reform, to improve rapidly the capability of our educational system to correct the deficiencies, we can only expect the gap between need and performance to continue to widen."

I am in complete agreement. There can be no question that the need is now. Certainly the proper attention to our education system will not solve all of the problems which beset us but the expenditure of our energies in this direction will be a vital expression of our determination that the gap between need and performance must not continue to widen.

We are faced with many urgent problems, education is just one. We must begin if our national priorities are to reflect our commitment to the goals of our national heritage.

RUNNING SPRINGS SIXTH GRADE STUDENTS CONDUCT POLLUTION-PRIORITIES POLL

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as part of my efforts in the crucial struggle for environmental quality, I have recently asked many Californians their views on a number of key questions relating to this overall issue.

Members of the sixth grade class of the Running Springs, Calif., elementary school also used my questionnaire as the basis for a classroom poll. As their class secretary, Lisa Aldinger, notes in her letter to me:

We believe your questionnaire will make more people think about the problem . . . we all should be more aware of what's happening.

I agree with Lisa, and I am glad to see

these young citizens taking such an interest in public affairs.

Because I think that the poll done in the Running Springs sixth grade reflects a keen appreciation of current issues, I am inserting into the RECORD the results of the poll and the ordering of priorities as gaged by these students.

The poll follows:

RUNNING SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
Running Springs, Calif., February 4, 1970.

Hon. GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. BROWN: Our teacher made copies of the questionnaire you sent to our parents about the environment. We all filled one out. We totaled our answers. You might like to know how we think about your questions.

Our class is very concerned about what's happening to our environment. We believe your questionnaire will make more people think about the problem . . . we all should be more aware of what's happening.

Sincerely yours,

LISA ALDINGER,
Class Secretary.

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you favor proposals to ban the internal combustion gasoline engine unless it meets stringent exhaust emission standards?

Yes ----- 14
No ----- 6

2. Do you feel that the oil companies and automobile manufacturers should be required to act more quickly to solve the problems of air pollution?

Yes ----- 11
No ----- 9

3. Do you favor a Federal Regulatory Commission on Environmental Quality?

Yes ----- 19
No ----- 1

4. With 95% of the 8,000 miles of the nation's shoreline in private hands, do you favor stronger government efforts to regulate shoreline use, in order to substantially increase the amount of beach property available for public use?

Yes ----- 13
No ----- 7

5. With the state's open spaces increasingly filled by urban sprawl and unplanned development, would you support stronger government efforts to regulate use of undeveloped open spaces, including advance acquisition of land for public use?

Yes ----- 13
No ----- 7

6. Would you support a complete ban on all Federal offshore oil drilling except in national emergency?

Yes ----- 16
No ----- 4

7. Do you favor much stronger governmental efforts to educate the public as to the problems of over-population?

Yes ----- 15
No ----- 5

8. What do you consider the national priorities for 1970?

RANKING OF PRIORITIES

1. Pollution, 2. Vietnam, 3. Crime, 4. Education, 5. Inflation, 6. Urban Problems, 7. Other (population, poverty, drugs), 8. Taxes.

9. Do you approve of the students of this room being given the opportunity to express their opinions through this questionnaire?

Yes ----- 20
No ----- 0

HIGH INTEREST RATES

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 6, 1970

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am concerned about the problems that current high interest rates are creating in our economy. Many people I represent are being sorely pressed by unreasonable, artificially high interest rates.

I have repeatedly urged President Nixon to exercise the powers available to him to bring interest rates down to a reasonable level. Aware of this problem, Congress passed a bill last year conferring unprecedented power on the President. The President still has not acted. People who have money borrowed or who need to borrow are being severely and unfairly hurt. Homeowners, the housing industry, people who wish to buy or build a home, and State and local governments are bearing the brunt of this inaction.

The analysis I have made of the high interest rate problem and my efforts to roll interest rates down has struck a responsive chord with the citizens of Tennessee. The man on the street understands the source of the problem, he understands who is being helped and who is being hurt by high interest rates.

The homebuilding industry is in a recession as a result of the administration's high interest-tight money policy. I have been advised by the president of the Nashville Home Builders Association that in January, single-family housing starts dropped 37 percent from January 1969. This disastrous situation, Mr. President, is the direct result of the policies of the administration.

Nor is the situation improved by loose talk by administration officials. The Secretary of the Treasury has been saying in the recent days that lower interest rates may be closer at hand than most people realize. It is encouraging that the distinguished Secretary is devoting some thought to this matter, however belated. I sincerely hope he is right.

But, Mr. President, homebuilders need more than vague hopes and wishful thinking. Statements like that of Secretary Kennedy, without followup action, just make the situation worse for the housing industry.

Mr. President, home buyers and homebuilders need concrete help. And they need it now. We need action from the administration to lower interest rates—not crystal ball gazing. Mr. President, Mr. Reese L. Smith, Jr., president of the Nashville Home Builders Association, sent the following telegram to Secretary Kennedy that graphically describes the problems created for the housing industry by the administration's hands-off policy on high interest rates.

Single family housing starts in Nashville dropped by 37% in January over last year. This came after FHA-VA interest rates were increased in early January to produce more houses. Your statement last week that time may be closer at hand than most people realize when record high interest rates may begin to decline is vague and misleading while we in the Nashville housing industry

want and seek lower interest rates. History has shown that permanent long term mortgage rates have never declined appreciably and that waiting for them to decline will cost the home buyer more because of the constantly increasing prices of land, labor, and materials. We of the Nashville Home Builders Association feel your statement should be retracted or you should use sound reasoning and timing for a reduction in long term permanent mortgage rates. Therefore the public should be informed after the interest rate is cut and speculation on future cuts should be halted. This is a great disservice to the buyer and builder when speculation is freely given without any foundation.

Another Tennessean has written me:

Consideration and legislation compelling the lowering of interest rates on home loans has been suggested in Congress. Obviously this is an essential step that must be taken for the American public.

It is hopeful that you will succeed in this effort.

I have also been pointing out to the administration that high-interest rates fall on those who can least afford them—working people trying to buy homes, veterans struggling to reestablish themselves in civilian life, small businessmen who badly need to borrow working capital, and small investors.

One Tennessee small businessman wrote me:

We have been promised easing of interest rates by a half dozen men, either directly or indirectly connected with the Government. How long are we expected to live on promises? . . .

It's time there were some actions taken on interest rates. If something is not soon done, there won't have to be a worry about budgets or anything else in my opinion. Things are worse than most economists and bureaucrats can see, and in most cases, that's no further than the end of their nose.

I urge a stand against Federal Reserve and do something constructive about interest rates.

Another Tennessean, in a recent letter to me, has painted a vivid picture of the heavy burden the high-interest rates impose on our farmers:

We want to thank you for the good work you have done and are doing and plan to do for the poor and needy people of Tennessee and elsewhere. Especially do we want to thank you for the stand on the high interest rate the poor people are having to pay on their purchased homes and the burdens placed on small farmers who are forced to borrow money to finance their farming operation. It seems that the high rate of interest is making the rich people richer and the poor people poorer. An example: My son is a dairyman trying to get out of debt for land and dairy equipment. Now he is forced to build a new dairy barn, buy more cows and some dairy equipment and pay the bank 8 per cent interest for the required money.

Please keep up your fight for a lower rate of interest for the low income people.

Young people suffer disproportionately from high-interest rates. In recognition of this fact, the people of Marshall County, Tenn., have petitioned members of the Tennessee delegation for support of legislation fixing a maximum interest rate of 6 percent on GI loans. I ask consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have warned that consumers are also suffering under the administration's do-nothing policy. One Tennessee resident wrote me:

I hope you will continue to speak out each day against the present tight money policy.

I see no reason to hurt people with these high interest rates. It will not stop the rise in prices because businesses are going to raise prices in order to make a profit.

It is like you have said, the banks and big businesses are making big profits and the average working people are paying both the high prices and high interest.

The Tennessee General Assembly has by resolution also brought home another fact—that State and local government programs are casualties of high-interest rates. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a joint resolution of the Tennessee House of Representatives and Senate memorializing Congress to consider enacting uniform, nationwide maximum rates of interest.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the bankruptcy of the administration's policy is reflected in the inability of local governments to provide badly needed services that our citizens are entitled to. In 1969, the first year of the Nixon administration, 509 issues of local government bonds went unsold because of high-interest rates. These issues represented \$2.9 billion worth of streets, police and fire protection, pollution control facilities, and schools that our people needed but had to forgo.

Tight money and high interest are invoked as a weapon to curb inflation. But the man in the street can see the fallacy in this specious reasoning. I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a letter I received from a respected Tennessee businessman who states:

In my opinion, tight money has failed to do what it is supposed to . . . to stop inflation. Actually, it is increasing cost rather than reducing . . . Credit, wage and price controls should be the answer rather than tight money.

Mr. President, I am gratified that administration officials are finally addressing themselves to the high-interest rate problem. Dr. Paul W. McCracken, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and Dr. Arthur Burns, newly appointed Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, both testified on high-interest rates in hearing before the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Chairman McCracken specifically spoke to the problems faced by the housing industry. Unfortunately Dr. McCracken's testimony shows how slowly the administration is awakening to its responsibility to bring interest rates down. For, in listing the causes of the problems of the housing industry, Chairman McCracken lists high-interest rates as last on a list of five items.

Mr. President, this just does not square with what Tennessee homebuilders have been telling me. Nor does it square with the facts. First in Dr. McCracken's list of housing ills is the rising costs of con-

struction. These costs have gone up—but not nearly as much as interest rates. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, labor and material costs constituted only a slightly larger proportion of overall homebuilding costs in 1969 than they did in 1949—38 percent as compared to 36 percent. But financing costs have doubled as a proportion of total building costs—10 percent in 1969 compared to only 5 percent in 1949.

So, Mr. President, the President is still ducking the hard fact that he must employ the powers at his disposal to bring interest rates down if the homebuilding industry is to recover. In this connection, I was distressed to see that Dr. Burns is still counseling against use of the powers to control interest rates that Congress bestowed on the President last year.

EXHIBIT 1 RESOLUTION

That Marshall County, Tennessee hereby goes on record as favoring Federal and State Legislation for Military Personnel in the Viet Nam War, whereby a favorable interest rate, not exceeding 6% may be passed by the Congress, and/or the State Legislature, for G.I. Loans for said Veterans, and any supplement above this 6% rate, to be supplied by State or Federal Authorities, if any.

That the Congress and the State Legislature be so respectfully petitioned, and that certified copies of this Resolution be presented to our United Senators, all Tennessee Congressmen, the member of the General Assembly representing Marshall County, Tennessee and the County Courts of Tennessee.

Adopted this 12th day of January, 1970.

R. S. CLARK,
County Judge.

State of Tennessee, Marshall County.

I, Frank Hardison, clerk of the county court, do hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and correct copy of the resolution as adopted by the quarterly county court, at its regular January, 1970 meeting January 12, 1970.

This 12th day of January, 1970.

FRANK HARDISON,
County Court Clerk.

EXHIBIT 2

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 48 (By Lacy Neese)

A resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to consider enacting uniform, nationwide maximum interest rates

Whereas, money flows with relative rapidity from one state into another and back again, since financial transactions are not limited by imaginary state boundaries, and

Whereas, the price of money, or interest that is the charge for the use of money or credit varies widely from state to state and may vary according to the type of loan or according to the class of lender; and

Whereas, such variations often result in unhealthy competition between states for capital, as interest rates are fixed higher and higher to lure outside capital, thus contributing to and increasing an inflationary trend; and

Whereas, this would not be the case if there were a nationwide uniform interest rate, with perhaps different rates being provided for different types of loans or credit;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-Sixth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the Senate Concurring, That the United States Congress is urged to give serious consideration to enacting uniform,

nationwide maximum interest rates for different classifications of loans or lenders or both.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to each member of the Congress from Tennessee.

Adopted: January 28, 1970.

WILLIAM L. JENKINS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
FRANK C. GORRELL,
Speaker of the Senate.

Approved: Jan. 30, 1970.

BUFORD ELLINGTON,
Governor.

HON. JAMES B. UTT

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my own tribute to those of my colleagues who have, heretofore, marked the passing of our friend, James B. Utt, who after 17 years of dedicated service in this body has now gone "home."

All Members of this House feel the loss of Jimmy Utt most deeply. He may have been short of stature, but he was a big man in so many other ways—the possessor of a faith that knew no bounds, of a sense of commitment to the values that made this Nation great in a degree that, by today's standards, was remarkable, and of that kind of loyalty—to his State and Nation, as well as to his friends—that made him as loved as he was respected.

This is not to say that there were not those who disagreed with him. No one who was as fiercely independent of mind as he—or who clung as stubbornly as he did, sometimes all by himself, as it seemed, to his basic beliefs and convictions—could operate always in an atmosphere of sweet consensus. But even those who disagreed most violently with some of his views and attitudes inherently understood that they were founded upon an unquestionable integrity and soon learned that, underneath, Jimmy had the kindest of hearts and the most gracious of spirits.

I suspect that it will be for such admirable facets of his personality that he will be best remembered—along with his unpretentiousness and his endearing and sincere friendliness; for such traits, and for the devotion to his legislative and congressional duties that marked every day of his life here—as well as for the warmth of his smile—and not for the fact that his convictions sometimes led him to stand almost alone among us.

The latter fact we shall remember, too, for such an example of independence and individualism has become rare in an age when the urge to "go along" and the desire to find an easy consensus has seemed to become the model for our conduct.

But it still is as a friend—and a dear friend, at that—that I shall remember Jimmy Utt; and it is as such a friend that I shall miss his presence.

Mrs. Robison joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Utt, and to their son and grandchildren.

DEATH OF A GREAT ILLUSION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the question has been properly raised as to whether education is, in fact, automatically advanced by compulsory racial quotas in which busing of students is involved. The obvious administrative problems and cost are, of course, evident and now it is becoming more obvious that education is suffering. Therefore, an editorial in the Wednesday, March 4, Chicago Tribune is, I believe, of great significance. It follows:

DEATH OF A GREAT ILLUSION

Sixteen years after the Warren Supreme court's decision that compulsory racial segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional, it has been recognized, suddenly and almost by national consensus, that compulsory integration is an impossible dream. Not only southern conservatives but northern liberals and Negro civil rights leaders now oppose busing or other means of compulsion to effect integration, for the simple reason that it will not work.

Some ideological zealots are wringing their hands and weeping lugubriously about this. Tom Wicker of the New York Times, for instance, accuses the Nixon administration of selling out to the southern segregationists in one of his lamentations, which concludes: "Poor old Union! Its great and generous dreams falling one by one to dusty death."

We think this apocalyptic view of the failure of integration is preposterous. Recognition of its failure has come with such a shattering impact upon the proponents of integration for integration's sake because they were wrong, not only in assuming that it was feasible but also in their insistence that education in all-Negro schools is necessarily inferior. We agree with the National Observer that it is a gross insult to the Negro race to say, as many white liberals do, that it is necessary for black children to attend school with whites in order to get a good education.

This false premise has adversely affected public education, particularly for Negroes. As Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, the distinguished Negro psychologist, has said, the fundamental question of quality education "because more and more obscured if not ignored" as controversies and conflicts over desegregation increased in frequency and intensity.

Official acknowledgment that integration has failed came when the Senate, with the support of some northern liberals, passed an amendment by Sen. John Stennis of Mississippi to an education bill, providing that federal guidelines for integration must be applied uniformly thruout the country. This would abolish the distinction between segregation in the south, resulting from laws long ago held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, and segregation in the north, resulting from residential patterns. Both the Senate and the House have passed education bills with anti-busing provisions.

Sen. Abraham Ribicoff (D., Conn.), a liberal, accused other liberals of hypocrisy in trying to compel the south to do what could not possibly be accomplished in northern cities. He noted that when black enrollment in the schools reaches a certain point (some say the "critical mass" is about 30 per cent), the whites move away and the schools quickly become resegregated.

So far the Supreme court and most of the lower courts have failed to take note of the

obvious fact that integration in cities with large Negro populations is a physical impossibility. Even Robert H. Finch, secretary of health, education, and welfare, an ardent integrationist, has condemned "confusing and misleading" court decisions, including "totally unrealistic orders for busing on a massive scale to fill racial quotas.

We believe the "freedom of choice" principle is the answer to this problem. Any pupil would have the right to attend any school of his choice, but not necessarily to be bused there. Some southern states accepted this principle, but the lower courts rejected it as a subterfuge to evade integration and the Supreme court refused to review their decisions.

Last Oct. 29, the Supreme court said it was time for "every school district to terminate the dual system at once and to operate now and hereafter only unitary schools." Freedom of choice is the essence of the unitary school principle. The Supreme court has held that racial discrimination is unconstitutional, but it has not held that integration is compulsory. When it recognizes that compulsory integration is impossible, as it must, perhaps we can expect greater efforts to improve the quality of education in all the public schools.

SURPRISE, SURPRISE, DOINGS ON POSTAL REFORM—INJUN STYLE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the brave warrior is back in the picture on postal reform again.

Although twice beaten and nearly scalped, he is venturing forth onto the battlefield once more.

And what is he carrying? The same old shopworn plan for allegedly attempting to reform the postal service.

Oh yes, maybe he has changed a word or two, here and there, but the philosophy is the same—and just as unacceptable.

Working behind a smokescreen, he and his leader claim they are trying to save face for this great white father. An offer to smoke a loaded peace pipe. But their offer is transparent.

The warrior comes forth while his leader's grandfather—whom I happened to meet today by chance—expresses complete bafflement at what the issue is all about. The warrior and the leader are trying desperately to save a hopeless situation.

At the 11th hour they now have summoned the leader's grandfather to try to pull the leader's chestnuts out of the fire.

On the other hand, the leader's counterparts are ready to let the leader go down the drain to his destruction all by himself, a self-charted fate. They are convinced the leader is willing to let his own family and associates be massacred to save his own neck.

Meanwhile, the fires are burning briskly around the tepees. The other warriors are in rebellion, completely confused by the rehashings, perplexed by the misrepresentations, and annoyed at the repeated rabble-raising war dances.

The picture is clear to me—if not to

some others. I want postal reform—but not "injun" style where everyone gets scalped, especially the American public.

ADDRESS BY HON. GERALD R. FORD

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished minority leader made a most important and informative address last Wednesday at the annual meeting of the Shipbuilders Council of America, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues. The text of Mr. GERALD R. FORD's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA, AT WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 4, 1970

Perhaps longer than most of you in this room, I have known your President—Ed Hood. I remember him when he was John Marshall Butler's right hand on Capitol Hill, and have since observed many of his activities here in Washington on your behalf.

Thinking of him, I also remember an event, seven or eight years ago, in which I had a part, which vitally affected our nation's private shipyard industry. At that time, I was serving as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, and the matter of distribution of naval ship repair work between Navy yards and private yards came before us.

If I recall correctly, the Navy yards were then receiving 80 per cent of this work, and there was considerable feeling among members of the Subcommittee, as well as within your industry, that an 80/20 per cent split was disproportionate. After much debate, a 65/35 per cent ratio was enacted by the Congress, and I am told that formula has been followed very closely ever since.

This episode clearly establish the advantage of lower costs in commercial shipyards—an advantage which has subsequently been translated into additional revenues for your industry, not only in terms of naval ship repair work but also in terms of a much greater volume of new naval ship construction.

That single event, more than any other until recently, did much to reestablish a peacetime direction for our private shipyard industry, at a time when a new direction was needed. This fact, I am afraid, is not generally appreciated. But, I can tell you, the advocates of naval shipyards, even today, shudder at the mention of 65/35.

So as it is I am no stranger to your industry, and you might say that we gather here today as old friends.

I very much appreciate this opportunity to address your 1970 Annual Meeting for it seems to me that your industry, your workers and your suppliers are about to experience a new era of attention and activity.

For too long, there has been no cohesive or intelligible national policy on shipbuilding. There has been no long-range commitment on the part of the national Administrations. There has been no leadership at the top.

In the recent past, the Johnson and Kennedy years could hardly be cited as illustrations of national leadership in the development of effective programs to produce the ships our country so urgently needs for commerce and national defense. The watchword of those times seemed to be: let someone else

handle this later; meanwhile, create the illusion that something is being done.

The accrual effects of such a deceptive policy can be monumental, and, in the case of shipbuilding, the impact has been both short and long range. Short range, the evidences are not hard to find: Our naval and merchant fleets are largely composed of vessels 20 years of age or older and replacement programs have been grossly inadequate. On a long-term basis, the omissions of the past have created a much larger problem for today and have multiplied the cost of solution.

By comparison, if we look at Japan we see a dramatic example of the continuous employment of a clear direction in shipbuilding in pursuit of a firmly stated national policy.

In the late 1940's and early 1950's, we exported to Japan a shipbuilding technology which had been developed under the pressures of a war emergency of staggering proportions. During World War II, we learned how to produce ships in quantity through the application of good old American ingenuity. The merchant and naval ships built in our shipyards, not only for our own purposes but for those of our allies, were the medium to victory.

But, flushed with the joy of victory, we were apparently not smart enough or visionary enough to apply the body of shipbuilding technology evolved in those difficult years under difficult circumstances to our own peacetime pursuits. On the other hand, the Japanese took the concepts we developed, at great cost to our own treasury and substance, and "ran with the ball."

A nation virtually annihilated in 1945, its manufacturing centers literally destroyed, its merchant marine ruined, its spirit shattered, Japan has reestablished itself in the 1960 decade as one of the world's leading industrial powers. Its shipyards today produce half the world's shipping tonnage, nineteen times as much annually as do the American yards which built the fleet that once destroyed them. To reach this prominence in world shipbuilding, Japan has perfected and expanded techniques which were American born and bred.

This point, too, I fear, is little appreciated. Many times in recent years, I have heard the charge made that American yards should copy their Japanese counterparts, whereas, in point of actual fact, it is they who have copied our shipbuilding know-how and made good use of it. How unfortunate it is that there have been—and still are—those, in and out of government, who have either not taken the time to discern this fact or who just plain don't want to recognize anything good about American shipbuilding. These misguided souls—and all of us—could learn much from what has taken place in Japan.

Historically, there has been a close relationship between the Japanese government and the maritime industry of Japan. Since 1950, there has been an even closer relationship between the Japanese government and the shipbuilding industry of Japan. This has meant that there has been what some might call a "paternalistic" attitude on the part of the government toward the shipyard industry, and, in turn, the industry has been, and is, very responsive to the views of government even though those views are often not expressed in laws and sanctions.

In consequence, the integrity of government and the initiative of private industry have been combined to assure that shipbuilding remains a strong factor in the national economy and trade balance of Japan. In matters relating to world shipping, every move, every action of the Japanese government is pointed toward increasing market penetration for Japanese shipyards. There has been no meaningless palaver, no delib-

erate procrastination, no time-consuming charades such as took place in this country during the decade of the 1960's. There is a fixed national purpose that Japan will take a back-seat to no other country where shipbuilding is concerned.

Japan has long held to the policy that programs to expand domestic shipping resources as well as export opportunities should be pursued for the specific purpose of promoting domestic shipbuilding as a function of national affluence. This policy has been formulated and executed with a high degree of cooperation between government and shipyards—cooperation which does not now exist on the same scale anywhere else in the world. The marketing of shipbuilding capabilities is accomplished with substantial promotion, encouragement and support from the Japanese government. That support, it should be noted, takes many forms—direct and indirect—all pointed toward the marketing, financing and completion of ship construction contracts in Japanese shipyards.

The United States has a long way to go in this direction. But, fortunately, a meaningful and promising beginning has been made by President Nixon.

He has proposed that, in the national interest, our naval forces should always be second to none.

He has proposed that, in the national interest, our merchant marine should be rehabilitated and capable of carrying a substantial portion of our nation's trade and commerce.

To accomplish these objectives, a great many new ships must be built, and he has said they will be built in American shipyards by American workers—in the national interest.

I am certain Ed Hood has reported to you on the details of legislation to implement President Nixon's proposals, which is now before the Congress. I will therefore not go into this facet of the current situation on Capitol Hill other than to say that the legislation has considerable bi-partisan support and a good chance of being passed by both the House of Representatives and the Senate in the very near future. The Congress in 1970 has an obligation to act before adjournment.

On the House side of the Capitol, Congressman Eddie Garmatz, Democrat from Maryland, and Congressman Bill Mailliard, Republican from California, are actively supporting the President's program as ranking members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Within the Appropriations Committee, Congressman John Rooney, Democrat from New York, and Congressman Frank Bow, Republican from Ohio, share similar sentiments with respect to the urgency of improving our nation's maritime/shipbuilding posture.

On the Senate side, Senator Warren Magnuson from Washington, and Senator Russell Long from Louisiana, both Democrats, are working toward this same goal along with Senator Norris Cotton of New Hampshire and Senator John Tower of Texas, both Republicans.

There are many others, on both sides of the political aisle, and I am encouraged by the favorable reactions of virtually all of my Congressional colleagues to President Nixon's proposed merchant marine program. I am told it incorporates cost-saving features which you, the shipyards, have advocated for many years. I also understand that your industry has accepted some very hard challenges imposed by this program, and it is refreshing to know that American shipyards are willing to stand up and be counted.

I fully realize that the proposed Nixon program will not become a reality overnight—or in a matter of a few months. Even

after the pending legislation is enacted, the needed money must be forthcoming from both government and private sources. The arrangement of shipyard contracts and the actual construction of ships will take more time. But, it is important to recognize that, unlike his predecessors, President Nixon is providing that quality of top leadership so essential if the United States is to have, once again, a merchant shipping capability commensurate with our strategic and commercial requirements.

I further realize that the development of a U.S. shipbuilding industry equal to that of Japan demands far more than upgrading of shipyards, standardization of building practices, institution of automation and other conditions. It requires a firm policy determination that the shipbuilding industry of the United States will be integrated with other national endeavors to take proper advantage of geography, ingenuity, technology, manpower, organization and resources to guarantee the well-being and security of all of our people. That is the thrust of President Nixon's commitment. And that is also the thrust of my commitment as I transmit my thoughts to you at this, your annual meeting.

RAMBAM TORAH INSTITUTE STUDENTS FAVOR STRONG GOVERNMENT ACTION TO HALT POLLUTION

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the overwhelming voice of the people should serve as a guide for Government action in critical areas such as environmental quality.

In an effort to ascertain just how the public feels about many key pollution issues, I recently sent a questionnaire to many California residents.

Response to my questionnaire has been very encouraging, and as the results become available, it appears that the majority of concerned Californians want stronger Government efforts in the search for environmental quality.

Since my questionnaire was sent out, I have heard from a number of groups and individuals that they have adapted my questions for their own use.

For example, Mrs. Stephen Schloss is chairman of the social studies department of the Rambam Torah Institute of Yeshiva University in Los Angeles.

Some 60 students at Rambam Torah Institute answered the questionnaire, given them by Mrs. Schloss, and as you can see from the tabulation shown below, they indicated a definite bias for more active Government action to achieve a clean and healthy environment.

I am enthused by this response by the Rambam students, and I hope that we here in the Congress can move toward the type goals they favor.

I now insert in the RECORD a tabulation of the poll results by the Rambam Torah Institute students, along with their ranking of national priorities for 1970.

The material follows:

TABULATION OF RESULTS—RAMBAM TORAH INSTITUTE OF YESHIVA UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

	Yes	No	No answer
Do you favor proposals to ban the internal combustion gasoline engine unless it meets stringent exhaust emission standards?	44	15	1
Do you feel that the oil companies and automobile manufacturers should be required to act more quickly to solve the problems of air pollution?	59	1	0
Do you favor a Federal Regulatory Commission on Environmental Quality?	46	8	6
With 95 percent of the 8,000 miles of the Nation's shoreline in private hands, do you favor stronger Government efforts to regulate shoreline use, in order to substantially increase the amount of beach property available for public use?	42	15	3
With the State's open spaces increasingly filled by urban sprawl and unplanned development, would you support stronger Government efforts to regulate use of underdeveloped open spaces, including advance acquisition of land for public use?	41	14	4
Would you support a complete ban on all Federal offshore oil drilling except in national emergency?	34	23	3
Do you favor much stronger Government efforts to educate the public as to the problem of overpopulation?	46	14	0
Do you approve of the citizens of this State being given the opportunity to express their opinions through this questionnaire?	59	1	0

**RANKING OF NATIONAL PRIORITIES FOR 1970
BY RAMBAM TORAH INSTITUTE STUDENTS**

1. Vietnam.
2. Pollution.
3. Inflation.
4. Crime.
5. Education.
6. Urban Problems.
7. Taxes.
8. Others.

**DOLLARS—NOT WORDS—NEEDED
FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION**

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, well over a year ago—to be exact—on February 3, 1969, I wrote to HEW Secretary Robert Finch about developing a plan for the full utilization of Veterans' Administration hospital resources in helping solve the medical manpower crisis. On February 24, 1969, Secretary Finch acknowledged my letter but nothing else happened. Having received no further reply or any indication of interest on the part of the Secretary as to using the vital resources of the VA hospital system to help solve the "crisis," I wired Secretary Finch on June 5, 1969, reminding him again of the Veterans' Affairs Committee interest. On July 10, 1969, a special press conference was held at the White House with Secretary Finch present, the essence of which decried the "massive crisis" in the delivery of medical care—citing shortages of doctors and other medical personnel and predicting "a breakdown in our medical care system which could have consequences affecting millions of people throughout this country," unless the "crisis" is met within the next 2 to 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, so far as I can determine, little if any support has come from the administration to fully utilize VA facilities for medical education purposes. As a matter of fact the contrary appears to be true. The VA is being forced to absorb a substantial wage increase and part of these funds are being taken from the education program.

The 1971 budget submission for the Veterans' Administration calls for 49,000 trainees, an increase of about 3,600 over fiscal year 1970 in the medical education

program. From information which this committee has assembled, it appears that with proper funding beginning in 1971 the VA could, over the next 6 to 10 years, train almost 90,000 trainees in all major medical manpower areas. So far as I can determine, there have been no substantive advances made to further involve the VA in helping solve the "massive crisis" which the President said he was so concerned about last July.

In fact, it appears that in fiscal year 1970-71, VA may invoke a "freeze" on VA hospital house-staff funds. Just a few days ago I received a most alarming letter from Dr. Robert Munsick of the University of New Mexico, indicating that this medical school and others will be forced to cancel contracts already made to hundreds of interns and residents because of the VA freeze on house-staff funds. If this is true, patient care for our Nation's veterans will certainly suffer and medical education for many young doctors and interns will be further inhibited because the Veterans' Administration medical program is not being properly funded.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot rationalize such action with what the President's Chief Health Adviser, Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, said in an article which appeared in U.S. News & World Report on February 23, 1970. When asked about the Nation's No. 1 health problem and how to solve it, he said in part, "In the first place, we need just sheer numbers of people; 50,000 more physicians than we have now, almost 150,000 more technicians." The lack of action by the administration to take advantage of what VA has to offer in the field of medical education is incomprehensible.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration for a complete report on the reported "freeze" and our committee will explore this situation further when we hold hearings on the VA medical program in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, the letter from Dr. Robert Munsick of the University of New Mexico School of Medicine follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., February 27, 1970.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House Veterans Affairs Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: I am writing to you regarding a matter of the greatest urgency. This concerns the announce-

ment that there will be a freeze on VA Hospital house-staff funds for Fiscal Year 1970-71.

Veteran patients and we at the University of New Mexico School of Medicine, and others at medical schools everywhere where there is a VA affiliated program will suffer the most dire consequences if this freeze is upheld. The reasons follow:

1) In many areas, services for VA Hospitals are expanding. To provide optimal medical attention for the patients, intern and resident care is required for these patients. The freeze will preclude staffing and necessitate limitation of care.

2) To train more physicians and fill the medical manpower gap, VA Hospitals are being utilized by medical schools for more housestaff and medical student education. With the freeze, this will be impossible, and the national desire for greater medical and para-medical manpower will be frustrated.

3) We and many other medical schools have already committed to hundreds of prospective residents and interns, by contract, position for next year which require salaries from the VA. If we are forced to waltz on our promises, our program will be wrecked for years to come. These contracts have been offered in good faith, with annual verbal commitment of adequate funds from the VA Central Office, next year included.

That the VA should now, at this late date, arbitrarily rescind this commitment would be absolutely unconscionable, despicable and dastardly.

You will note that I am an Obstetrician-Gynecologist—hence, I have no direct interest in the Albuquerque VA Hospital. We do have such a stake in our VA Hospital program and developing medical school programs, though, that I fear no one would be unscathed by this unprecedented, untimely and ill-fated move. I beg you and your Committee to study the circumstances of this decision and to reverse it if humanly possible.

Yours sincerely,
ROBERT A. MUNSICK, M.D., Ph. D.,
Professor and Chairman.

SAVING THE INTERCITY TRAINS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, for several years now, I have been greatly concerned over the increasing loss of rail passenger service—which has now left my congressional district completely without such service.

There is no question but that our Nation's railroads need help in maintaining and even recreating adequate intercity passenger service and defining needed intercity corridors for this service. We have done just about all we can now to aid our highways and airways, and it is past time for us to help an ailing industry that should be able to provide us with a convenient, safe, and reliable alternative to air and highway travel.

I am well aware of the struggles of both the Senate Committee on Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to come up with a legislative solution to this problem, for I have several bills pending in the House committee at this time. I am also pleased to note the interest the administration is taking in this area, and

I am hopeful that an acceptable plan will soon be forthcoming.

In an effort to add some needed perspective to this issue, I am inserting in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Wall Street Journal of March 3 entitled "Saving the Intercity Trains," and I respectively call it and the need to attack this problem, to my colleagues' attention:

Just about everyone agrees that most intercity trains will soon disappear unless the Federal Government does something to assure their continuation. So far, however, rescue proposals are making slow progress.

Why? Well, one reason is that transportation of all kinds is only one of many problems competing for shares of the nation's resources. Within transportation, moreover, the intercity trains probably rate lower priority than urban mass transit.

The way some metropolitan areas have become clogged with cars, about the only alternative to usable mass transit is walking. Between most cities, by contrast, other alternatives do exist: Airplanes and buses, in addition to private cars.

So there is reason to give a good deal of hard thought to how much the Federal Government should spend on intercity trains, and to just what that money would buy. The fact that some people within the Administration appear to be giving such thought may explain why the Transportation Department's "Railpax" plan has yet to be endorsed as the Administration proposal.

Under Railpax a quasi-public corporation would be set up to operate a network of intercity trains deemed essential. The plan would provide \$40 million in Federal grants and \$60 million in Federal loans over the next three years.

Before it became entirely clear what that money would buy, the Budget Bureau rejected the idea, presumably on economic grounds. But Transportation Secretary Volpe later said he still expects approval, so the future of Railpax depends first on the outcome of a dispute within the Administration.

Even if the plan finally gets White House approval, it will still have to compete with an alternative being drafted by a Senate Commerce subcommittee. This plan probably would be more costly than Railpax, at least initially.

Under the Senate group's tentative proposal, the Transportation Secretary would designate the intercity routes and equipment that would make up a "national rail passenger system." The Government then would cover 80% of the railroads' losses on operating the routes, with subsidies set at up to \$60 million a year.

It is doubtful that the railroads would be pleased with such a plan, since they've generally opposed any subsidy that would not pay all their losses. And their losses on passengers, while a subject of controversy, have undoubtedly been substantial.

Critics, and there are many, argue that the railroads have set out to drive away passengers by deliberately downgrading service. There's no question few railroads love passengers (who enjoys losing money?). Yet it may be doubted that even fine equipment and service would bring passengers rushing back to the rails everywhere.

The Metroliners, operating between Boston, New York and Washington, have shown that a market for intercity service exists in congested metropolitan corridors. The high-speed trains make the trips just about as fast as airlines, when travel time to and from airports is added, and their fares also are competitive with planes. They have been running about 75% full and are often sold out.

In other similar areas there probably could

be similar service, which eventually should not require a Federal subsidy. When planners go beyond potentially profitable runs, though, they should pick and choose with extreme care.

It is hard to see justification, for instance, for preserving much service over very long distances. No matter how much rail buffs, like ourselves, prefer trains to planes, the airlines' time savings are sure to bring them the bulk of the long-haul passenger traffic.

Keeping priorities and costs carefully in mind, then, some sort of Federal intercity train program probably is reasonable. Still, the nation must be careful not to waste scarce resources on services that most of its citizens no longer want or need.

YOUNG PALO ALTO STUDENTS WRITE ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that so many young Americans hold such strong views about environmental issues. After all, the decisions we make today concerning the environment will shape the world they must live in—and if we fail to halt pollution now, their world may be a shambles.

Recently I asked many Californians their views on a number of environmental issues, and I have been pleased to find that teachers throughout the State have employed my questionnaire as a basis for their own classroom work dealing with the environment.

One of these teachers is Mrs. Margaret Killingsworth of Palo Alto, Calif. Mrs. Killingsworth's fifth graders at the Ohlones School in Palo Alto have written me a quite analytical series of letters expressing their feelings about environmental issues.

The points they raise, the questions they ask, the solutions they call for, make me proud of these young students. But, today, the burden is upon us, and we must act now to stop pollution.

Halfway measures, procrastination, and rhetoric only add to the problem. These fifth grade students demand action: What are we going to do?

At this point, I am inserting the letters from Mrs. Killingsworth and the Ohlones School students in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to read them and then act accordingly.

The letters follow:

PALO ALTO, CALIF., February 2, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: Your routine questionnaire, which I received, resulted in some interesting experiences. My 5th graders had been reading stories concerning early trappers who had no concern for the future, and about the establishment of Yellowstone as the first National Park. When I introduced your questionnaire as an answer to "what, or who, is the government," these young, concerned future citizens asked to write to you. The results are included for your enjoyment and enlightenment.

Errors in spelling, grammar etc. can be forgiven because the thoughts, feelings, and

genuine interest expressed by these 10 year olds should shame that "silent majority" and its government which is failing them.

As their teacher I feel a sense of pride in them and hope for their future if we only listen and "let a little child lead us."

Most sincerely,

(Mrs.) MARGARET KILLINGSWORTH.

OHLONES SCHOOL,

Palo Alto, Calif., January 30, 1970.

Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR SIR: I'm writing because I'm concerned about conservation, two things especially, San Francisco Bay being polluted. I guess I'm concerned with the San Francisco Bay because my friends mother is trying to save the Bay. Soon there will be a big famine and and to get more food we will then make more pollution and if we make more pollution we won't have air to breathe or water to drink.

My dad's a doctor specializing as an obstetrician and that's why I'm concerned with birth control. Over population is the main problem. As you probably know, scientist have feared that if people, like rats live to close together they will destroy each other.

I don't expect you to stop these problems alone but just to know that I care.

Yours truly,

JENNIFER BOL.

OHLONES SCHOOL,

Palo Alto, Calif., February 2, 1970.

Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I am in the fifth grade and am concerned about conservation and pollution. Just walking home from school isn't so fun when a bus comes along. Even when it's gone just try to breathe, it's not very easy (doesn't smell too good either. I've had the experience).

I'm pretty convinced that most pollution comes from cars, and factories too. I've spent enchanting afternoons watching great clouds of steam and smog puff from factory chimneys. Man's made a big mess, and if he doesn't clean it up, man himself will become extinct, along with every other living thing. I wouldn't mind horses and buggies instead of cars and buses. How can I help stop pollution? Please answer my question and send some information about pollution.

Yours truly,

LISA STANZIANO.

OHLONES SCHOOL,

Palo Alto, Calif., February 2, 1970.

Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I'm writing because I don't like having so many polluted lakes and rivers. I don't like having polluted air and I won't live in a big dome. I know we do need cars for a lot of things but we would live longer with out them. It would be all right to ride horses and donkeys. And for long trip to places like New York we could have steam cars or cars that charge up over night or something like that. If somebody is afraid of horses and donkeys there will always be bicycles.

Sincerely,

HOLLY VAN DERIET.

OHLONES SCHOOL,

Palo Alto, Calif., January 30, 1970.

Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I am interested in the questionnaire you sent out; my teacher got one.

I think air pollution should be stopped as soon as possible. I think it is mean that man

is destroying nature's balance. I think this land should be protected.

Maybe someone should change the law so that the gasoline and oil would be kept out of the water so the wildlife will live longer. Many lives of animals would be saved if the water and air were better.

The second thing I want to say is that the Vietnamese War should be stopped soon—so all our men don't get killed.

Would you please write back if possible?
Truly yours,

JANE WOODWARD.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 30, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I am writing to you because my teacher received a questionnaire which brought up a discussion in our class. My parents are concerned with the Foothills of Palo Alto.

I think that the federal government should do something about the oil off Santa Barbara, because only about 7% of the nations beaches are open to the public anyway! I feel that there should be more beaches open to the public, simply because there are over 200,000,000 people in the U.S.A.

I also feel that the auto manufacturers should be required to do something about internal combustion although I don't really know what.

Hope you win for us.

Sincerely,

JOHN TRAPNELL BYRNE.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., February 2, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I have lived on this earth 11 years I would like to live a full life and die around 75. But if people keep using the earth like we are thousands of other kids and I won't make it passed twenty-five. I think we should ban the internal combustion engines. We should do some work on electric motors. My idea of an electric motor is to have a strip of copper that has electric currents running through the copper and the cars have pick-ups and run by gears which turn the wheels.

I think the oil companies and the automobile companies should act right now to stop air pollution if the world wants to live a long life.

I think the citizens of the U.S.A. should have a committee of Federal Regularity Commission on Environmental Quality.

I feel the government should control land spaces more so that the people will have more area for recreation.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE CHRISTENSEN.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 23, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I am interested in the conservation of animals and the forest and that is why I am writing. In my letter I will be talking to you about the things of my concern.

In my class we have been talking about the special groups preserving animals and forest land that we might not have today if someone had not been concerned. I would like to know more about these groups and where they are in the United States. I think we have more groups like these.

I am also concerned about the conservation of air and water. I hope you and the Congress will do something to help support these groups.

Yours truly,

DAVID.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 30, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I read your questionnaire about stopping and putting an end to pollution. It was very good. When I grow up I shall design cars, and they won't have any air intake.

That is the trouble that causes pollution by the car. Now it has to intake and outtake on the pistons and if you put a good filter on it, it would stop the pollution.

It's a good idea to have gas and oil companies act more quickly to solve the pollution problem. And I hope you are senator in the California primary.

Sincerely,

PAUL H. BENJAMIN.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., February 2, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I am a student at Ohlones School and am writing to you concerning air pollution.

I am very concerned with it. Besides writing to you about air pollution, I am also writing to you about water pollution. For instance, at the Great Lakes, the fish in Lake Erie are just floating around on the water dead because of the water pollution.

I saw a television program and it showed huge factories just pouring out smoky, polluted air. It made me sick to just think I was breathing some air like that. After a storm I feel so good to breathe some fresh air.

I hope you can do something about the pollution.

Yours truly,

KIM WELTON.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., February 2, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I am a student at Ohlones School and interested in stopping air pollution. I don't think that large factories should pollute the air. My 5th grade reading class has read a few stories on how people hate air pollution so much. I also think that oil companies should stop causing oil slicks. The slicks kill many, many animals. If the air pollutes much more we won't have beautiful blue skies anymore. Our world will become gray and ugly.

Yours Truly,

SUSAN CASTLE.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 30, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I'm writing this letter to you because I am interested in the questionnaire you sent people.

In school we are studying about conservation. Your questionnaire fit into what were studying. I think it was a good idea to send it out. I am concerned about pollution, over population and the rest of things on the questionnaire you sent out. I am lucky that I'm getting a good education but some people don't have one. I think something should be done about it. Some of the older people don't do anything about the pollution so I am glad you are trying to do something about it. I think the reason that some of the older people don't do anything about it is because they won't be around when the earth is polluted so much that people will be living under the ground and in domes. They are also too busy with politics and other things. I am glad to see that you are

interested in the way other people feel about these kind of things.

Sincerely,

MIKE WITTE.

PALTO ALTO, CALIF., January 29, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles Calif.

DEAR CONGRESS BROWN: I am writing to you from my school. I live in Palo Alto and I am ten years old. Our class is studying conversation, and my teacher brought your questionnaire to school. These letters are coming from a fifth grade class. Our book is bold journeys. Most of our parents are interested in keeping Foothills Park from being polluted. Our teacher gave us our possibilities for the future if something isn't done. She said that instead of looking out the window and seeing wildflowers and beautiful greenery, we will have a dome over the cities, and I think that we will not be able to have aquariums (and by then at the rate we're going there won't be any fish if you ask me). We won't be able to go to the aquariums on weekends, or do anything with anything that lives under water. Since my brother is allergic to fur and feathers, I devote most of my time to wildlife. So naturally I would not like to see anything done to it. I hope you can do something.

Sincerely,

ANNE PIERCY.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 30, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I am writing to you because I want to know more about what you are doing. I also am interested in the Monterey and San Francisco bays. My dad is with the Sierra Club and is working to preserve our Foothills in Palo Alto.

I would like to know the answers to these questions; are you planning on keeping up your fight against pollution? How long have you been in the fight against pollution.

My name is Doug Morris. I am ten. I would appreciate it very much if you wrote back.

Sincerely,

DOUG MORRIS.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 30, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I am concerned about animals. People like animals and there are too many getting killed. All over fish are getting killed because of water pollution. People have been taking animals for pets and there are not many left. Soon there may not be a enough food for the animals, so they might attack humans.

Maybe you can help save animals.

Yours truly,

BURT YARKIN.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 30, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: My teacher told us about conservation and all the pollution in California. She told us that in Berkeley about 1,000 fish were killed because of pollution. The water was so polluted people couldn't even swim or water ski in the water.

Is it true that the air is so polluted in San Francisco it will reach Palo Alto and be so bad we wouldn't be able to breathe?

Yours truly,

DAVE McKENNA.

March 6, 1970

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 30, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I feel that the lakes and beaches that are polluted should be cleaned out so you can swim in them and fish can live. I think that if there is an oil slick, that you should freeze the water and scrape off the oil. Cars should be used for a different purpose and we should use a type of car that looks sort of like a roller coaster, or something like it.

Yours truly,

PHILIP GOLDWORTH.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 30, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I think air pollution is a great problem in California. There should be a law against polluting the air. Electric cars or cars that don't have exhaust should be made. Filters should be made to clean factory smoke.

Oil drilling should be stopped in or close to beaches, and the government should buy more beaches and open them to the public and have a FEW private beaches.

Yours truly,

WALTER CONTI.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 30, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I would like to talk about pollution in our country because, the thing people dump into our lakes, beaches and in all big know water areas the beach and water is dirty. My parents say that everywhere there is some polluted air and water. Just think if you were a fish somewhere it is polluted you wouldn't like it! So I hope everyone will try to stop pollution. I hope Congressmen will try to do something.

Yours truly,

GEORGE ROSS.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto Calif., January 30, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I'm writing because of all the problems in water today. Millions of fish are dying every day just because a few people don't give a darn about conservation.

Take Lake Tahoe for instance! In the late thirties you could catch a fish 20 inches long. Now the only thing you can catch is a TIN CAN! The whole lake is becoming full of boat exhaust and raw sewage. I hope you can help the fish and game.

Yours truly,

HENRY BROWN.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 30, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I'm writing because I'm concerned about today's problems.

I'm very concerned about air pollution and polluted water. So many lakes and rivers are polluted. I am also interested in the questionnaire you sent out. My family got it and we discussed the questions.

I think we should be able to look toward our future and not be worrying about these things. I don't want to live in a dome city and wear gas-masks. Living in a dome city would not be fun. If we lived in a dome city we couldn't see our relatives.

A lot of animals' lives could be saved if air pollution were stopped. We need cars for a lot of reasons, but they cause most pollution. Instead of cars we could use horses and steam-engine cars. I think that the car manufacturing company should start making steam-engine cars.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

STACEY TAYLOR.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 30, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I am writing to you about the air pollution because I am thinking of people's lives.

The air is getting so bad that people may die. When I get older, other people and I may be wearing air masks or living in dome cities, which will not be too fun. There are about 15 more years of air left. If we live in dome cities we may never see our relatives again, but we may die still if we live in dome cities because pretty soon there would be no air left for the cities.

I think that something should be done now about the cars and trucks to help stop the pollution. We could ride horses or bikes to work or school.

Well thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

DINA MONICA.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., Jan. 30, 1970.
Congressman BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Long Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: My teacher received one of your questionnaires we were discussing it. I think you should make more public beaches because there is about 93 percent private beaches and only about 7 percent public beaches. I think more land and beaches should be given to the public for recreation.

Thank you for your help.

Yours truly

MIKE WINKLER.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., Jan. 30, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I am in the fifth grade. I am quite concerned about pollution and getting rid of it.

It is very important to get rid of all forms of pollution. I would say (having done a report on it) that air pollution is caused mainly by cars and factories. If man doesn't hurry up and clean up the mess he's made every living thing will die.

Do you know if there is a plan going on to stop pollution in the San Francisco Bay Area? Is there anything I could do to help stop pollution?

Please write back and answer my questions.

Sincerely,

SHARON GREEN.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 30, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR SIR: I live in the Santa Clara Valley and I am concerned about the air pollution in California. Sometimes on a sunny day I try to look out across the bay but I can't see the other side because of the air pollution. How could we stop pollution?

I also know that many lakes and bays are polluted.

If we did try to stop pollution would we have to stop factories and manufacturing

cars or is there something the companies can be made to do?

Yours truly,

BEV NORDEN.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: My name is Randy Martin and I am in the fifth grade at Ohlones School in Palo Alto, California.

We have been talking about conservation and pollution. I think the following things would help the pollution problem:

1. Limit factory wastes.
2. Improve ways of controlling the pollution that is caused by factories.
3. New ways should be invented to make car exhaust less.
4. Do away with all outdoor burning of trash.

I hope this problem can be solved soon.

Yours truly,

RANDY MATRIN.

OHLONES SCHOOL,
Palo Alto, Calif., January 29, 1970.
Congressman GEORGE BROWN,
Federal Office Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: My teacher brought your questionnaire to school. We talked about it and decided that our reading group would write a letter and tell you what we feel about the questions.

My feelings are that we should have gas companies and car companies do something about air pollution. When I grow up it might be hard to breath and people will cough a lot. I grew up in Santa Barbara and always went to the beaches. Now our family never goes swimming there. And lots of sea life is being killed by the oil. I think that's terrible! I think we should start protecting the wild life and all the greenery. The trouble is where has it all gone? The world is not going to have enough food by killing all the fish and animals dying because they can't live in their natural environment. I think there should be something done soon!

Sincerely,

DENISE DANIELS.

NCAA AND ECAC—THE BLIND LEADING THE BLIND

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I have condemned on several occasions the National Collegiate Athletic Association for placing Yale University on athletic probation for 2 years. I need not restate my reasons. My previous remarks on this subject and the letters, newspaper articles and columns, and other documents which I have placed in this RECORD show beyond doubt that Yale was punished only because it was caught in the middle of the outrageous power struggle between the NCAA and the AAU.

Apparently blinded by its own quest for athletic dominance, the NCAA displayed its ignorance, arrogance, and lack of fairness in its arbitrary punishment of Yale. I suppose that ignorance, arrogance, and lack of fairness, when practiced for so long, become habit; the NCAA, therefore, is guilty of bad habits.

if nothing more. Cowardice, however, is another matter. That trait was exemplified by the Eastern College Athletic Conference, the largest allied athletic conference in the NCAA, when it rubber-stamped the NCAA action by also placing Yale on probation.

The ECAC had no excuse, Mr. Speaker. It knew that the NCAA decision had been vigorously protested in this body, in the press, and by thousands of concerned Americans both in and out of sports. It knew that Yale students were being used as pawns in a power struggle. It knew that the NCAA was ignoring its responsibility to represent the best interests of individual college athletes and their schools. It heard an outstanding presentation by Yale officials of the reason why Yale defied the NCAA ban on Maccabiah basketball. Still, Mr. Speaker, the ECAC chose to ignore the NCAA's abrogation of responsibility to its students and voted to follow blindly with a punitive measure of its own.

In previous statements, I blamed NCAA actions on an "arrogant hierarchy." Now, however, I am not so sure. It may well be that the arrogance and blindness shown time and again by NCAA leaders have now infected the entire structure of intercollegiate athletics. I pray that this is not the case, for if it is the primary purpose of amateur athletics will eventually be subverted.

Whatever the reason, the ECAC action was a senseless and tragic example of the misuse of power. Furthermore, it showed once again the great need for a thorough investigation of the structure of intercollegiate athletics in this country. The resolution introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), and me, along with 24 cosponsors, would create a select committee to conduct such an investigation. I urge again its prompt enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point an excellent column by sportswriter Tim Horgan which appeared in a recent issue of the Boston Herald-Traveler. I urge our colleagues to note the statement in this column which

says "Any college's first obligation is to its students, not to whatever organizations it might belong." This is the crux of the matter, Mr. Speaker. This is why Yale is right and should not have been punished.

The text of Mr. Horgan's outstanding column is as follows:

PAWNS IN NCAA FEUD: ECAC FAILS STUDENTS BY ITS ACTION

(By Tim Horgan)

The ECAC was quite right yesterday in placing Yale on probation for 15 months. But otherwise, it was incredibly wrong.

The ECAC's action was justified because it is a card-carrying member of the NCAA. And Yale had violated an NCAA rule prohibiting American college students from playing basketball in the Maccabiah Games last summer.

The ECAC was otherwise wrong, however, because the rule was a bad one, if not downright immoral. And the 190 member colleges of the ECAC have no right to force their students to submit to a bad rule, particularly one perpetrated by an off-campus agency.

Any college's first obligation is to its students, not to whatever organizations it might belong.

By kowtowing to the NCAA, the ECAC not only has compromised itself as an organization, but each of its member colleges has failed all of its students.

The NCAA rule is a bad one because it was passed for a notorious reason. Walter Byers, the NCAA's executive director, stated as much in a letter to Dr. Gaylord P. Harnwell of Penn. last summer.

Byers explained that the NCAA Council had barred all U.S. college students from playing basketball in international competition because the NCAA thus hoped to force the AAU to give up control of amateur basketball in the U.S.

Why does the NCAA want to control amateur basketball in the U.S.? I don't even know that it has the right to tell non-collegians when and where they'll play the game.

But that's the least of the questions raised by this affair.

The critical issue is why the ECAC colleges felt obliged to obey the NCAA at the expense of their own students?

There was nothing wrong with the Maccabiah Games. The NCAA allowed athletes in every other sport to take part in them, although that doesn't prove much either.

Langer certainly suffered no physical, moral, mental or other harm by playing in

Israel. On the contrary. He got a worthwhile educational experience.

The NCAA simply intended to use the college students as pawns in its preposterous fight with the AAU. And for any college to condone this is, to my mind, insufferable.

Yet, Yale is the only college that stood up to the NCAA. Yale made its reason abundantly clear, too, not only through athletic director Delaney Kiphuth's 11-minute speech to the ECAC yesterday.

Yale Pres. Kingman Brewster, Jr., also wrote to the academic heads of every ECAC college not long ago, and told them:

"We think the NCAA has badly misused its powers in this controversy, and that the ECAC should condemn the NCAA rather than Yale."

Of course the ECAC should have. But instead it followed the NCAA as blindly as a flock of freshmen.

The worst part of it is that the ECAC doesn't deny that the NCAA rule is wrong. The 154 colleges which voted yesterday to punish Yale did so merely because Yale had stepped out of line. And the boys believed that, as administrators, they had to uphold law and order at any price. I can understand a little better now why our campuses are in an uproar.

I think it's frightening that Yale was the only ECAC college with the courage and intelligence to understand what's at stake here and to try to do something about it.

What's at stake is the right and duty of a college to protect its own students from being exploited. I don't know how any college can go about doing that now.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 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?

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 9, 1970

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

So we do not lose heart. Though our outer nature is wasting away, our inner nature is being renewed every day.—II Corinthians 4: 16.

Eternal God, whose paths are mercy and truth and who dost endeavor to lead Thy children to the heights of righteousness and peace, we come to Thee seeking light upon our way, strength for our tasks, wisdom to see clearly, and the courage to do what ought to be done for the well-being of our country.

Help us to live this day with joy and peace, without stumbling and without stain, because Thou art with us and we are with Thee. May the labor of these hours be in accordance with Thy holy will and for the good of all our people.

Come, O Lord, like morning sunlight, Making all life new and free;

For the daily task and challenge
May we rise renewed in Thee.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 5, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 527. Concurrent resolution relating to the enrollment of the bill H.R. 13300.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concur-

rent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3339. An act to authorize the Public Printer to fix the subscription price of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and

S. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report 91-617, entitled "Organized Crime Control Act of 1969".

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 82-414, appointed Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FONG, and Mr. THURMOND as members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy.

PALISADE, COLO.—FRESH AIR UNLIMITED

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)