

DEATH OF SENATOR RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL, OF GEORGIA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to advise the Senate of the passing of the senior Senator from Georgia.

The State of Georgia leads the Nation in mourning the death of RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL—one of the greatest U.S. Senators of all times, a distinguished statesman without peer, and a fine man beloved and respected by all of us in the Senate today, and all those who served with him during his 38 years in this Chamber.

A great leader and a great statesman has fallen. I know of no other Member of the U.S. Senate throughout all the history of America who served his Nation with greater distinction. A legend in his own time, Senator RUSSELL will be enshrined in history, along with giants of the U.S. Senate such as Webster, Calhoun, and Clay, and other Americans of great stature.

For more than 50 years, Senator RUSSELL served Georgia and the Nation as State legislator, speaker of the Georgia House of Representatives, and Governor of the State. He served for 38 years in the Senate.

As President pro tempore, he was third in line for succession to the Presidency. In modern history, Senator RUSSELL was without peer in the Senate. No other Member of the Senate was more beloved and respected. Senator RUSSELL was a Senator's Senator.

He was friend and counsel to Presidents, and there is no doubt in my mind that he would have been President himself, except for the fact that he was from the South. Georgia, the Nation, the free world, mourn his passing. I have lost a devoted friend, colleague, and confidant. I am grieved by his passing.

Mrs. Talmadge joins me in extending to the members of the Russell family our deepest heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have discussed this matter with the distinguished minority leader and we feel it only appropriate that remarks covering the passing of our late beloved colleague, the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr.

RUSSELL), be delivered tonight only by his own colleague from that great State.

I do wish to take this moment, though, to announce that, at the conclusion of morning business on Monday next, the remainder of that day will be devoted to eulogizing our late colleague.

I wish to join with the distinguished Senator in the remarks he has just made.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I thank the able and distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 7

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Richard B. Russell, late President pro tempore of the Senate and late a Senator from the State of Georgia.

Resolved, That the President of the Senate appoint a committee, of which he shall be a member, to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate stands adjourned at the close of the joint session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is considered and unanimously agreed to.

Under the second resolving clause the Chair appoints the entire membership of the Senate as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN COMMITTEE EXPENSES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 8

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the

actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of the Honorable Richard B. Russell, late a Senator from the State of Georgia, on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution (S. Res. 8) is considered and agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS—JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess to attend the joint session.

Thereupon, at 8:38 p.m., the Senate took a recess to attend a joint session of the two Houses.

The Senate, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate (Francis R. Valeo), the Deputy Sergeant at Arms (William H. Wannall), the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER), and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address by the President of the United States on the State of the Union.

(The address by the President of the United States delivered by him today appears in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1971

At the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses, the Senate, in accordance with the order previously entered and, pursuant to Senate Resolution 7, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, at 9 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m. adjourned until Monday, January 25, 1971, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TUNNARD: A SOUTHERN RECORD

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on August 10, 1861, the Battle of Wilson's Creek, the second major engagement of the Civil War, took place.

The site, located southwest of Springfield, Mo., was recently designated a national battlefield by President Nixon.

Willie H. Tunnard, a member of the 3d Louisiana Infantry, was a participant

in that battle and, later, when the war ended, wrote a book about the action. That book has now been reissued with a new preface and an additional 200 pages of notes along with a roster of the 2,200 names and service records of the members of the 3d Louisiana Infantry. I have one of the numbered copies and have read it with absorbing personal interest.

The book is entitled "Tunnard: A Southern Record," and is published by the Morningside Bookshop in Dayton, Ohio. The additional 200 pages and the roster have been edited by Edwin C. and Margie Bearss. Mr. Bearss is an employee of the National Park Service.

A review of the work was recently

printed in the Springfield, Mo., News and Leader newspaper by its former managing editor—now retired—and my personal friend.

To those who are interested in writings about the Civil War, I offer the following review:

THE BOOK CORNER

(Edited by C. W. Johnson)

SOUTHERN VIEW OF WILSON'S CREEK

(A Southern Record, by Edwin C. Bearss and Willie H. Tunnard; Morningside Bookshop, Dayton, Ohio, 582 pages, \$12.50 (\$15 after Jan. 1))

The battle of Wilson's Creek, second major engagement of the Civil War, fought over the rolling hills southwest of Springfield during

the morning hours of Aug. 10, 1861, should, according to the protocol of warfare, be called the Battle of Oak Hills—the title given it by the Confederates.

History records it as a Confederate victory, although crediting the Union forces comes a reissue of a Civil War history that the South was unable to press its advantage by pursuing the withdrawing Northerners as they pulled back to Springfield and thence on to the northeast toward St. Louis.

All the accounts written of the battle appear to be in general agreement, but now comes a reissue of a Civil War history that was written immediately after the close of the war that offers several major differences from previously accepted accounts.

This is an account of Willie H. Tunnard's participation in the campaign in which the 3rd Louisiana Infantry figured, first the thrust into Missouri, to be followed by scattered action in northern and western Arkansas, then diversion across the Mississippi to take a hand in the prolonged defense of Vicksburg.

Tunnard, born in New Jersey in 1837 but taken by his parents within a few years to Louisiana, attended and graduated from Kenyon College in Ohio and, with some early experience in journalism, wrote this book immediately upon the close of the war. It was published in a limited edition and in consequence has long been out of print; now, with Edwin C. Bearss as editor it has been expanded by some 200 pages by the inclusion of pertinent notes relating to the war, and the addition of the roster of 2200 names and service records of the members of the Louisiana regiment.

But Tunnard's account of the Battle of Wilson's Creek is at some disagreement with details generally accepted from other historians. Tunnard writes, for example, that the forces commanded by Gen. Ben McCulloch had been in pursuit of Union General Lyon from Cassville toward Springfield, and that some contact with Union forces had been made prior to the battle that began before dawn Aug. 10.

Tunnard's story, too, relates that the Confederates continued pursuit of the Union army all the way to Springfield, whereas historians generally accept the fact that the South suffered such crippling losses during the battle that pursuit was impossible.

Tunnard quotes official accounts to show that the Confederates had 5300 troops in the battle, of whom 156 were killed and 517 wounded. More recent accounts indicate that the South had 11,600 men in the battle against the North's 5400, that the South sustained 257 deaths, 900 wounded and 27 missing as against the North's 233 killed, 721 wounded and 291 missing.

"Gen. Lyon was killed about half-past one o'clock, while bravely leading his men," the Tunnard account says, "his uniform was cut up into small pieces and carried away as relics. His horse, a magnificent gray stallion, imported from England, was also killed, and the boys cut all the hair from his mane and tail and distributed it."

This, too, as a reprint of a book originally published in 1866, is of a limited edition of 1000 copies. An important addition to the history of the Civil War, it is available from Morningside Bookshop, Box 336, Forest Park Station, Dayton, Ohio, 45405, at the price of \$12.50 through Dec. 31 and thereafter at \$15.

REPORT OF 235 ACTIVITY IN NORTH CAROLINA

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, recent revelations about hous-

ing assistance for lower income families in some areas of the country have tended to leave the impression of a nationwide scandal. I do not know what the situation may be in other areas of our Nation but I am impressed with the integrity of the program in North Carolina. Recently I met with the FHA director in my State, Mr. R. B. Barnwell, and with others associated with the program. They are good men doing a good job. The information they provided about section 235 activities in my State impressed me, and I am entering it in the RECORD as an example of responsible administration of this program:

REPORT OF 235 ACTIVITY IN NORTH CAROLINA

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 establishes a new Section 235 of the National Housing Act to assist lower income families in acquiring homeownership or membership in a cooperative.

Assistance is in the form of monthly payments by HUD to the mortgagee to reduce interest costs on a market rate home mortgage insured by FHA to as low as 1 percent if the homeowner cannot afford the mortgage payment with 20 percent of his income.

The amount of subsidy will vary according to the income of each homeowner and the total amount of the mortgage payment at the market rate of interest. Family income and mortgage limits are established for eligibility in each locality.

Assistance under Section 235 will generally be limited to new or substantially rehabilitated units. However, within specified limits, existing dwellings can be sold to the families who are eligible for assistance.

When the 235 program, Interest Subsidy for Low Income Families, was instigated as a result of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, this office was allocated funds for 994 units. Activity in this program was light in the beginning and during 1969 due to the newness of the program and the availability of money for other FHA programs and conventional financing. Most builders were slow getting on the bandwagon. As money became less available, the 235 program provided practically the only means of obtaining construction and permanent financing, interest in the 235 program increased sharply.

The first appropriation was 25 million and the appropriation for fiscal year 1970, 30 million, therefore, allocation of contract authority to this State has been small. As a result, obligation of 235 funds has been carefully limited to builders known by FHA and who could produce and evenly distribute production all over the State.

Interest has been altogether divided between proposed and existing construction. No interest has been shown in Rehabilitation.

The following gives complete data on the 235 activity in North Carolina:

1. Contract authority allocated to cover 5,439 units since the 235 inception.
2. 4,500 commitments have been issued under the 235 program.
3. The average sales price of properties sold under the 235 program has been approximately \$17,500 for 3 bedroom and \$19,500 for 4 bedroom homes.
4. Properties built under 235 have been located evenly throughout the State with a greater concentration in cities of 30,000 population or more.
5. 2,455 units (including those processed by the Farmers Home Administration) have been insured since the inception of the program.
6. 235 complaints received in the last six months where original inspection was made by (a) FHA, 18; (b) VA (referred to VA for handling), 15.
7. 235 complaints resolved in last six months involving original FHA compliance inspections, 10.

8. Total complaints received (all home programs) for last six months (new and reopened), 111.

9. Total complaints resolved or closed (all home programs) for last six months, 105.

10. Fourteen (14) 235 properties have been foreclosed since the inception of this program.

EDUCATING OUR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, in my hometown of Davenport, Iowa, we have a unique organization devoted to providing educational facilities for preschool children. The following guest editorial from the Davenport Times-Democrat explains more fully the work of the Quad-City Montessori Association:

A LIFE OF CREATIVE LEARNING

(NOTE.—The guest article today is by A. Fred Berger Jr. on the work of Maria Montessori and of the school opened recently by the Quad-City Montessori Association. Berger is president of the association, first assistant county attorney in Scott County, and a member of the law firm of Dircks, Berger and Saylor. He received a doctor of jurisprudence degree at the University of Iowa in 1957. He, his wife and three children live at 822 W. Rusholme St., Davenport.)

Maria Montessori (1870-1952) was Italy's first woman physician. She devoted her life to children's liberation. Her many books and articles, all published many years ago but as fresh as classics, should be read by anyone who knows a child. In them she summarizes her careful observations of children and presents her revolutionary thoughts on their educational needs.

In "The Absorbent Mind" Dr. Montessori wrote, "The most important period of life is not the age of university studies, but the first one, the period from birth to age six. For that is the time when man's intelligence itself, his greatest implement, is being formed. But not only his intelligence; the full totality of his psychic powers . . . At no other age has the child greater need of an intelligent help, and any obstacle that impedes his creative work will lessen the chance he has of achieving perfection."

Dr. Montessori believed that no individual is educated by another person. He must do it himself or it will never be done. A truly educated person continues learning long after the hours and years he spends in the classroom because he is motivated from within by natural curiosity and love for knowledge. She felt, therefore, that the goal of early childhood education should not be to fill the child with facts, but rather to cultivate his own natural desire to learn.

Children, she observed, have periods of intense fascination for learning a particular skill such as counting. It is easier for the child to learn that particular skill during the sensitive period than at any other time in his life. She also observed that in order to learn there must be concentration and the best way a child can concentrate is by fixing his attention on some task he is performing with his hands—the hand being the chief teacher of the child.

From these theories and observations, Montessori developed the "Casas dei Bambini" or children's houses. The Montessori school consists of a pleasant, carefully prepared environment where children feel comfortable and at home. All equipment and materials are scaled to the child's size. Each

child is free to select activities which correspond to his own periods of interest and readiness thus allowing him to experience the excitement of learning by his own choice rather than being forced. All equipment in the classroom allows the child to reinforce his casual impressions by inviting him to use his hands for learning. In addition, the classroom materials are self-correcting, allowing the child to do a task by himself. The adults in the classroom are there to help the child help himself rather than to teach in the conventional sense. The classroom materials give specific information to the child and at the same time perfect all his natural tools for learning, so that his ability will be at a maximum in future learning situations.

The Quad-City Montessori Association opened its school in Davenport last September. Formed by a group of parents concerned about the education of their pre-school children, the association is a non-profit corporation dedicated to the task of maintaining a Montessori school locally. It has 31 enrollees 3-5 years of age. Classes meet in St. Andrew Presbyterian Church. Mrs. Neil Chrisman of Geneseo, Ill., serves as the directress and is assisted by Mrs. Tom Tyree and Mrs. Marvin Bryce, both of Davenport.

Montessorians throughout the world are observing the centennial of Maria Montessori's birth. The Quad-City group is proud to be a part of this centenary year. Their motto is "building the foundation for a lifetime of creative learning" which summarizes Maria Montessori's goal for all children.

THE CAMBODIANS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Kipling wrote:

But there is neither East nor West, Border, nor Breed, nor Birth, When two strong men stand face to face, tho' they come from the ends of the earth!

The spirit exhibited by the Cambodian people as they bravely fight to hold back the North Vietnamese Communist armies has been likened to that shown by the people of Great Britain during the early part of World War II. What Winston Churchill said about the English people during the Battle of Britain can be said today of the Cambodians:

This was their finest hour.

The small nation of Cambodia moved into the forefront of the anti-Communist struggle in Southeast Asia last March when the National Assembly voted no confidence in the long-time head of state, Prince Sihanouk. Sihanouk had allowed the Communists to tranship goods across Cambodia from the port of Kompong Som to their sanctuaries in eastern Cambodia since the early 1960's. He had also made agreements with the Communists in violation of the Cambodian neutrality law of 1957 and the Geneva Accords of 1954 which pledged Cambodia to maintain a neutral position.

Upon learning of his ouster as chief of state in favor of nationalist anti-Communist forces, Sihanouk rushed from Moscow where, interestingly enough, he was at the time, to Red China, where he set up his present shadow government.

He threw his support behind the North Vietnamese Communist effort to conquer his own country, proving that treason can reach the top level of government.

Portions of the North Vietnamese armies immediately began marching westward toward the Cambodian capital of Phnom Penh. By April 20 the town of Saagn, only 20 miles from the capital, was seized by the enemy forces. Lon Nol, the current leader of Cambodia, had appealed fruitlessly to both the cochairmen of the commission set up by the 1954 Geneva Accords, which had guaranteed Cambodian neutrality, and also to the United Nations, which, as usual, was not interested in doing anything about aggression by Communists. On April 21 he appealed directly to the United States for arms and ammunition to repel the aggressors. Although a few captured AK-47 Czech and Red Chinese made rifles were forthcoming, he was advised to look elsewhere for ammunition. Just where he was supposed to look is a real question.

Then on April 30, a combined United States-South Vietnamese force slashed into the Communist rear areas in eastern Cambodia. This effort, so soundly condemned by some Americans who seem to have become most interested in the success of the North Vietnamese war effort, temporarily saved Cambodia from falling to the enemy. The Cambodians knew this well. To them, the charges that this operation was aggression on the part of the United States toward Cambodia are ridiculous. They diplomatically refrain from calling these assertions malicious.

Today, the Communist forces control half of Cambodia proper, and the situation is tenuous. The Cambodians have, however, risen to the occasion in defense of their homeland. Two examples of the fine spirit of total national resistance and opposition to communism stand out from among many. The first is the fact that the Cambodian Army has increased in numbers from 35,000 in March of this year, when Sihanouk was constitutionally deposed, to a current strength of over 150,000. This has been done without conscription. Here is a real people's war, with tens of thousands of Cambodians flocking to the banner of what is known as the "Salvation Government" to fight for their nation against an increasingly vicious aggressor.

The second fact illustrating the spirit of the Cambodian people is less well known. For years individual Cambodians have been traveling to South Vietnam to join an organization known as the Khmer Serai—Free Cambodians. This group has been one of the main elements of the special forces efforts in many areas of South Vietnam. The Khmer Serai has proved itself to be one of the toughest and most reliable anti-Communist fighting groups in South Vietnam. Many of the Khmer Serai fighters have now returned to their own land as it pursues its new course in the fight for freedom.

While many American students have demonstrated in favor of Communist war aims, practically the entire student and teacher population of Cambodia have marched off to war against the North Vietnamese invaders. They understand perfectly the difference between libera-

tion and aggression and have dedicated themselves to the fight for national independence, rather than against it.

The U.S. Congress, while voting weapons and other material to aid the Cambodian people, has voted against allowing American troops to go directly to their aid. It will be interesting to see whether the spirit of the "Flying Tigers" will revive, with Americans individually volunteering to go and help the Cambodians. Under a 1967 Supreme Court decision Afroyim against Rusk, an American cannot lose his citizenship for an action of this type.

The spirit of determined total resistance to aggression pervades the Cambodian people. They deserve to win, and, with our help, they can and will win.

W. C. HANDY: THE LEGEND OF
BEALE STREET

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, Col. George W. Lee, a good friend of mine and an outstanding figure in this country, is one of the most magnificent and eloquent speakers of our time.

Recently, and understandably so, he was selected to deliver the main address at the dedication of the W. C. Handy Museum in Florence, Ala.

W. C. Handy wrote the widely known song "Memphis Blues" and from this original art score came similar blues music—"The St. Louis Blues," and "The Beale Street Blues."

To give you some background on Colonel Lee, I want you to know that he has enjoyed one of the most successful careers of any man I have ever known.

Colonel Lee is a great American and has served as an inspiration to all of those who know him. He is a man of high principles and has led a life which has brought to him many rewards as a soldier, author, lecturer, civic leader, and successful businessman.

Colonel Lee's phraseology and his oratorical style are matched by few and the speech he delivered in Alabama certainly brought forth these rare talents.

I have read a copy of the dialect and I feel readers of the RECORD also are entitled to read it.

The address follows:

W. C. HANDY: THE LEGEND OF BEALE STREET

Master of ceremonies, ladies and gentlemen, I wish I could express my gratitude for your invitation to share with you the glory of this hour, but my heart sinks into a sea of gratitude and language takes its flight. Perhaps my feeling can be expressed best by the line in Handy's "Beale Street Blues," "I would rather be here than any place I know." Nowhere has the dream of the Founding Fathers been more beautifully expressed than in what you are doing here today. You have risen above race and tradition to glorify the achievement of a great American who happened to be a black man. Thus, in Governor Wallace's land, you are demonstrating that geography has nothing to do with the appreciation of genius.

The true test of the genius of an artist is how long his creations can remain in full bloom in the memory of man. How long will they be followed by mankind with admiration and devotion? How long the dream of the artist, expressed on canvas, in prose, in music, or in song, can remain above the runways to oblivion and not be forgotten or buried beneath the tongueless silence of the dreamless dust? A million songs have flown with the drift of the wind; a million landscapes have been etched; a million sunsets over the Rockies have been painted; a million faces of heroes have tiptoed out of the fantastic imagination of the poet and dreamer, but only a few have stood the test of time; have withstood the whips and scorns of time and remained sweeter and brighter as the years flowed by.

Hundreds of years have passed since Pygmalion fashioned a Galatea out of rare and nameless marble, so life-like that he bowed down and prayed to it to come into being, and the Galatea is still cherished. Hundreds of years have passed since Michelangelo decorated the Sistine Chapel with paintings of the disciples, prophets, saints, teachers, and apostles of Christendom that saved civilization when Rome was sacked by vandals. The paintings in the Sistine still prime the wells of enthusiasm and stir the pride of a people strikingly devoted to Christianity and its great history. Hundreds of years have passed since Mendelssohn wrote his overture to "A Midsummer Night's Dream," and Goethe finished his "Faust." Hundreds of years have passed since Mozart smote the lyre of the Scottish plowman and stayed the life of the German priest, but they still remain as distinctive gifts to the world's treasure house of art and music.

Standing here today, at the birthplace of the immortal William Christopher Handy, I have no need to build up the value of his creations out of Pierian Spring Water and Sweet Lemonade, but I can use the same yardstick that has been used to measure the creations of other great artists who have starred their age and time. More than a half century ago Handy wrote the "Memphis Blues." It was then, and is now, so far as I know, the first and only original art score ever produced in American music. Its mood and melody inspired the "St. Louis Blues", the "Beale Street Blues", the "Memphis Blues", and a thousand other blues songs that have flown with the drift of the wind to Paris, London, Singapore, and then back to a shotgun shack in the mud flats of East Street. A half century ago Handy wrote the "St. Louis Blues." It still holds its place today in the minds of music lovers as one of the 12 great songs in the Treasure House of American Music. When other hectic modernisms have lived their swift and furious lives and have faded out in this country that "St. Louis Woman, With Her Diamonds Rings", will be swinging down the corridors of time to the echoes of the blues, rising like winged music through eternity.

The vehicle for Handy's first great song was Mr. Crump, who ran for mayor back in 1909, on a ticket to reform Memphis, which at that time, was a hell-roaring river town. Handy, whose band was employed in the campaign, wrote a song for the occasion which ran: "Mr. Crump Don't Low No Easy Riders Here." The easy riders sang back: "I Don't Care What Mr. Crump Don't Low; I'm Gonna Bar'l-House Anyhow." And they did just that, but in the end Mr. Crump had his way and the easy riders faded into memory. But the campaign itself was God's gift to W. C. Handy. The melody of the "Memphis Blues" has, for more than a half century, caused bands to go to town on its red-hot syncopation, and a million juke boxes to swell up loud in a million hok-nose restaurants and chattering cafes, and in a million ballrooms where kings and princesses over the earth

shook wicked shoulders. It inspired jazz, rock and roll from which soul music come.

It was Handy's great sense of value that caused him to discover the nationalistic element in the folk songs of black people in the back country; songs that flowed in quick tears and laughter from their unhappy hearts; songs of burly roustabouts rolling cotton bales down the jumpy gangplank of the Robert E. Lee; songs of John Henrys tapping up railroad tires, and from field hands in the sweltering river bottoms and the tall corn fields; songs that the heart couldn't tell in its own futile terms, but borrowed from travesty and fervent plaint the walls from which Handy drew his own great songs. The wailing that Handy heard among the roustabouts, field hands, and workers on the levy took root in his mind and he felt in his soul the apathy and despair of these downtrodden people which he later expressed so admirably in his music. He was determined to do something to emphasize the nationalistic elements of these songs, set them to music, and make the world sing them. This was not the determination of black people, however, who rejected the blues, but Handy thought differently. He knew that until the black man found his heritage he would never find his pride. He would always be doomed to live a life of subjugation. He knew the teaching of history and that the strength of the people was in its heritage. He had the guts to hold up that heritage in our folk songs and give them everlasting voice with his golden trumpet, pressed to hot lips and with his pen pressed to music paper.

Vincent Lopez, in his first jazz concert at the Metropolitan Opera, proclaimed the "Memphis Blues" the only original art score in American music. Then George Gershwin came along and admitted his dependence on Handy's music for his "Rhapsody in Blue", and America gradually woke up to the idea that Handy's music, the blues, might someday constitute the rough foundation of a new American culture. So Handy's place in history is secure. Around his fortunes, about his hopes, and amid his anxious tears gathered the best minds, both black and white, rich and poor, to enjoy the festival of his music called the blues. Sometimes in taverns, and drawing rooms and hotel lobbies, they gathered to listen to his stories that prompted his sad sweet songs.

The Milwaukee Journal, in 1949, named him as one of the 20 grand old men of the world, along with George Bernard Shaw, Toscanini, Lionel Barrymore, Connie Mack, Bernard Baruch, Cordell Hull, and others. He was born here in Florence, but he was not of the south. He was not of the north. He was of the universe and all human kind was his brethren. His life is the tale of three streets, Beale Street in Memphis, Market Street in St. Louis, and Broadway in New York, but from the dust of Beale Street rose the legend of a man. He pressed his trumpet to hot lips and a song came forth. "I hate to see that evening sun go down." His music spans the barriers of race and establish communication; builds bridges of communication from man to man; from heart to heart such as a sick world is in such dire need of today because the slaughter of human beings will not stop and man will not reach the millennium until the Iron Curtains have been torn down in Russia, and the Bamboo Curtains have been torn down in China, and the curtains of racism have been removed from every American heart.

Later in life Handy became more conscious of a mission. It is revealed in his Afro-American hymn. It is revealed in his turn from writing blues to gospel songs which reflected a feeling of concern about race and religious feelings that were tearing at the soul of the Nation. He gave endless days to writing such songs that might breathe reality into the American dream so that an inspiring democ-

racy would constitute the divine fire that would illuminate our presently fearful future. Nevertheless, the "Beale Street Blues," the "Memphis Blues," and the "St. Louis Blues" holds fast to something deep down inside of one. They are more than songs. They are loving, shining symbols that only the soul of man can understand. So, when the last sun goes down on the judgment day it will reveal three bright musical mansions in the sky. The one on the right for George Gershwin, built out of "Rhapsody in Blue." The one on the left for Stephen Foster, built out of "My Old Kentucky Home." Then a shaft of musical lightning will thwart the inky skies and reveal in the center a shiny bright mansion for William Christopher Handy, built out of the "Memphis Blues," the "St. Louis Blues," the "Beale Street Blues," with the solid foundation that those who "sow in tears shall reap in joy." In my mind's eye I see St. Peter standing in the doorway to this blissful land where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary is at rest. He extends his hand in fellowship to W. C. Handy. As Handy approaches I think I can hear St. Peter say, "You captured the attention of art and music and entrusted her charms to your joyous care. Your magic genius opened the closed door. Your achievements under the stars and stripes engaged the wonder of civilized man."

ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA ENDORSES NEW CONSUMER PROTECTION PROPOSALS

HON. ROBERT McCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the new proposed rule announced last September by the Federal Trade Commission would provide a 3-day cooling off period—during which merchandise marketed door to door would be subject to cancellation by the purchaser. At a recent hearing on this proposed FTC rule, Mr. Charles E. Swanson, president of Encyclopaedia Britannica, presented testimony in support of the FTC proposal. This endorsement by Encyclopaedia Britannica is most significant—and has been described in a statement from the public relations division of Encyclopaedia Britannica on Friday, January 8, 1971. I congratulate the officials of Encyclopaedia Britannica for their enlightened position on this subject. Britannica's endorsement is set forth as follows:

ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA ENDORSES NEW CONSUMER PROTECTION PROPOSALS

Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., one of the nation's leading publishers of educational materials, today announced its endorsement of the newly proposed Federal Trade Commission trade regulation rule designed to protect consumers from unfair and deceptive sales practices.

The new trade regulation rule being proposed by the FTC was announced last September and hearings are scheduled to begin here January 19.

Charles E. Swanson, Britannica's president, commenting on testimony prepared for the FTC, said "we are pleased to give unqualified support to the FTC 'cooling off' proposals," which concern sales practices, although, he added, as the FTC records show, the most common complaints voiced by consumers regarding direct distribution companies in-

volve billing procedures and problems associated with the delivery of goods purchased.

We favor, Swanson said, this step toward greater consumer protection. Business and industry can and must do more in this entire field.

"If this rule is finally adopted for the entire home selling industry, we believe consumers will have increased confidence that their rights in the home have full and adequate protection.

"Home selling, an American tradition, accounts for a significant portion of all goods and services sold in the United States. This segment of the economy is important to jobs, production and the economy in general. However, it must be healthy to continue to grow."

Heart of the new FTC rule is a mandatory three-day "cooling off" period which allows buyers three days before a sale of consumer goods or services is final. Swanson said that in response to consumer interests and varying state regulations, Britannica voluntarily introduced a four-day "cooling off" period in 1968 which goes beyond that currently being sought by the FTC.

Another important provision of the proposed trade regulation rule calls for the seller to protect the purchaser from misrepresentation on the part of sales representatives.

"Britannica, recognizing its historical position of leadership within the industry, is proud to take this strong consumer stance and to be the first company to endorse the proposed FTC regulation," he said.

Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., American-owned since the early 1900's, has since become a highly diversified international publishing organization. In addition to the 203-year-old Encyclopaedia Britannica, the oldest continuously published reference work in the English language, the company produces a wide variety of other educational materials both here and abroad.

THE 53D ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 53d anniversary since the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic and the anniversary of the Act of Union, whereby all Ukrainian territory was united into one independent and sovereign state of Ukraine. The independence of Ukraine was proclaimed in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine on January 22, 1918, and the Act of Union took place a year later.

The Ukrainian National Republic was recognized by foreign governments including Soviet Russia. Shortly after this recognition Russia began a large scale invasion of Ukraine. For 3½ years the Ukrainian people waged a gallant struggle in defense of their country but it was subdued to a puppet regime of the Soviet Socialistic Republic.

The freedom loving people of Ukraine have not accepted the Soviet-Russian domination and have since been fighting to regain their independence by all means accessible to them. During World War II the Ukrainian people organized a powerful underground resistance movement known as the Ukrainian Par-

tisan Army—UPA—which fought not only against the Soviets but the Nazi regime as well.

The Brezhnev and Kosygin leadership is bent on keeping the Soviet-Russian empire intact by persecution of Ukrainian intellectuals, professors, poets, writers, scientists, and commentators. The international press has been providing a vast amount of documentation on the suppression of the Ukrainian culture.

Briefly, the Kremlin rule in Ukraine can be described as follows: Exploitation of Ukraine's economic resources for the benefit of Moscow and its imperialistic ventures in Asia, Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. Genocide and systematic deportation of Ukrainians to central Asia. Arrest and trials of Ukrainian patriots including Ukrainian Communists defending freedom of their country.

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

All the available evidence of the Western observers shows that the ever-increasing tempo of repression has failed to intimidate the Ukrainian people; therefore, the Russian leadership in Kremlin took brutal measures against liberal movement in Czechoslovakia. Since Kremlin leaders were convinced the liberal ideas of Czechoslovakia would help Ukrainian liberals and other captive nations.

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

I insert in the RECORD an article from the New Star, Chicago, Ill., entitled "Genocide Against Christians in Ukraine":

GENOCIDE AGAINST CHRISTIANS IN UKRAINE

WASHINGTON, D.C.—"The Ukrainian Catholic Church must be protected," said Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington, on the occasion of the inaugural lecture of the Roman Smal-Stocki Lecture Series sponsored by the Ukrainian Catholic Studies Foundation presented on December 11, 1970 at the St. Josaphat Seminary in Washington, D.C. by Archbishop Ambrose Senyshyn, OSBM, Metropolitan for the Ukrainian Catholics in the United States. The thesis presented was, "Christianity in Soviet Ukraine," in which the Archbishop charged the Soviet Union with practicing genocide against Christianity in Ukraine.

The Archbishop made 21 charges of genocide and crimes perpetrated by the Soviet Union against the Byzantine-Ukrainian Catholic and the Ukrainian Autocephalus Orthodox Churches in Soviet Ukraine.

In a lecture delivered by the Archbishop at St. Josaphat's Ukrainian Catholic Seminary in Washington (Dec. 11, 1970), he stated that the Soviet Union systematically planned the complete destruction of the Byzantine-Ukrainian Catholic and Ukrainian Autocephalus Orthodox Churches, notwithstanding its so-called constitutional guarantees of religious freedom and its demonstration of tolerance of religion to foreigners by allowing a few "show" churches to remain open.

Archbishop Senyshyn charged the Soviet Union with the following deliberately planned official acts of genocide and crime against Christians and Christianity in Soviet Ukraine:

1. The Soviet Union caused to be killed or die in prison many thousands of bishops, priests, nuns, vergers, professors of theology and prominent faithful of both the Byzantine-Ukrainian Catholic and the Ukrainian Autocephalus Orthodox Churches in Ukraine.

2. The Soviet Union destroyed or confiscated historical churches, monasteries, seminaries, schools, icons, chalices and other church property belonging to the Byzantine-Ukrainian Catholic or the Ukrainian Autocephalus Orthodox Churches or the Christian faithful.

3. The Soviet Union deliberately sent hoodlums into the churches to disrupt services and to physically attack priests and the faithful.

4. The Soviet Union arrested falsely thousands of clergy and faithful merely for practicing their right to religious freedom.

5. The Soviet Union abolished Sunday as a holiday and eliminated all other church holidays as a measure against the practice of religion.

6. The Soviet Union deliberately set exorbitantly high fees for the use of the churches they confiscated so that the priests would have no place to conduct services.

7. The Soviet Union declared priests, nuns, professors of theology and other churchmen "non-working elements thus denying them certain civil rights available to other members of the Soviet society.

8. The Soviet Union used numerous terroristic measures to dissuade priests from hearing confessions, celebrating Mass and caring for the faithful and used similar methods of terror on the faithful.

9. The Soviet Union imposed exorbitantly high taxes against priests and church property so as to preclude the exercise of religious freedom.

10. The Soviet Union dressed atheists in priest's vestments, who with cross in hand held wild masquerades in the streets and ridiculed God, religious faith, the Church and the priesthood as to discredit the dignity of belief in God.

11. The Soviet Union organized the "Union of Atheists" run by the communist party and supplied them with various propagandist means at the expense of the state while denying the same to those who would encourage the practice of religion.

12. The Soviet Union organized the population to take part in anti-religious demonstrations under duress of arrest for not participating.

13. The Soviet Union deprived the children of the clergy the right to get an education and denied them entitlement to work for normal wages unless the children severed all connection their parents.

14. The Soviet Union closed down all seminaries and church schools in order to deny the Byzantine-Ukrainian Catholic and the Ukrainian Autocephalus Orthodox Churches development of future priests.

15. The Soviet Union denied the religious press the freedom to propagate the faith by closing down all publishing facilities used by the Byzantine-Ukrainian Catholic and Ukrainian Autocephalus Orthodox Churches.

16. The Soviet Union destroyed Christian cemeteries and monuments and converted the stone into building blocks for roads and sidewalks, thus attempting to eliminate all traces of Christian tradition of the Ukrainian people.

17. The Soviet Union forbade priests from visiting the sick and dying thus denying them the last sacraments.

18. The Soviet Union prohibited the clergy from engaging in any charitable and social work on behalf of the needy, thus denying the priests from carrying out their religious duty.

19. The Soviet Union made false accusations against the bishops, priests and other churchmen by charging them with collab-

oration with the Nazis, a crime of "high treason" against the Soviet Union.

20. The Soviet Union denied the imprisoned clergy and faithful the right of legal counseling or fair trial and further denied them humane treatment.

21. The Soviet Union applied extreme pressures and tortures to the Byzantine-Ukrainian Catholic clergy in order to force them to renounce their Catholic faith and to sever all ties with the Vatican.

In reply to the question of "what is the status of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Soviet Ukraine today?" Archbishop Senyshyn said, "The Catholic Church of the Byzantine Rite is outlawed in Ukraine. The faithful, however, worship in secret. There exists an underground Ukrainian Catholic Church in Soviet Ukraine. The Holy Mass is held in secret and marriages are performed in secret."

Finally, the Archbishop said, "Nonetheless, if we are to view the future of the Church from the perspective of faith, then we have every reason to hope for a happy resolution to every problem and difficulty. The Fathers of the Church have always taught that the blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church. The Ukrainian Catholic Church, has not ceased shedding her blood, and because of this alone, coupled with an ardent faith in God's Divine Providence, we can expect a glorious future for the Catholic Church not only in Ukraine, but in every country where faithful Ukrainian Catholics have made their home."

THE POSSIBILITY OF RENEWAL

HON. BILL D. BURLISON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, my very good and personal friend, the Reverend Robert L. Burke, who is pastor of the Wyatt and Bertrand United Methodist Churches of Mississippi County in my district, recently delivered a New Year's message for 1971 which I feel is quite extraordinary. It is my desire to share his remarks with the Members of the Congress:

THE POSSIBILITY OF RENEWAL

No simple action is more fraught with possibility for opening new vistas than the tearing off of the last sheet of the old calendar. It's not as if it were any other month ended. It's the end of a line; it's returning to the head after having served the entire route.

Revelation 21: I heard a loud voice speaking from the throne: "Now God's home is with men! He will live with them, and they shall be his people. God himself will be with them, and he will be their God . . . The old things have disappeared". And the one who sits on the throne said, "And now I make all things new."

New Year's celebrations in our society give testimony to the desire to leave our "low-vaulted past." A favorite theme of literature has sounded the note of putting off the old, putting on the new:

(By Alfred Tennyson)

Ring out, wild bells, to the wild sky,
The flying cloud, the frosty light;
The year is dying in the night;
Ring out, wild bells, and let him die.

Ring out the old, ring in the new,
Ring, happy bells, across the snow;
The year is going, let him go;
Ring out the false, ring in the true.

"Behold! I make all things new". Before us like the calm ocean depicted by James

Russell Lowell lies a full calendar of unused days. In readings of astrology and plottings of horoscopes no one escapes the personal pinch "What will the New Year bring for me?" The prospect of the future is always a prime concern even though occupation with the business of the now is sufficient for the business of today. Renewal is always a great longing of man. Alladin was taken in by the offer of "swapping" his old lamp for a new.

The last book of the New Testament is addressed to this very thought—"Behold I make all things new" is a startling assertion. And the Book of the Revelation will forever be a mystery until it be understood as it was understood by the recorder of its insights and revelations, not an easy task for our day. John wrote deliberately in pictures and symbols while he was caught up in the spiritual ecstasy of one who spent his whole time in communion with God—alone, in exile, lost in contemplation. John on Patmos was peculiarly in tune with God—he heard clearly because he listened intently. His book continues to "bug" people who find in it descriptions wholly alien to today's living—descriptions of events to be brought to fulfillment. Efforts to give twentieth century handles to the picturesque, figurative symbolism can end only in further confusion. We here have John's vision of the future in wild, extravagant colors "splashed on a ten league canvas with brushes of camel's hair"—his vision of a new heaven and a new earth.

We may wonder how one on a lonely sand island could imagine that God was making all things new. Christians were savagely persecuted, Rome was well on her way to decline, Greek culture was almost forgotten. It seems to me that John could make such a tremendous assertion only because he himself had been made new. He and a relatively small group had experienced the reality of God. The same bodies—the same passions, imperfections, but they had a new outlook, a new attitude toward all people, a new spirit, a new incentive, new priorities, new values.

Do you suppose it's possible for our lives to be made new? Common sense dictates "For me, I'm too old to change—too set in my ways. And I'm not sure I want to change." And I agree that there are times in our lives when the possibility of renewal seems remote if not impossible. Let me suggest.

1. If we begin with the conviction that there is no hope for you or your world then there will be none. Not that our lives are all vile and base and mean, dirty and godless but that there's enough of that in them of selfish pride and greed and unconcern that every one needs to cry with St. Paul "Wretched man that I am, who will deliver me?" If Miss Sullivan had given up in hopelessness Helen Keller would never have lived. Had Gandhi said, "There's no possibility of freedom in a country so vast and so illiterate," India would never have known the freedom of Gandhi's India.

Renewal is a possibility only if we believe it. If it happened to Jon (and James and Peter and Paul and ———) it can happen to me.

2. If you think you can do it by yourself, you're lost. If you have no will, no desire to change, you won't. If you think you can do it on your own, you can't. Paradoxical? Yes. The alcoholic is helped when he admits he needs help. Come O Christ, and make me new and whole.

No one man drove back the dark of the Middle Ages and brought the light of the Renaissance. It was the coming of the dawn that brought men to light. Like the life in the flower bulb, we can grow, can be renewed, no matter how old, how stuffy, how battered by life—we can have a new spirit when something comes to us to which we respond. Like the life in the bulb, we cannot do it ourselves. It is done to us. We must will it, be acceptable, keep the door open. Unrealities must be discarded. Welcome every breath

that comes from the "new world". Be on the lookout for the coming near of the spirit—borne by persons, in places, under circumstances. And we must not be timid or fearful of the price tag. Renewal, urban or rural, political or social, is never cheap. Above all spiritual renewal is never a bargain basement item. Sacrifice, discipline, humility, love are dear. The stakes are high. Since man was first endowed with imagination, since the struggle upward toward light began, man has never been content with self-containment. His spirit's only rest is in God—only then can he know all things made new. Put up the new calendar—a whole new year, unused, lies ahead. God is making all things new. And for you and your world, always an available possibility.

THE PENTAGON VERSUS CESAR CHAVEZ

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I addressed the House, describing legislation which I have introduced, along with 16 cosponsors, to prohibit the Department of Defense from using its procurement policy to combat the lettuce boycott organized by Cesar Chavez and the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee. As it did in the case of the grape boycott, the Pentagon has increased sharply its purchases of boycotted lettuce, thus violating its own rule requiring impartiality in a labor dispute.

A column by Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden, entitled "Pentagon Versus Chavez," which appeared in the January 5, 1971, edition of the New York Post, describes the activities of the Defense Department in undermining the efforts of Cesar Chavez to organize the lettuce workers. I urge my colleagues to read it and support my legislation.

I also include in the RECORD an editorial from the January 8, 1971, issue of the New York Post, entitled "The Pentagon Versus Cesar Chavez"; and an editorial broadcast on January 18-19, 1971, by radio station WMCA, in New York City, entitled "Lettuce and the Pentagon." The items follow:

PENTAGON VERSUS CHAVEZ

(By Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden)

WASHINGTON.—As if Defense Secretary Laird didn't have enough trouble, some of his subordinates are now using the Defense Dept. to break the most honest union in the nation.

In the valleys of California, from Salinas to Coachella, where migrant farm workers pick lettuce at this season of the year and try to scratch a little dignity from an average annual income of \$1,900 and a system which gives them none of the legal protection other workers have enjoyed for 35 years, the Pentagon has assumed, once again, the role of strike breaker.

"Once again," because in the years before Cesar Chavez' United Farm Workers Organizing Committee used the strike and a national consumer boycott to get a contract from the grape growers the Pentagon buyers went into the market and more than tripled its purchase of grapes, in an obvious attempt to use taxpayers' money to break the strike and the union.

Now, when the commodity in question is lettuce, the Defense Dept. is at it again. First-quarter figures show that since the major strike and boycott began against Bud Antle Inc., a major California lettuce grower affiliated with Dow Chemical, the Defense Dept. has increased Antle's share of the lettuce market from less than 10 per cent to nearly 30 per cent.

The Antle figures are instructive and show clearly that Antle has become the chosen instrument of some Pentagon officials in breaking the strikes. In the three months ending Sept. 30, 1970 (later figures are not yet available), Pentagon buyers paid \$750,000 to Antle for lettuce, more than in the previous 12 months.

What is more, Antle is receiving—from presumably sharp-eyed military buyers—a price not only above the market price, but also above what the Pentagon is paying other lettuce producers. The price leverage is more than welcome to Antle, which is dumping its boycotted lettuce—as the boycott begins to work—elsewhere at lower prices.

The muscle in this military buying becomes even more apparent when one compares lettuce sales of Inter Harvest, a United Fruit Co. affiliate which has signed a contract with the Farm Workers' Union. Inter Harvest has experienced a sharp drop in military sales, even as Antle has been soaring.

In Denver, for example, Pentagon produce buyers now buy exclusively from Mile-High Produce, the only wholesaler in the area which handles Antle lettuce.

These apparently calculated efforts within the Defense Dept., began almost as soon as the strike began. As soon as the grape growers signed a contract with the union, Chavez turned toward the lettuce field.

Within a few days, many of the lettuce growers had signed "sweetheart" contracts with—of all people—the Teamsters Union, in most cases without any request from the Teamsters and in all cases without any consultation or votes by the farm workers. Thus thousands of lettuce pickers found themselves tied to a Teamster contract, complete with dues checked off, in some cases at the old rate and in no event at more than a 5-cent an hour raise.

The response of the workers was to strike; the response of Cesar Chavez was to call for a boycott of those lettuce growers who would not respect the wishes of the workers; and the response of the growers, led by Antle, was to get an injunction. They found a local judge who would order Chavez to jail until he publicly called off the boycott—since reversed by the California Supreme Court.

The same judge as a law enforcement official 30 years ago had deputized every white adult male to arrest the participants in an earlier organizing drive.

The scene was graphically described by John Steinbeck in his novel "In Dubious Battle": "A Communist, mister, is any son-of-a-bitch who wants 35 cents an hour when I'm paying a quarter." In today's more civilized times, Melvin Laird ought to find out why the Defense Dept. is carrying on the tradition.

THE PENTAGON VERSUS CESAR CHAVEZ

Interdepartmental competition is not uncommon in Washington, but a newly reported example invites special attention. It suggests that the Dept. of Defense is vying with the Dept. of Agriculture in furnishing lavish subsidies to opulent farm interests.

The detailed specifications are listed in a suit filed in federal court in Los Angeles by the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee (AFL-CIO) against the Pentagon and a major California lettuce grower. According to UFWOC, headed by Cesar Chavez, the nationwide boycott aimed at organizing lettuce workers is being undercut by the government.

For one thing, it is charged that the military has doubled purchases of lettuce from the grower—whose field workers were once "organized" by the Teamsters. For another, the union alleges that growers who have signed contracts with it have suddenly lost substantial business with the Dept. of Defense. Since it was only a year ago last summer that the Pentagon was making huge purchases of table grapes amid another boycott led by Chavez, the situation is strongly suspicious. Does the government have any plausible explanation?

LETTUCE AND THE PENTAGON

A couple of years ago, when Cesar Chavez and his farm workers organized a boycott of table grapes, the Pentagon suddenly decided it needed more grapes to send to the troops in Vietnam. Eventually the exploited workers' boycott was successful. It might have been successful a lot sooner if the Pentagon hadn't been helping the other side.

Now history seems to be repeating itself. This time the boycott is against lettuce—especially lettuce grown by a subsidiary of Dow Chemical. The Pentagon admits this grower's share of defense purchases has nearly doubled over the last year. It also admits it paid more for lettuce from this grower than from others.

The Defense Department says it has a policy of complete impartiality in labor disputes. Maybe that's not such a bad policy in theory. But it is a bad policy if it means in practice that when Cesar Chavez strikes a produce grower, that grower gets a bigger share of the defense market. And that's certainly how it looks in this case, isn't it?

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT INCREASE NEEDED NOW

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I took the floor to discuss the need for immediate action to increase social security benefits by 10 percent. As I indicated yesterday, I intend to take the floor daily until the increase is enacted into law.

The enclosed letter which I recently received from a former employee, certainly puts the need for an increase in social security benefits in perspective:

PHOENIX, ARIZ.

January 7, 1971.

Hello. The Schwengel Family:

Hope you had a nice Xmas and enjoyable holiday season.

In today's paper, that is, the eve. Phoenix Gazette, under the title letters to the Editor is the following Quote":

"When the 91st Congress adjourns Sen. Gaylord Nelson's parting remarks was:—"Our position (on SST) very likely will be much stronger in March than it is now."

As a Social Security recipient, I only hope that the other people on Social Security (26 million of them) will have a clear mind and a good memory in November 1972 and be ready to clean out the stubborn knotheads (self-centered knotheads) who have entrenched themselves on "Smoky Hill". It took only 20 minutes to vote a 40% increase in pay for themselves on "Smoky Hill" and the other day they voted a \$255 million "loan" to Cambodia. What kind of a bank or lending firm would make a "loan" with the kind of collateral the Cambodians have?

Also, they voted (or set aside) \$39 million

for a study of the "drinking problem" of people who drink too much—alcoholics.

Twenty-six million people on Social Security have "eating problems". But in Washington they shove Social Security legislation to the very bottom and leave it there.

Come Nov. 1972 Social Security recipients could use a ballot as a broom to sweep the halls of Congress clean.

Today in the Valley of the Sun the early morning temp. was 19°—almost a record. However, I learned that back in 1913 it went down to 13°.

I am sending copies of this article to my Ariz. Congressmen.

A GIANT SCIENTIFIC STEP FOR MANKIND

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Fanfare, a house organ of Fansteel, Inc., recently outlined the important gains to our Nation contributed by our national space program over the past decade. Mr. Robert H. Ford, president of Fansteel, Inc., forwarded me a copy of this article. It cites the many contributions of the space program to all walks of American life, and points out that adequate support for our national space program is essential if our Nation is to continue to improve its standard of living. Because of the significance of this article, I am including it in the RECORD and commend it to my colleagues and the public:

A GIANT SCIENTIFIC STEP FOR MANKIND

A transducer is being used in the fitting of artificial limbs. It is smaller than a dime and weighs less than an ounce. A patient has an EKG taken while in an ambulance through the use of a spray-on electrode and transmitted by radio-telemetry direct to the physician who will handle the case. A sensor smaller than the head of a pin is inserted into a patient's vein to measure blood pressure. An Atlantic hurricane is forming hundreds of miles from the Florida coast, but the citizens are warned in time and, while there is property damage, there is no loss of life. The Olympics in Tokyo, Japan are shown live on TV as they happen. What do all these events have in common? They are all developments resulting from our American space program.

And these are only a few of the technological spin-offs from NASA's Apollo and other space programs. The new jumbo jets that will soon be the mainstay of passenger transportation in the world are the result of "know-how" developed from space program projects by Boeing, McDonnell-Douglas and Lockheed. In another area not related to aerospace, the Chrysler Corporation in order to meet new Clean Air Act criteria, reworked their automobile ignition systems, designing distributors to operate within much closer limits. To assist in this they called on their own personnel who had developed the automated checkout and launch sequence equipment for the Saturn launch vehicle.

Space astronomy has been another development. Satellites provide the means for making observations in the radio, infrared, ultraviolet, x-ray, and gamma-ray wave lengths that cannot penetrate the earth's atmosphere to the ground. And space photography enables us to view the entire earth as never before, permitting study of its atmos-

phere in detail, to search for new resources, to monitor water resources, agricultural activity and forest growth, to explore the oceans and assist in large scale civil engineering.

Space geodesy has shown us the true shape of our planet—where it flattens and how much it bulges. As a result we are better able to map the earth and navigate. And we know now that the atmosphere of the earth has an upper boundary and that the earth's magnetic field in space is not like that of a simple bar magnet extending indefinitely outward, but is instead very complicated.

Some of the benefits of space science have come from associated or preparatory work done in the laboratory. C. B. Cone, Jr., when studying radiation effects on cells in order to understand possible space radiation effects on astronauts, made discoveries in the electrical voltage across the surface membrane of a normal cell that controls cell division. This new cell division information has opened up a new avenue for possible chemical control of cancer.

Dr. Fernandex-Moran, working on cell structure for NASA, needed an electron microscope with requirements beyond the range of commercially available electron microscopes. He therefore proceeded to build the world's most powerful instrument of its class capable of magnifying objects 20 million times. To prepare specimens to the same scale, a diamond knife was invented by Dr. Fernandez-Moran that can dissect away portions of a molecule or cut a hair into 10,000 length-wise strips.

In the field of meteorology, the contributions of the space program have been tremendous. They include: sounding rockets to take vertical profiles of the atmosphere from surface to space; satellites to provide continuous watch of the earth's moving cloud cover; solar observation satellites to monitor the sun's cycle of activities; satellites to track storms, measure winds, record the temperature at different heights, and report on the moisture content of the atmosphere; ground and airborne radar and lasers to probe weather conditions from below; computer systems, mathematical models and software programs that can receive and analyze vast amounts of global data from many sources to make possible more accurate forecasting, and data transmission systems to link together the various parts into one global meteorological network.

Since 1966, U.S. weather satellites have watched every major storm threatening the nation. In 1969, for example, 12 Atlantic hurricanes, 10 eastern Pacific hurricanes, and 17 western Pacific typhoons were identified and tracked by satellites. And it is estimated that 50,000 lives were saved in hurricane Camille because of advance warning from weather satellites.

The fantastic growth of the telecommunications industry in the last decade from \$22 billion per year in 1960 to over \$47 billion in 1970 owes a good part of its expansion to the communications satellite—a space program development. We are in the midst of a global communications explosion. The communications satellite can supplement cable, radio, or microwave links where they exist, can provide their equivalent where they do not, and can literally interconnect every part of the world.

The list of technological fallout from the space program could go on and on; it includes new testing techniques, new metals, heat sensors, reflective superinsulation, new machining devices, digital image processing, new plastic, fireproof material and safety devices for automobiles.

And in addition to all the technical developments, another important kind of achievement from the space program is the demonstrated national capacity to organize and manage very large, long-term, global

technical enterprises and meeting difficult performance goals on schedule and within budget. We said we would put a man on the moon in 8 years, and we did. We said it would cost \$20 billion and it looks like it will cost \$24 billion, which, allowing for inflation, is more "on target" than 99% of all other government programs.

Our space effort over the decade has cost this country less than one-half of one percent of our gross national product, and in return it has made a major contribution to the growth of our GNP from \$440 billion in 1958 to \$900 billion in 1969.

World War II resulted in major scientific and technological breakthroughs—radar and electronics to mention two major areas—but with the tragedy of millions of lives lost and destruction of cities and billions of dollars of property. The scientific fall-out of the space program has been equally productive at a fraction of the dollar cost and without the loss of life. *The space program is, therefore, a moral substitute for war and international competition—that works!*

PHILADELPHIA'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, despite a continuing financial crisis, Philadelphia in 1970 gained nationwide recognition for numerous public service improvements and was rated "first" in a number of fields. Mayor James H. J. Tate declared:

The financial problems of Philadelphia and the other cities is a reflection of the total inflation problem throughout America, and most cities are now going through the same experience as we are.

I have discussed this at length with the mayors of other cities and this has been a matter of much consideration at meetings of the United States Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities.

In spite of this handicap, however, Philadelphia's list of accomplishments in 1970 was "impressive," Mayor Tate said. Among them:

Traffic safety: Statistics compiled by the National Safety Council show that Philadelphia has reduced traffic fatalities by as much as 30 or 35 percent and has the lowest traffic fatality rate of all major cities.

Fire protection: For the 13th year, Philadelphia was selected by the National Fire Protection Association as the leading city in advancing the protection of lives and property from fire.

Safety in the streets: Statistics compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation show that Philadelphia again had the lowest crime rate of the Nation's 10 largest cities and the highest rate of crime clearances by arrest.

Air pollution: Significant progress was made in 1970 in meaningful enforcement of Philadelphia's air management code, and the city installed the most modern air monitoring system in the Nation to provide an instantaneous check on air pollution conditions.

Water pollution: Philadelphia mapped a comprehensive program which will

commit the spending of more than \$80 million over the next 6 years to combat pollution of lakes, waters, and streams. Oil spillages into the Schuylkill River above Philadelphia did not contaminate Philadelphia's water but emphasized the need for the city to remain constantly alert.

Rat control: With the aid of Federal funds, Philadelphia made real inroads into its rat problem in the second year of operations and was recognized by the U.S. Public Health Service as the No. 1 city in this field. Some 200 workers made 165,000 treatments of rat-infested premises.

Public health: A mayor's committee on hospital services recommended a radical shift in provision of health care, and detailed studies were initiated. District health centers in two heavily populated areas began operating as comprehensive family care centers, and 140,000 children received free german measles inoculations.

Clean streets: At a cost of \$3.5 million, the city replaced half of its 500 trash collection vehicles in a move toward more effective street-cleaning operations. Philadelphia also won the Trigg Trophy, awarded by the National Clean Up, Paint Up, Fix Up Bureau, for the third time.

Abandoned cars: The police tow squad removed approximately 25,000 derelict vehicles from the streets of Philadelphia, roughly 2 percent over the 1969 total.

Transportation: Continued success of the Lindenwold line, bringing south Jersey suburbs within 22 minutes of Philadelphia, emphasized the need for new concepts to solve the area's mass transit problem. Construction of the South Broad Street subway extension progressed but insufficient funds necessitated deferment of the northeast extension.

Philadelphia International Airport: The Delaware Valley's major aviation center began to take concrete form with completion of the first phase of the city's biggest public works project, involving the investment of hundreds of millions of dollars. New passenger, vehicle, and cargo facilities will transform the airport into a facility serving the entire eastern seaboard.

Ports of Philadelphia: Expansion of the Packer Avenue Marine Terminal, and inauguration of the Tioga Marine Terminal, made possible the rapid shipment of goods by modern cargo-handling methods to help Philadelphia retain its position as the Nation's foremost center for international trade.

Highways: Firm decisions were made to replace the Crosstown Expressway with an alternate route and eliminate the cover over a portion of the Delaware Expressway, thus clearing the way for completion of this segment of I-95 by 1976. The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation began widening important sections of the Schuylkill Expressway.

Bicentennial: After years of planning, Philadelphia was officially designated the focal point for the Nation's bicentennial in 1976. The city began taking a new look at initial proposals and a steering committee was given the

task of reorganizing the Bicentennial Corporation, hopefully putting the city in a position to commence construction in 18 months.

New construction: Construction began of two major projects, the 1500 Market Street office buildings and an apartment at 1500 Locust Street, completing a record year in which some \$300 million of building permits was issued. New construction on practically every corner of center city completely altered the city's traditional skyline. At year's end a further boost came with announcement of plans for a \$40 million hotel and apartment development facing Logan Circle.

Urban renewal: Vigorous efforts were being maintained to get further Federal help for urban development in the city's neighborhoods, with specific results anticipated.

Looking ahead into 1971, Mayor Tate concluded—

Finally, we can look forward to inaugurating the finest multi-purpose stadium in the entire country when the Phillies take the field in their opening game of the 1971 season early in April.

THE NATION'S ECONOMY

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, many alarms continue to be sounded about our national economy, but Dr. Harold C. Passer, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs, believes the alarms are being rung too long. He contends there are many indications of sound recovery and improvement which deserves recognition.

In a recent address he examined the importance of passing the trillion dollar rate in gross national product and of the spreading impact of the administration's aggregate economic policies which are changing the entire economic environment for prices and wages, production and markets. Dr. Passer reminds those who remain eager to criticize the economic results of the last year that the slowdown was the product of two major battles—to gain control of inflation and to wind down the influence of Vietnam war production in the economy. The coming year should be a period of renewal, Dr. Passer maintains; of renewed economic growth and strength and renewed faith in our economic future.

I insert Dr. Passer's remarks in the RECORD so that all my colleagues may consider them:

THE U.S. ECONOMY—WHERE WE ARE AND WHERE WE ARE HEADED

This may be one of those times when it is safe to forecast a dramatic, immediate improvement in the Nation's economic performance. We are in a recovery period from an automobile strike, and other conditions seem ripe for strong growth and diminishing inflation.

I am tempted to dwell on how much Gross National Product is likely to increase in the first quarter because a strong gain is almost a certainty, but I am also reminded

of a statement by Presidential Counselor Daniel Moynihan in his farewell speech to the Cabinet and Sub-Cabinet in December. He said that we should resist the temptation to seek simplistic solutions in a complex world, and that we should not hesitate to become complexifiers.

Thus, the real question is not the simple one of whether we will see substantial economic growth during a strike-recovery period, but whether growth will continue through the year. There are some very strong underlying forces in the economy, and I'm optimistic about economic prospects for 1971. In a few moments, I'd like to give you some reasons for my optimism.

There were two major economic transitions in the past year: the removal of the war in Vietnam as a predominant influence on the economy, and the reduction of the pressures which had been generating inflation in the late 1960's. Both of these transitions involved increased unemployment. That is the unfortunate but necessary temporary cost of achieving our basic goals of a lasting peace and a sound prosperity.

The prime goal of economic policy in 1970 was to break the stranglehold of severe inflation without bringing on a serious recession. In general, this goal was met, although a prolonged automobile strike put a crimp in production in the last half of the year and caused the economy to fall short of our hopes and expectations.

During 1970 business activity declined and unemployment increased, but for the year as a whole, unemployment averaged less than in the peacetime years of the 1960's. The average for 1970 was 4.9 percent compared to a range of 5.2 to 6.7 percent for the years 1961 through 1964.

As a result of the economic slowdown, excessive demand was eliminated and the fundamental source of inflationary pressure was eliminated from the economy. A modest but significant start was made in slowing the rate of price advance. Inflation has not yet been curbed, but progress in that direction has been achieved and efforts are continuing.

GNP IN 1970: IMPACT OF AUTO STRIKE

Preliminary data on Gross National Products in 1970 will be released by the Office of Business Economics of the Department of Commerce within a few days. These data will indicate a GNP for 1970 of between \$975 and \$980 billion, measured in current dollars, and a GNP in real terms that is slightly less than in 1969. In short, GNP in 1970 increased slightly less than 5 percent in current dollars, but the GNP deflator increased slightly more than 5 percent so that Real GNP declined slightly.

These data will also indicate that the auto strike had a significant impact on GNP in the fourth quarter of 1970. The fourth quarter decline was enough to drag down Real GNP for the entire year so that it showed the first year-to-year decline since 1958. Except for the auto strike, Real GNP in 1970 would have shown a slight increase instead of a slight decline. Fundamentally—with or without an auto strike—real output in 1970 was unchanged for the year as a whole.

As we noted earlier, the economic slowdown of 1970 was the joint product of the battle against inflation and the transition toward a peacetime economy. It is also interesting to note that if defense expenditures are excluded, Real GNP increased in 1970.

Had there been no auto strike, GNP in the third quarter would have been \$2 billion higher (\$987.5 billion instead of \$985.5 billion) and GNP in the fourth quarter would have been well over the trillion-dollar mark for the fourth quarter as a whole—probably in the neighborhood of \$1,005 billion. This would have meant a GNP for the year of \$980 billion, a figure within the range which was forecast last February by the Council of Economic Advisers.

GNP AS AN INSTANTANEOUS RATE

As most of you know, we celebrated the crossing of the trillion-dollar mark at the Department of Commerce on December 15, and we have been asked why we chose this date for the ceremony when GNP for the quarter is below a trillion dollars. My answer may be put in the class with the complexifiers, but I believe that it can be understood by those who will take a moment to think about it. The difference between the two numbers is somewhat like the difference between the average rate of speed of an automobile on a long trip and the peak rate of speed of the same automobile.

Economists usually think of GNP as a rate of production, but it is almost always expressed as the amount of production per year just as the speed of a car is expressed as miles per hour. Thus, the rate of GNP at any given time indicates how much could be produced if the rate were sustained for a year.

The Office of Business Economics regularly publishes GNP for an entire year and for quarters at an annual rate. Sometime in 1971 OBE will begin publishing GNP on a monthly basis at an annual rate.

We can also think of GNP as a daily, hourly or instantaneous rate of production, all expressed in terms of annual rates. Looked at this way, GNP for a year is the average of the instantaneous rates of production during the year. Or GNP for a quarter of the average of the instantaneous rates of production during the quarter.

Had there been no auto strike, GNP in the third quarter would have been about \$997.5 billion. That was the mid-quarter rate. As a result of the strike, GNP suddenly dropped on September 15 and remained depressed until the end of November when the strikers began to return to work. For two or three weeks, as General Motors returned to full production, the instantaneous rate of GNP increased rapidly.

According to our calculation, GNP passed through the trillion-dollar mark on December 15 and has continued to increase since then. For the fourth quarter as a whole, however, GNP was below \$1 trillion because it was below the trillion-dollar rate for two and one-half months of the quarter and above that rate for only half a month. The first time GNP will be above \$1 trillion for a full quarter will be the current quarter. On an annual basis, the first year to be above \$1 trillion will be the current year.

THE GNP CLOCK

Thus, you must use the instantaneous rate of GNP if you want to find the approximate day on which the economy reached \$1 trillion. On December 15 we unveiled a new GNP Clock, which shows the instantaneous rate of GNP, and President Nixon, Secretary Stans and Chairman Paul McCracken of the Council of Economic Advisers participated in the ceremony.

We certainly accomplished our objective of calling attention to this Nation's productive power. The Clock has stimulated a considerable amount of commentary in the press. I would like to mention very briefly some of the points that have been raised.

Some observers have wondered why we had our ceremony on December 15, just before the issuance of strike-depressed data relating to November and also shortly before release of such data as Real GNP for the fourth quarter and for the year 1970, all of which have or will show declines.

I have already discussed why the ceremony was held on December 15: our calculations indicated that December 15 was the day the economy reached the trillion-dollar mark. It was not dictated by political considerations; I don't know what possible political advantage could be garnered by holding the ceremony on December 15 rather than on some other day.

The main point is that in the ceremony we were talking about the instantaneous rate of GNP on December 15 whereas all other data being reported at that time, such as industrial production, referred to necessity to earlier time intervals. The trillion-dollar figure shown on our GNP Clock was an indicator of business activity after General Motors had returned to full production (or nearly so). Data for November reflect the auto strike and even December data are not quite normal because during the first half of the month, the strike effects were still dominant.

There were also questions raised about the influence of inflation on the GNP numbers. The answer to these questions are to be found in the speeches that day by President Nixon and Secretary Stans. Both stressed that we were marking a long-term accomplishment—that is, the cumulative achievement of decades—even centuries—of effort to increase economic output and our economic well-being. It was a true milestone that we attained and the comparison was not with last month or last quarter or even last year, but with decades or centuries ago.

With 10 percent of the population of the Free World, the United States produces about 45 percent of the Free World's output of goods and services. Data on the Communist countries are not complete enough to include them in this comparison, but it is significant that at the very time that we celebrated the trillion-dollar economy here in the U.S., workers in Poland were rioting because of food shortages.

In this talk at the GNP Clock ceremony, President Nixon also emphasized that the tremendous productive power of the American economy, as indicated by a GNP of a trillion dollars, is what will make it possible for us to solve problems that face us in education, housing, health, and other areas. As he said, laws merely set minimum standards in these areas and are of little or no value unless the economy has the productive power to meet them—which ours has.

THE GNP CLOCK AS AN EDUCATION DEVICE

It is unfortunate that the publicity about the trillion-dollar economy has glossed over the value of the Clock as an educational device. Part of the machine is called the "Econo-Quiz."

As you know, for some years a Census Clock has been in the Commerce Lobby. This shows the total population as resulting from the interaction of the birth rate, the death rate, and the rates of immigration and emigration. A visitor who studies the Census Clock, as many do, thus learns something about how our population grows.

Similarly, we have provided material for study at the GNP Clock. One part of the display lists 50 questions about the economy, including sensitive questions like, "Do we increase pollution as we increase GNP?" and "Don't higher prices inflate GNP?" The answers to all of the questions can be obtained by setting a dial and pushing a button. The answer is then displayed on a screen directly above the question panel.

Thus, the GNP Clock is intended to serve the general public, not professional economists. It is a serious attempt to show the approximate instantaneous rate of GNP and to increase understanding of the American economy. The reading on the Clock is not in any sense official nor a forecast of what OBE will later publish. The GNP Clock is intended to indicate only in an approximate way the current level of GNP and is not intended to display in those lighted numbers the exact and official level of GNP, which cannot be known until sometime after the close of a year or quarter.

OBJECTIVITY IN ECONOMIC DATA

Before I leave the subject of official statistics, I should like to emphasize that the

economic and demographic statistics issued by the Federal Government are prepared by career civil servants and are released by civil servants (not political appointees) according to pre-announced schedules. Neither the data nor their times of release are subject to any manipulation or political influence whatsoever.

As you may recall, one of President Nixon's goals on taking office was to restore the credibility of the American people in their national government. He, therefore, issued a directive in his first weeks in office, on February 8, 1969, which required the non-political handling of statistics.

There is a clear-cut distinction between the issuance of economic data on a monthly or quarterly basis by professional economists and statisticians who are career civil servants, and the economic interpretations issued by Presidential appointees and other representatives of the Administration.

Let's use housing statistics as an example. Last spring, the Bureau of the Census issued statistics on housing starts and permits in the same way that it has issued them for a number of years—on a regular, monthly basis and without comment on the likely trend in the future. I concluded, however, that housing had passed its low point and that the homebuilding industry was headed for a resurgence of activity. I issued a public statement to this effect, and I can happily report that my interpretation proved to be correct; in fact, housing activity increased throughout 1970 and seems to be headed in 1971 for its best year since 1950.

In case you think that I am immodest, I should also mention that I forecast a strong upturn in the economy in the last half of 1970—and, of course, the auto strike punctured that forecast.

My point is that economists of all political persuasions are free to comment on Government economic data—but the preparation of those data and their release according to pre-announced schedules has quite properly been left to career civil servants.

CHRISTMAS SALES IN 1970

During his speech at the trillion-dollar ceremony, President Nixon made a passing reference to the Christmas selling season and expressed the hope that it would be the biggest ever. Later, he asked Secretary Stans to check with leading retailers on how well Christmas sales were going.

Two days afterward, Secretary Stans reported to President Nixon that Christmas sales were running at a brisk pace, would finish strong, and would set a new record. This report was somewhat contrary to the "Blue Christmas" expectations so common at that time.

We now have the weekly retail sales data for the Christmas season, as issued by the Bureau of the Census. These data show that retail sales, excluding automobiles, were 8 percent over a year ago in the four-week period ending with Christmas week.

If we allow for the fact that prices of goods at retail are about 4 percent higher than a year ago, the real gain in Christmas sales was about 4 percent. This was a marked improvement over 1969, when the real volume of Christmas sales was approximately unchanged from the previous year. The 1970 gain was about equal to 1968 which was considered to be a strong year for Christmas sales.

Although the Bureau of the Census will later have more complete and more final data on the Christmas season, these preliminary data indicate that President Nixon's hopes and Secretary Stans' predictions were realized. It is also significant that, because retailers in general were cautious in their buying for the Christmas season, their post-Christmas inventories are on the low side. This suggests that they will be re-ordering in good volume in the months ahead, thus giving support to the currently rising trend of business activity.

GOAL FOR 1971: REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT

Although 1970 finished strongly, with record Christmas sales, I think that there is general agreement that there was too much unemployment and too much inflation and that we need progress in these two areas in 1971.

To reduce unemployment, we must, of course, have a rising economy in 1971. I am convinced that the business slowdown ended about mid-1970 and that economic growth got underway again in the third quarter. Both fiscal and monetary policy turned stimulative early last year, and the results were first felt in the summer months. The auto strike, however, stalled the economy for nearly three months. With that episode behind us, we can expect the effects of the 1970 monetary and fiscal policy changes to be reflected in the economy in 1971.

After the November election, there was extensive discussion of whether the Administration's economic policies would change and if so, how much and in what direction. I should like to emphasize that the "game plan" all along has called for stimulative economic policies to bring about a rising economy after mid-1970. The exact nature of these stimulative policies is subject to mid-course corrections, but the basic plan is unchanged.

It is important to understand this aspect of the "game plan", because some observers have incorrectly concluded that because aggregate economic policies are now expansionary, the battle against inflation has been abandoned. The fact is, however, that even though the direction of the economy is now upward, further progress will be achieved in the battle against inflation because of the existing slack in the economy. This slack is the result of opening a gap between actual and potential output. The level of economic activity relative to potential output is more important in the fight against inflation than the direction of economic activity.

INCOMES POLICY

Also unchanged is another aspect of the strategy, one that has generated more than the usual amount of speculation and controversy. I speak, of course, of "incomes policy."

Chairman Arthur Burns, of the Federal Reserve Board, spoke on this point in Los Angeles on December 7. His remarks have rightfully received much attention for they represented a significant statement. What has been generally overlooked in his remarks is the following passage:

"The essence of incomes policies is that they are market-oriented; in other words, their aim is to change the structure and functioning of commodity and labor markets in ways that reduce pressures on costs and prices."

By this definition of incomes policy, the Nixon Administration has been following an incomes policy from the beginning. In the spring of 1969, a few months after taking office, President Nixon ordered a special investigation of the soaring price of lumber, which was exerting a strong inflationary force on the key housing sector. Steps were taken to increase the supply of lumber, steps that coincided with the easing of demand pressures as housing starts began declining due to tighter money. As a result, the price of lumber stopped rising and began falling.

Copper and construction were the subjects of similar investigations. In copper, the price began declining shortly after the report appeared, in response to a better balance between supply and demand in world markets. In construction, some Government projects were postponed, steps to reduce seasonality were initiated, and a number of steps were taken to increase the supply of trained labor and to study improvements in the structure of collective bargaining. President Nixon's reference to possible reform of the collective

bargaining structure in construction in his December 4 speech was based on those studies.

Incomes policy is sometimes interpreted to mean informal or formal pressures on businessmen or union leaders to follow certain guidelines. The difficulty with this approach can be simply stated: It doesn't work. Anyone who doubts this should examine the Canadian experience, where guidelines were tried for a year but then abandoned, or the experience of many other countries, including our own in the mid-sixties. It is clear, for example, that President Johnson abandoned guidelines not because he didn't believe in them but because they were swept away by inflation. It is also interesting to note that the November inflation report of the staff of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development did not call for such guidelines as past reports had done. The reason undoubtedly is that they have been proved unworkable.

From the beginning, the Nixon Administration has battled inflation with aggregate economic policies, which are intended to change the economic environment in which price and wage decision are made. Because this approach relies heavily on the market mechanism, we can be expected to be concerned anytime that a market does not work properly and to take action to improve its operation.

This does not mean that every market that is not operating with textbook perfection will be entered and restructured by the Federal Government. But it does mean that markets that show themselves to be seriously and persistently out of joint will be subject to investigation and appropriate action.

As President Nixon said in his December 4 speech and as was said in the Second Inflation Alert, the evidence is now overwhelming that the labor market and collective bargaining structure in construction are working very badly. Wage increases have been twice the rate of increase in manufacturing, despite a rate of unemployment in construction that has climbed to almost twice the national average. Very long strikes—up to six months and more—have shut down construction in one metropolitan area after another. This situation of skyrocketing wage rates, rising unemployment, and severe strike losses is in need of corrective action which, as President Nixon said, may be taken by the Federal Government unless labor and management can work together and adjust to the economic realities.

OUTLOOK FOR 1971

Unquestionably, 1971 will be a better year than 1970 and will see progress on the inflation and unemployment fronts. I am confident, as are most economists, government and private, that at year-end 1971 the rate of inflation and the rate of unemployment will be less than at year-end 1970.

The short-term outlook for renewed economic growth is reinforced by the carryover impact of the automobile strike. Now that the auto industry is back in production and operating at full tilt to rebuild depleted inventories, the major measures of economic activity, which have been depressed by the strike, will soon point sharply upward. An added lift to the economy will be provided by the build-up of steel inventories in anticipation of a possible strike in that key industry on August 1. These temporary boosts to the economy will not reflect the underlying trend of business during 1971—any more than the strike-related decline in activity reflected the underlying trend in the fourth quarter—but they will serve to dispel the gloomy tone of business that has developed in the past month or two.

Business expansion in 1971 will develop out of the fundamental growth tendencies that are always present in the United States economy—a growing labor force and con-

tinuing advances in productivity—plus the stimulative policies that President Nixon has promised. These forces are leading to a rising volume of residential construction, a faster growth in State and local government expenditures and, most important, a significant advance in consumer spending during the year ahead. Business investment and Federal Government spending will increase, but to a lesser extent. On balance, inventories are expected to increase in line with sales; the pattern through the year, however, will be dominated by the special situations in autos and steel, where inventory building will be concentrated in the first half.

As Secretary Stans said in his year-end statement, the brighter prospects in sight for the coming year suggest that 1971 will be known as the year of renewal. Renewed growth in economic activity is already underway, and a slower rate of inflation will renew the faith of all Americans that their economy can and will move toward an essentially noninflationary growth path.

DMSO

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, in 1963 DMSO—dimethyl sulfoxide—burst onto the medical scene following experiments by two Oregon physicians with the wood derivative. It was promptly hailed as a wonder drug capable of a host of medical uses.

Perhaps the case for DMSO was overstated, perhaps not. We may never know if the Food and Drug Administration continues its arbitrary and highhanded policy in banning even the limited clinical testing of the drug. The official reason, I believe, is because of some eye changes observed in animals from massive topical application of the solution.

I plan to introduce legislation to remove the responsibility for the testing and evaluation of new drugs from this agency in the very near future. But the purpose of my remarks today is to have inserted in the Record a letter to me from Dr. Edward E. Rosenbaum, of the University of Oregon Medical School. Dr. Rosenbaum, along with his colleague, Dr. Stanley Jacob, successfully experimented with DMSO, which previously had been used as a powerful commercial solvent in the timber manufacturing industry.

Dr. Rosenbaum is commenting on a white paper issued by the FDA that details its reasoning in banning the testing of DMSO. I find it an excellent and comprehensive analysis, one that points out the many inconsistencies of this agency in its policy toward the drug. I commend it to my colleagues for their careful perusal:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

MEDICAL SCHOOL,

January 5, 1971.

Representatives WENDELL WYATT,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WYATT: I wanted to give you my opinion on the "White Paper" issued by the Food and Drug Administration. The paper is headed "Chronology of Dimethyl Sulfoxide".

On the first page under *preclinical evaluation for safety*, the impression is given that the Food and Drug Administration did not feel that DMSO was safe for clinical testing. This was, of course, not a fact. The Food and Drug Administration did permit clinical testing with DMSO when applied to the skin. They did preclude the use of DMSO by other routes such as intravenous, oral or direct instillation into the bladder. So the verbiage is unclear and it is obviously confusing to the lay reader. What they are saying in that paragraph is that they did approve it for application to the skin and that topical application at that time was perfectly legal.

On page 2 in the first paragraph, the White Paper goes into a great deal of discussion concerning animal toxicity. This paragraph contains several errors. In the last sentence the statement is made that in all animals corneal and lenticular changes in the eyes were observed. Actually, no corneal changes have been observed and the lenticular changes have not been shown to occur in all species studied. The point concerning proximity to human dosage is misleading. The fact is that the lowest dosage in which the change has been recorded in the most sensitive animal is approximately 10 times the average human dose. Completely omitted from this paragraph is the fact that numerous studies show these changes do not occur in man.

In discussing toxicity the White Paper fails to point out that frequently toxicity in lower animals results with large dosages and unusual methods of administration. This is part of the conventional toxicity study of any drug. A drug is given until toxicity is produced to determine the margin of safety. This is unclear to the average lay reader who reads this White Paper.

To me, however, the most important thing is that this so called "scientific" agency and its White Paper declared that the drug was unsafe for human use and yet we find on page 9 they are able to conclude seven years later that the drug is safe when used in human beings in a dosage range of 1 gm/kg of body weight. This would mean that at least 70 ml could be applied safely to the average human being—far greater than the ordinary human dosage which ranges from 4 to 12 ml per day. To apply 70 ml to a human would necessitate almost total body application.

In the second paragraph on page 2 beginning with "concurrently the results of DMSO in testing in human beings were evaluated" the FDA makes the point that because of publicity in the lay press it was difficult to control clinical investigation and over 100,000 patients were treated during 1964 and 1965. This is an amazing statement. In a democracy all government officials and all government agencies are subject to review by the public. At a time in our society when every move of even the President of the United States in time of war is subject to immediate reporting and analysis in the lay press, it is surprising that a government agency would consider that the public does not have a right to know. This amounts to censorship in its worst form. Completely ignored was the fact that among the 100,000 patients tested clinically no serious toxicity was documented.

In the second paragraph on page 3, the point is made that the adverse effect of DMSO on the eyes of animals treated by cutaneous application was observed in September of 1964, but was not reported immediately to the Food and Drug Administration. Our information from Dr. Richard Brobyn, Director of the Merck DMSO study is that the FDA was notified of these toxic changes by Merck in the spring of 1965. Nevertheless, FDA waited six months until November of 1965 to discontinue testing. I would suggest you check this information

with Dr. Brobyn. We have in our possession a report prepared by Merck, Sharp and Dohme marked NDA which was in the hands of clinical investigators from Merck in September of 1965. It is inconceivable that Merck had not submitted this report to the Food and Drug Administration before submitting it to investigators. If these eye problems were so serious why did the FDA wait so long?

On page 3, the FDA speaks of reactions observed in clinical testing of DMSO before and after November 25, 1965. It is important to point out that none of these so called reactions were in the truly severe category and are not at all unusual in new drug testing. FDA also makes the statement that DMSO was discontinued by voluntary agreement of all the sponsoring pharmaceutical firms. Syntex was not even present at the meeting. It may very well be that you could receive verification of this from Dr. Gerhard Boost of Syntex. Our information is that the so called "voluntary agreement" was more arm twisting by FDA.

The Food and Drug Administration states it discontinued all testing because of "eye toxicity" although 100,000 patients were under treatment at that time. It is interesting to note that in 1970 they now admit that the drug is apparently safe for clinical use in short term therapy. One may reasonably ask why it took a scientific group five years to determine this responsibility towards patients. Dr. Brobyn has told us that Merck offered to do an eye study on prisoners at this point, but that the FDA refused to permit it. It would have also been a relatively simple procedure in 1965 to immediately discontinue widespread clinical testing except in patients with serious diseases for which no other treatment was available and to periodically examine the eyes of patients already treated. Here we had a built in clinical test, but the FDA refused to take any steps to prove or disprove a very important point.

On page 4, FDA states that DMSO testing was discontinued on November 25, 1965, but they subsequently permitted resumption of clinical testing in patients who had diseases untreatable by other methods. The important point here is, how long did it take after discontinuation before they published this notice of resumption. Our information is that it was December of 1966 or one year later before seriously ill patients were again permitted to be treated with DMSO. A possible exception to this is that Dr. Scherbel might have been given permission on his scleroderma group, but certainly no notice was published by FDA before December of 1966.

At this point in time, we find that FDA has turned down the Squibb application, (see point 3, page 9) on the basis that efficacy still has not been proved. In the letter accompanying the White Paper they admit that they have approved it as a prescription drug in veterinary medicine for use on horses. Why do they say that efficacy has not been proved when they themselves approved it. They certainly are not loath to use toxicity data from other species in man.

This is a "scientific" agency staffed presumably by competent physicians. It would be easy for them to prove efficacy of DMSO in less than 72 hours. A physician from FDA could work in an emergency room in any large metropolitan hospital, treat acute trauma and satisfy himself of efficacy. Even a lay person could satisfy himself of efficacy by observing the immediate lessening of swelling, the disappearance of bruises, and the lessening of pain. Why is it so difficult for competent physicians such as the FDA claims they have to see it? Also, as to their contention that efficacy has not been proved, they themselves state that 100,000 patients were treated. Hundreds of physicians were involved in treating these patients. Even if we grant that the vast bulk of these phy-

sicians were totally incompetent and, therefore, their work was not valid from the scientific point of view, were all of these physicians incompetent? Could not the Food and Drug Administration have called in 1, 2, 3 or 4 of these men whom they trusted and respected and discussed with them whether or not the drug was efficacious? It is my personal opinion that the reason FDA halted studies was the point that they made concerning lay publicity, and difficulty in controlling investigation once the public was aware of the drug. Perhaps they wanted to make an example of DMSO. This of course strengthens the contention that the agency is more like a police body than a scientific one and that no agency in government should be permitted to be policeman, judge and jury.

Sincerely,

EDWARD E. ROSENBAUM, M.D.,
Associate Clinical Professor Medicine,
Acting Director, Department of Rheumatology.

SPINAL COLUMN

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Christmas has come and gone, but a recent article in the Publishers' Auxiliary brought to my attention all over again the depth of appreciation one human gets from helping another human being.

The Spinal Column, a tabloid published in my district which serves several communities in Oakland County, Mich., was featured in the Auxiliary for its special Christmas issue.

The paper was not honored for some specific topographical achievement, or for its investigative reporting. It was singled out as an example of public service by the Fourth Estate.

The Spinal Column printed a special Christmas edition, with features and stories about the holiday, and made them available at no charge to the Goodfellow organizations in Commerce, Highland, Milford, Waterford, West Bloomfield, and White Lake Townships as well as the Tri-City Fire Department.

Proceeds from the charitable sale then went to fill Christmas baskets for the underprivileged.

This newspaper proved itself more than adequate in meeting its public service responsibilities by making it possible for more than 500 families to have a pleasant holiday season.

I am justifiably proud of the Spinal Column, and of its publisher, James W. Fancy. It is hard hitting, and hard working, and the mark it is leaving on its readers is an example other papers would strive to achieve.

For printing in the RECORD, I am enclosing a copy of the article in the Publishers' Auxiliary.

THE SPINAL COLUMN

The Spinal Column, the 25,000 circulation west Oakland County, Mich., weekly, produced a "first edition" for the annual Goodfellow newspaper sale. Proceeds from the sale fill Christmas baskets for the underprivileged.

The newspaper staff produced the eight-page tabloid edition specifically for the Goodfellows in the six townships and two cities in which the Spinal Column is circulated.

It marked the first time the charity groups had received a special edition of its own from any area newspaper. There was no charge to the groups.

With orders for 11,000 of the supplements, the Spinal Column provided Goodfellow organizations in Commerce, Highland, Milford, Waterford, West Bloomfield and White Lake Townships as well as the Tri-City Fire Department with free copies of the paper for sale.

The supplement carried no advertising. It was devoted totally to Christmas feature material including special displays at Greenfield Village and Oakland County's historic Moses Wisner Home as well as recipes, a list of charitable organizations selling Christmas cards and special features on the traditions of Christmas.

"Reaction from the local Goodfellow groups was unanimously positive," publisher James W. Fancy indicated. "Every group exceeded its determined goal. Giving the Goodfellows a special edition provides them with a product more people are inclined to buy and read rather than two- or three-day-old overruns of other newspapers that are usually ignored," he added.

Regular Wednesday editions of the Spinal Column publicized the "first edition" through a picture story of the Goodfellow edition make-up.

The newspaper will produce an expanded version of the special edition next Christmas, hoping to make it an annual event.

More than 500 underprivileged west Oakland County families received food baskets, canned goods and toys, largely as a result of the Goodfellow sale.

A FEW KIND WORDS FOR THE COAST GUARD

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, recently a resident of Coral Gables, Fla., Mr. Oscar F. Miller, wrote of Capt. J. Carrington Gramling, Jr., U.S. Coast Guard Reserve, retired, in Miami, defending the actions of the Coast Guard officers in the defection of the Lithuanian seaman who boarded the Coast Guard cutter *Vigilant*.

Mr. Miller's views were brought to my attention and I think they will be of interest to all Members, many of whom, I am sure, received much mail on this matter.

Therefore, I am inserting his statement in the RECORD for your perusal:

MIAMI, FLORIDA,
December 28, 1970.

HON. J. CARRINGTON GRAMLING, Jr.,
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard Reserve, Ret.
Biscayne Building,
Miami, Fla.

DEAR JUDGE GRAMLING: I have been grievously concerned by the manner in which the recent incident between the Coast Guard Cutter "Vigilant" and the Russian seaman has been handled, both by our news media and others.

My thoughts on the subject are set forth in the attached.

Sincerely,

OSCAR F. MILLER.

A FEW KIND WORDS FOR THE COAST GUARD

Now that the mass hysteria created by the American Press over the Russian Coast Guard affair has begun to subside, perhaps it is now time to soberly and sanely analyze some of the facts and circumstances of this sea-going incident.

Instead of threatening Rear Admiral Ellis and Captain Fletcher Brown with a court martial, and "permitting" them to retire as a result of the part they played in this melodrama, I think both of these able and experienced men should have been promoted.

Before alerting the F.B.I. and the C.I.A. to investigate the writer for making such an audacious statement, perhaps it would appear appropriate at this point to say I am a seventh generation native-born American citizen, who has never been in Russia, and—to my knowledge—has never known a Russian citizen or peasant—whatever they may call their regimented sheep. I challenge anyone to question my loyalty. Further, I believe any person who refuses to swear allegiance and take a loyalty oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, should not be permitted to work for the United States Government or any political sub-division within its boundaries.

Having been trained in the law, I have a propensity for analyzing facts.

All of the newspaper articles and editorials I have read on this celebrated affair, refer to a "Lithuanian" who sought shelter and freedom aboard a U.S. vessel. I detect a clever ruse to create an emotional appeal by constantly calling him a Lithuanian—never a Russian! According to my current geographical knowledge, this man is a Russian—whether he likes it or not.

If you are unable to accept this as a fact, then call me a "Rebel" because my grandfather was a Captain in the Confederate Army in the war between the States, struggling to defend Atlanta against that uninvited tourist known as General William T. ("War is Hell") Sherman. Ambrose Bierce defined a cannon as "an instrument used for the rectification of International Boundaries." One cannot deny its effectiveness. Consequently, neither the "Lithuanian" nor any of us, descendants of folks south of the Mason and Dixon line can question the authority of the Country within which we live.

I have as much feeling and sympathy as anyone for those unhappy persons seeking to escape from the tyrannical life imposed upon them within the Iron Curtain. The greatest error Franklin D. Roosevelt made was diplomatically recognizing these communistic descendants of the Czars. They have caused nothing but headaches ever since. Furthermore, I fully subscribe to the policies of our government in giving asylum to any and all defectors who successfully run the gauntlet, and primarily or ultimately reach our shores.

But, when carefully scrutinizing this episode involving a U.S. Coast Guard ship and a Russian ship, we are confronted with a series of maritime rules and customs that cannot be violated or ignored, notwithstanding our passions or feelings in this matter.

This man was a member of a ship's crew at sea, subject to the orders and directions of his Captain. He sought to "jump ship" in violation of the Captain's orders and long-recognized maritime laws. Further, the man was not an ordinary seaman, but held the vital and indispensable post of radio operator.

If the Commander of our Coast Guard vessel had refused to surrender this crewman when ordered to do so by the Captain of this foreign ship, the reverberations from this violation of maritime rules and customs would have been heard around the world. Jumping a ship is a far cry from jumping a fence—it isn't the same, and you better believe it!

The failure of America to recognize this fact precipitated the War of 1812. You should know what happened to the White House!

A more recent precedent was the San Jacinto affair in 1861, when U.S. Navy Captain Charles Wilkes removed James Mason and John Slidell from the British mail steamer "Trent".

A number of thoughts come to mind when reflecting on this sadly blundered and badly reported incident.

I think our American Press owe a greater obligation to their readers to avoid hysteria and rabble-rousing. True, the principal components of a newspaper consists of people—but, with the powers and prerogatives they exercise, they, like Caesar's wife, should be above reproach.

A little knowledge is a dangerous thing, but ignorance of history can be catastrophic!

VOTING AGE CHAOS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, article I, section 2, Constitution of the United States, says:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

In its decision last month on the constitutionality of the bill passed by Congress earlier in the year, setting the voting age at 18 in every State, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled directly, explicitly, and diametrically opposite to the section of the Constitution just quoted. Under its decision, persons 18 to 21 in every State must be allowed to vote for Members of Congress and for the President, but need not be allowed to vote for members of their State legislature.

Rarely, if ever, even in its fantastic history since Earl Warren became Chief Justice, has the Supreme Court so blatantly contradicted a provision in the Constitution. In the past it has ignored, twisted, and distorted; now it has moved to outright repudiation of what any child could see that the Constitution means.

The result—vividly demonstrating the consequences of abandoning the fundamental charter of our Government—is virtual chaos, which will satisfy neither the supporters nor the opponents of the 18-year-old vote.

All indications are that in most States the opponents are in the majority. In the past year alone, five States—Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, and Michigan—have conducted referendums in which lowering of the voting age to 18 was rejected. The Supreme Court having evidently lost all sight of its duty, it is the duty of the Congress to see that the rights of the people of these and other States to decide upon the qualifications of their electorate are not abridged.

For this reason, I introduced legislation December 21—and will reintroduce it in the new Congress which convenes at

the end of this month—to repeal the Federal statute requiring reduction of the voting age to 18. There is no reason whatever to assume that we must resolve the present chaos by a constitutional amendment compelling the States to reject the will of their own people and lower the voting age for State as well as Federal legislators. Why not leave this matter where the Constitution put it and the people obviously want it, in the hands of the electorate of each State? That is what my bill does.

Personally, I have always been and continue to be opposed to lowering the voting age below 21. This is the age at which, in our society, most young people first become fully self-supporting, since it is the usual age for graduation from college. Personal experience with the problems and responsibilities of financial self-support is highly desirable in these times when the burden of taxation is so heavy and those who do not have to support themselves are so easily tempted to vote away other people's money.

At whatever age the line is drawn, there will always be some people below the limit who would make more responsible voters than some people above it—and vice versa. But the line must be drawn somewhere, and I believe the usual age of beginning self-support is the best place to draw it.

It is interesting to note that, where it has already gone into effect, the 18-year-old vote has proved no panacea for the problems arising from angry dissent among our young people. The percentage taking advantage of their new right to vote is small, and even fewer become directly active in politics despite well-publicized attempts to get them involved.

WHAT IS THE TRUTH ABOUT CALIFORNIA FARMWORKING CONDITIONS?

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, whenever something occurs on California farms which places farm employers in a bad light it always makes the headlines. However, a recent release by the California Department of Agriculture, which reflects another side of the story, has received little notice in the press.

Because I believe California farmers have done an outstanding job of improving farmworking conditions and, in fact, lead the Nation in this effort, I think the following press release should be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope it will convince some who have had a field day in harassing California agriculture that it might be wise to direct their efforts elsewhere. How long can California farmers compete with those in other States who do not assume their social responsibilities as our farmers have?

The press release follows:

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
PRESS RELEASE

Little-known facts about California's farm working conditions were brought out today by the State Department of Agriculture, following a survey of farm wage rates by the Department's Crop Reporting Service.

The survey, conducted during 1970, showed an average wage rate for all hired workers on California farms of \$2.09 per hour. The range of pay was from a low of \$1.86 per hour for those paid by the hour and receiving cash wages only, to a high of \$2.42 per hour representing piece rate pay for harvesting work, and \$3.13 for supervisors.

These were higher rates than were paid during 1970 in any other state, with the possible exception of Washington, which is at about the same farm wage level as California, Department officials said.

The total hired farm labor force in California during 1970 ranged from a low of 163,000 in February to a high of 280,000 in September. These figures have been fairly constant over the past few years.

Besides having the highest farm wages in the nation, California has far more protective laws and benefits for farm workers than any other state, as shown by a report from the U.S. Department of Labor.

Of ten protective laws recommended to the states by the federal government, California has nine in effect. No other state has more than six.

California is the only state which provides temporary disability insurance to its farm workers. Under this program, a worker who becomes ill or is injured off the job is entitled to cash benefits ranging from \$25 to \$87 per week while he is disabled, plus an additional \$12 a day in hospital benefits, if he is hospitalized.

In addition, farm workers, like all other workers, are covered by workmen's compensation if they are injured or become ill on the job.

They are also covered by child labor laws, a minimum wage law, and wage payment and wage collection laws. The law also strictly regulates farm labor camps and farm labor contractors, and requires that farm workers be transported in safe vehicles.

The State Department of Agriculture is developing a new list of waiting periods which must be observed by growers before farm workers may enter a field or orchard following pesticide application. California has taken the lead in developing this type of worker safety program.

Director of Agriculture Jerry W. Fielder last year called on special county agricultural committees to exercise leadership in getting uniform compliance for adequate sanitary facilities, with handwashing and drinking water for field workers. Improvement in the provision of such worker facilities in fields and orchards have been reported in some 39 counties so far.

Legal actions have been taken against several aerial pesticide applicators and pilots for applying pesticides under conditions which endangered farm workers.

Much is done in California to help the migrant worker and his family. The State Department of Education reaches some 46,000 migrant children each year with a supplementary program through local school districts. Special bilingual teachers work with migrant children, helping them to adjust to school, and assisting them with problems of language, reading and mathematics. Special lunches are provided for these children to assure they are getting adequate nutrition.

The number of migrant workers in California has steadily declined over the past 20 years with the increased mechanization in agriculture. At the peak of farm work in September 1970, around one out of every

four hired workers in California was a migrant.

This is partly the result of improved worker housing, leading to families living the year round in one residence, and commuting to different farming activities within a radius of their homes.

During the past five years, more than 2,000 new housing units have been constructed for farm workers in California, according to the State Department of Housing and Community Development. These have been built throughout the state from Gridley in the Sacramento Valley to Indio in the South. During the past three years, these units have been constructed under a joint government-industry arrangement financed by federal government funds. Machinery is furnished by industry to manufacture prefabricated houses, with unemployed migrant workers trained to manufacture and assemble modern living units.

Commenting on working conditions on California farms, Director Fielder said, "Farmers would like to pay wages comparable to those paid in many other industries, but there is just not that kind of income in farming today.

"The farmer is caught in a severe cost-price squeeze which is driving more and more people off the farm. There is no way in which a farmer today can pay higher wages to his workers and add the cost on to his product, as is done in industrial wage raises.

"In comparison with other states, however, California is outstanding in its programs to provide proper working and living conditions for its farm workers, whether resident or migrant," he concluded.

A LAY PERSON TAKES A LOOK AT
OUR JUDICIAL SYSTEM

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, in a time when our judicial process seems bogged down in unnecessary delays and faces a crisis of confidence, I am impressed by a speech given recently by Ruben S. Ayala, chairman of the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors. He declares, as a layman, that he is genuinely perplexed over some recent Supreme Court decisions, and contends that the general public similarly cannot comprehend the results. Hopefully, this address will be as refreshing to my colleagues, a great many of whom are eminent members of the bar, as it was to me. Perhaps it will give us a little hint as to how we should begin to solve some of the problems that face our august judicial system.

The speech follows:

A LAY PERSON TAKES A LOOK AT OUR
JUDICIAL SYSTEM

I come here today as a lay person to speak to you as professionals. This, I believe, under the circumstances, to be healthy and I sincerely hope beneficial to all concerned. I was particularly delighted and pleased with your invitation because, frankly, it provides me with what I consider to be a very valuable and excellent opportunity to discuss with you, members of the Bar Association, a situation which should be of deep concern not only to those who deal on a daily basis with the judiciary, but should be of equal concern to every American who sustains and

cherishes the American way of life. And that, gentlemen, is the survival of the judicial system as we know it today. I firmly believe that unless some immediate dramatic changes are implemented, and it is inconceivable, that justice could break down in the United States of America, but that could very well be the case. Let me state right here and now that I couldn't agree more with former Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark when he makes the observation that more money in the form of more judges is not necessarily the answer to this dilemma.

I have always had, and I have been very careful to teach my sons to have, great respect for our constitution and the rights it insures. This extraordinary document is indeed the cornerstone of our democratic way of life. And, certainly, I place immense value in the protection of my rights as an individual as much, and perhaps more so, than anyone else in this room.

But while so much emphasis is being given to the rights of the accused . . . what about the rights of the victims? It appears to me that if anyone's rights have been violated it is certainly the rights of those individuals who have been murdered . . . who have been kidnapped . . . who have been raped, robbed or innocently fallen prey to any of the other insidious activities of those whose rights the courts have been so concerned about. Let me emphasize once again that I am in no way questioning the wisdom of the authors of our Constitution or the Bill of Rights. In fact, I strongly suspect that the current tendency to be overly protective of the rights of the accused would, and using a cliché, cause these great men to turn over in their graves. Certainly as time passes and social conditions change, varying interpretations may be given to their writings. But I hardly think that the fathers of our democratic system intended that confessed murderers should be set free because no one told them to remain silent . . . and, if in this day and age, we truly concern ourselves with respect for our Nation's founders, I do not believe we could cast a more damaging blow at their memory . . . than to interpret their work in this permissive manner.

If, as I suggested, we are to consider changing conditions in interpreting the Constitution, I must point out that one of the greatest areas of public concern in recent years has been law and order versus crime in the streets. Yet, when we look at the direction in which we have been moving . . . it appears to me that it is decidedly a case of law enforcement versus the courts. Gentlemen, you know far better than I that these two elements were designed to cooperate and that for our laws to be effective they must work without hostility. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am not advocating convictions . . . I am advocating justice. A man is considered innocent until proven guilty. And this concept has proven itself over the years, but when proven guilty, justice must be carried out. If there is a procedural error or if some technicality has been overlooked, perhaps the officers involved should be disciplined. But, it does not excuse the crime . . . two wrongs don't make a right whether the Constitution is involved or not.

There are any number of cases that we lay people across this great land of ours are confused about and we do not understand . . . many of these cases I am certain you gentlemen are familiar with and in my humble opinion substantiates what I have been alluding to.

For example, we lay people do not understand why some fourteen years ago in *Malloy v. United States* the defendant's confession was ruled invalid because the arresting officer failed to bring the suspect before a judge without unreasonable delay. We do not understand when four years later in *Mapp v.*

Ohio evidence was ruled inadmissible because it was obtained in what was termed illegal search and seizure. We may agree or disagree with these two decisions, but it is evident that such cases provided the foundation for the well known Escobedo and Miranda fiascos.

We do not understand that in 1964, in the case of *Escobedo v. Illinois*, the Supreme Court ruled out the confession because the suspect was not advised of his right to remain silent. Obviously, our Supreme Court felt that this omission by the arresting authority nullified the confession and automatically made the suspect free of any sin or wrong doing.

We do not understand when, 2 years later, the Supreme Court expanded its Miranda decision by reversing the conviction of confessed, and I wish to emphasize the word "confessed," kidnapper-rapist Ernesto Miranda, who was not advised of his rights before he confessed in Phoenix.

It occurs to me that society has a right to expect its citizens to have at least a basic knowledge of the law. When we consider offenses ranging all the way from minor traffic violations to premeditated murder—we lay people do not accept ignorance of the law a valid excuse for breaking it. . . .

We do not understand that nonetheless, the Supreme Court did not stop with Miranda . . . they went one step further in the case of *Reyes Arias Orozco*. But, before we go on to that—I want to remind you that in Miranda, the Court had attempted to justify its decision by explaining that if not fully informed of his rights, any criminal suspect is at an enormous disadvantage in which it termed the inherently coercive atmosphere of a station house. . . . Orozco, however, confessed in his own boardinghouse room where he was not in isolation or in unfamiliar surroundings as cited in Miranda.

Police investigating a shooting outside a Dallas bar found that Orozco had been in a quarrel earlier that evening in that very same bar. When questioned, he admitted being at the scene and furthermore produced the gun which later proved to be the murder weapon. . . . We do not understand that in 1969 the conviction was reversed as Justice Black said, a man is, in effect, under arrest from the moment he is asked his name. This is Miranda carried to a new and unwarranted extreme in the opinion of we lay people. But there is more . . . "Don't thank me. Thank the U.S. Supreme Court," responded irate Justice Michael Kern in 1967 . . . "You killed the child and you ought to go to jail." He was talking to a young mother who admitted taping her 4-year-old son's mouth and wrists and beating him to death with a rubber hose and broom handle. . . . This confessed child-beater and murderess was set free because she was not completely and instantly advised of her rights to counsel and silence. . . . We do not understand . . . Arthur Lee Davis wasn't even suspected of murder when Ohio authorities arrested him on suspicion of burglary. But he managed to confess to killing before being told about the Constitution. Davis confessed to having decided to kill a man he heard make a derogatory comment about his late mother. He carried out his intention a whole week later. His gun was examined by deputies and found to have fired the shell found near the victim's body . . . in this case of obvious premeditation, not only the confession was ruled out, but the resulting evidence was also banned.

Charles Kenny was arrested with several accomplices on charges of killing a service station attendant. He was advised of his right to an attorney and to remain silent. And at first, he denied the charge. But when his partners confessed, Kenny admitted the crime. He was, however, later released because although he was told he could have

an attorney, no one let him know that a free public defender could be made available. . . . We don't understand. . . .

Decisions like these seem endless. But I believe my point in this area is clear. . . . I do think it's important, however, to take a brief look at where the 1961 case of *Mapp vs. Ohio* has led regarding search and seizure. . . .

In 1965 an 86-year-old Massachusetts woman was the victim of rape. In reporting the crime to police she could only identify her attacker as a young Negro. In the next ten days police questioned 75 young Negroes. Most were fingerprinted, questioned and released. The fingerprints of John Davis, however, matched those on a windowsill in the victim's home and led to his conviction. But in 1969 the Supreme Court reversed that conviction because it said the fingerprints were illegally obtained without a warrant and were therefore inadmissible as evidence. . . . We just can't understand. . . . This decision not only freed a guilty man, but put a damper on the dragnet as a police method.

Now we are being told that even the practice of frisking a suspect is of doubtful legality despite the fact that one out of every ten frisks produced a concealed weapon and that the officer's life may be endangered. Apparently law enforcement officer's lives are expendable. . . .

Again, I could go on almost endlessly. . . . *Confessed and convicted* criminals are being set free. . . . Not because evidence cannot be obtained, but because of technicalities in obtaining it.

I strongly believe that this active situation is largely responsible for the loss of prestige suffered by the court system which produced the chaotic situations experienced recently in Chicago and New York, to mention only two.

In Chicago in the trial of those charged with inciting a riot during the 1968 Democratic convention . . . defendants referred to Judge Julius J. Hoffman as . . . Julie, Hitler, fascist pig, liar, sadist and executioner they screamed obscenities, brought a Viet Cong flag into the courtroom and ridiculed the court by wearing judicial robes. The defendants packed the courtroom with unruly spectators who laughed and chanted "oink" when the judge was called a pig.

When Black Panthers were tried in New York for bombing two police stations, attempted murder, possession of bombs, pistols, and guns without licenses, and for conspiracy to bomb department stores, justice John Murtagh, was forced to suspend proceedings in the pre-trial hearing. The defendants created much the same situation that occurred in Chicago except that they threatened: "If the courtroom doesn't give us justice, Mr. Murtagh, we are going to tear this raggedy, filthy injustice pig pen out, every single day" . . . and on two separate occasions defendants caused a melee in which they threw tables and chairs around the room. They heckled and fought court attendants and hospitalized three policemen . . . gentlemen . . . we just don't understand . . . order must be restored. When the court is able to act swiftly and directly in prosecuting criminals . . . unhampered by procedural red tape. Justice can be carried out and carried out in a dignified manner.

John A. McClellan, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures recently remarked, "I believe that the broad, sweeping advantages which have been given to criminals in many supreme court decisions have certainly militated against . . . and . . . done a great injury to the rights of society." The truth of this statement is unquestionable . . . regardless of . . . to what degree you concur. . . . You must agree that justice is being threatened.

And when justice is threatened. . . . Every American is threatened.

And gentlemen . . . across this great land of ours . . . are confused and we do not understand.

I strongly believe that interpretation by the courts of my rights under the constitution must be tempered with common sense.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Article that appeared in the Los Angeles Daily Journal dated 12-17-70 re:
 - A. Reorganization of California trial courts—proposal is designed to eliminate the distinction between Superior, Municipal, and Justice Courts in this State.
 - B. Estimated the approximately \$100 million in local property tax relief would result from the shifting of Court administration from the local level to the State.
 - C. Introduction of this bill aimed at massive reorganization of our Courts is scheduled for sometime in March.
2. Municipal Courts a 40,000 population.
3. Reduction in size of juries. 12 members to 6 (misdemeanors). Reduces trial time. Smaller civil cases.
4. Permit majority verdict in criminal cases in order to reduce number of mistrials due to hung juries.
5. Unwarranted Court continuances.
6. Unnecessary overly concern over technicalities.
7. Greater use of referees and Commissioners for routine type matters:
 - (A) Small Claims.
 - (B) Traffic Citations.
8. Greater use of circuit Judges bring our courts to the people rather than vice versa.
9. More use of specialty Judges where feasible.
10. More use of pre-trials as was introduced in the West End by Judge Garner. Saves the time of Judges—D.A.s, P.D.s, Deputies, Sheriffs and jurors.
11. In order to promote respect for our judicial system, Judges as well as Attorneys should devote time to explain controversial decisions to the press and the general public.
12. Judges and attorneys' should make a greater effort to get involved in the problems and the nuts and bolts operations of their respective communities.
 - (A) Drug prevention programs.
 - (B) Volunteer time.
 - (C) City councils.
 - (D) School Bds.
 - (E) Legal aid to the poor.
13. There has to be a much greater degree of cooperation between Judges and elected officials—we do have the tools to comprehend.

STATEMENT BY THE REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION ON REVENUE SHARING

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, our former Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Honorable Raymond P. Shafer, has called to my attention a statement unanimously approved by the Winter Republican Governors' Conference in Sun Valley. Following is the text of this statement on revenue sharing:

STATEMENT BY THE REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION ON REVENUE SHARING

The Federal system of shared responsibility between the Federal, State and local governments has worked for the people because it has had the support of the people.

The Federal system, however, has endangered itself because it is growing increasingly less responsive to the changing conditions and the new needs of the people by whom it was created and to whom it is responsible.

The people, now as always, determine the existence of governmental structure and the structure itself in turn depends on the confident support of the people.

The structure of government, the federal system, has now reached a critical point because State and local governments can no longer raise the money necessary to provide adequately for essential services to their people.

The resulting deterioration of services at the local level and particularly in urban areas is undermining confidence in representative government.

The Federal government collects 65 percent of all tax revenues and 91 percent of the fastest growth tax, the income tax, and yet returns only 18 percent to the total cost of state and local government.

Despite the fact that five years ago the National Governors' Conference first adopted a resolution urging federal revenue sharing and the President has submitted a revenue sharing proposal to the Congress, nothing has happened.

The Republican Governors' Association recognizes an impending collapse of confidence in State and local government, particularly in urban areas, and concludes that nothing less than a Federal revenue sharing program of at least \$10 billion annually, starting July 1, 1971, can save this situation.

The Republican Governors' Association petitions the President of the United States for a meeting at which this proposal and the crucial nature of this problem can be presented before the President completes his State of the Union Message.

INVOLVEMENT A WAY OF LIFE FOR DISC EMPLOYEE; 3 MONTHS WITH NO PAY TO HELP YOUTH IN TROUBLE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Elmer Hunter of 707 Carpenter Lane in Germantown, Pa., is a man involved. Involved in his community, his Nation, and his people. And probably more so than most, since he is a man who took a 3-month leave from his civil service job without pay this summer in order to establish a much needed chaplaincy program, also without pay, at an overcrowded youth detention center in Philadelphia.

To hundreds of military supply requisitioners all over the world, he is known as Mr. Hunter of the DISC Emergency Supply Operations Center, ESOC, responsible for receiving and transmitting vitally urgent supply requirements from bases around the globe.

To hundreds of Philadelphia youngsters who have had a brush with the law, he is known as Reverend Hunter, chaplain of the Philadelphia Youth Study Center, responsible for advising, counseling and spiritually helping the young people detained at the center.

A career Federal civil servant, Mr. Hunter spends a full work week during

the late evening shift at the Defense Industrial Supply Center in Northeast Philadelphia. DISC, as the center is known, is a field activity of the Defense Supply Agency and buys industrial type items for use in major weapons systems by all U.S. military services all over the world. He has been a Government employee for over 15 years.

Throughout his career, he has made involvement a vital way of life, especially involving himself with the problems and concerns of youth in contemporary society. Thus, at the end of a full, 8 hour night at DISC, Hunter considers his workday only just begun, as he assumes the role of chaplain, friend, and confidant to the young boys and girls at the Youth Study Center.

Hunter was born 34 years ago in the Frankford section of Philadelphia. He attended Philadelphia public schools, graduating from Overbrook High School in 1954. He enlisted in the U.S. Air Force in November of that same year. After serving in France for nearly 3 years, he returned to Philadelphia to enter Temple University and the Philadelphia College of Bible.

He has served on the chaplaincy staff of the Mercy-Douglass Hospital, as well as in field work with the American Bible Society, the American Tract Society, and Scripture Press.

Appointed recently to the Council of Chaplaincy Ministries in Institutions, Hunter served on the Graterford prison committee. His position with this council, coupled with his abiding interest in youth, led him to his current ministry at the Youth Study Center.

Prior to his involvement with the center this year, the institution because of a severely limited public budget, had no formal chaplaincy program, according to Hunter. Setting up a workable plan required a full-time effort by a dedicated volunteer who would be willing to work almost around the clock, and with no compensation. Without such a volunteer, no realistic program would succeed.

Hunter saw the need, and immediately worked toward filling the requirement. A married man with three young children himself, he applied for a 3-month leave of absence from his position as inventory manager at DISC, in order to devote his entire summer to the youngsters at the youth center.

Word of Hunter's dedication quickly reached Brig. Gen. Paul E. Smith, U.S. Army, Commander of DISC, himself an avid proponent of active involvement with young people.

In response to Chaplain Hunter's offer to visit and tour the youth center, General Smith expressed a desire to meet with and talk to the young people of the center and to assist the work of the center in any way possible.

During the visit, General Smith was very impressed with the program at the center, but concerned about the limited budget to continue the program Chaplain Hunter had begun.

Upon his return to DISC, Hunter became coordinating chaplain of the youth center continuing with a part-time involvement with the youth of the center, but this time with the help of his co-workers at DISC.

Magazines, books, games, and puzzles are now collected by volunteer DISC employees for delivery to the detained youngsters. A weekly delivery from DISC to the center is now greatly assisting in the continuing chaplaincy program, says Hunter.

He explains:

To see these youngsters dive into the magazines and games from DISC is a heartwarming experience indeed. We will continue the program, and its better than ever!

Hunter is back to the requisitions at DISC as well as his continuing work with Philadelphia youth. But this time he is not alone. His dedicated zeal is now supported by Brigadier General Smith and the over 2,000 employees of the Defense Industrial Supply Center.

Hunter sums up quietly:

I am grateful to God for my relationship with General Smith and the wonderful people of DISC.

ANTIRECESSION PUBLIC WORKS LEGISLATION

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am joining my colleagues, Congressman JOHN J. McFALL, Democrat of California, and Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat of West Virginia, along with approximately 100 other Members, in introducing comprehensive antirecession public works legislation.

I believe it is highly appropriate for us to introduce the accelerated public works bill on the opening day of the 92d Congress to reiterate our goal to combat the high rate of unemployment that has plagued our economy for too long now—a condition which is becoming more acute rather than diminishing.

The proposal would make Federal funds available—80 percent grants-in-aid—to assist local communities in building permanent public facilities. Specifically, the assistance would go to economic development areas and major labor market areas with exceptionally high unemployment rates, if the communities first, have a firm plan for badly needed permanent public facility, second, are able to finance the local share of construction, third, are ready to begin almost immediate construction, and fourth, can guarantee that a high percentage of the construction cost will be labor.

The goal is to make local areas more attractive to industry by building such facilities as sewer plants and municipal buildings without overburdening the local tax rate. It is estimated that \$950 million will be needed to initiate the program. Similar legislation proved highly successful in the early 1960's, and I am sure will again be beneficial in providing the necessary impetus to reverse the current trends choking our economy. Certainly the present rate of unemployment of approximately 6 percent nationwide, with some "pockets of poverty"

reaching close to 9 percent, warrants this beneficial legislation once again.

Congress can no longer sit idly by with the hope that prosperity is around the next bend, especially in view of the administration's refusal to use the anti-inflation tools that would not cause unemployment increases—authority to control wages, prices, and interest rates—and the President's equal resistance to a comprehensive manpower act, vetoed in the 91st Congress.

I represent a congressional district that qualifies for the concentrated employment program because of the high rate of unemployment in certain parts of San Antonio, and we would more than welcome the assistance that this legislative proposal would provide.

I would urge that the Congress provide some tangible evidence to these hard-hit communities that it cares for their general welfare. Hopefully we shall be able to schedule early hearings, and move soon toward enacting this badly needed legislation.

IS BEING ON THE DOLE A CIVIL RIGHT?

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that many of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, would take a keen interest in the following editorial from the January 16, 1971, issue of the Columbia, (S.C.) State. The article provocatively poses the unstated question, whether being on the dole has in fact ceased to be a governmentally sponsored, ironclad "civil right." Fortunately, the question, in this instance, is answered in the negative by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very signal event. The years of the Warren Court were breezy, activist, and some even thought meddling, years. Hopefully, they are now over. The present Court—wisely and judiciously, to my mind—appears to have begun to insist upon an at least even-handed treatment of rights as against responsibility to the great public at large.

The article follows:

WELFARE EDICT SUGGESTS END FOR BREEZY RULINGS

In what may have been a tell-tale decision, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled this week that welfare recipients, if they are to qualify for continued public support, must submit to reasonable investigations by public agencies. The vote was 6 to 3, with Justices Douglas, Brennan, and Marshall on the losing side.

The suit was brought in behalf of Barbara James, a welfare mother in New York who refused to allow a case worker into her apartment without a search warrant. She offered to provide whatever information the case-worker needed, but she agreed to do so only if a meeting were held outside her home.

New York officials stopped her welfare payments, reasoning that welfare regulations already provided sufficient protection against unreasonable intrusions into the home. Mrs. James had been notified in writing well in advance of the visiting date, in addition to which New York regulations prohibit night-

time visits, forcible entry, and "snooping" once entry is gained.

In a well-reasoned opinion by Justice Harry A. Blackmun, his first majority opinion, the court upheld the action by New York officials. What Mrs. James evidently expects from the public agency that furnishes her family with the necessities of life, Justice Blackmun wrote, is the right to receive those necessities on her own terms, with no thought to the public's legitimate interest. The public interest in her case, the court concluded, must take precedence.

As for the insistence on search warrants, the court saw no justification for it. The visiting system, it observed, is a "gentle means" to a proper end and cannot be compared to a search for evidence of crime. If Mrs. James valued her privacy more highly than welfare payments, said the court, she had the alternative of giving up welfare. It is scarcely reasonable, the court added, to expect welfare agencies to humor the preferences of their clients when such preferences hamper necessary checks on how public funds are being spent.

Frequently, New York officials had advised the court, visits to the home uncover physical abuse of children, the safeguarding of whose welfare is among the purposes of public assistance. Meeting welfare mothers outside the home, in short, is an unsatisfactory substitute.

In the face of this logic, the three dissenters could mount no effective retort. Justice Douglas sputtered something about one rule for the poor and another rule for "prominent, affluent cotton or wheat farmers," but the ruse carried no conviction. If abuses occur among cotton and wheat farmers, the majority seemed to understand, the solution is to put a tighter rein on agricultural subsidies, not to do away with whatever protections now exist.

It was a sensible ruling the court handed down, and it holds a certain interest over and above the case of Mrs. James and her locked apartment. The vote was six for common sense and reason, and only three against. It is only one straw in the wind, but it is significant nonetheless. It suggests that the gale-force wind that whistled through the law during the Warren years and laid the Constitution flat may have been subdued at last.

DR. BEN SHEPPARD "CITIZEN OF THE YEAR"

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1971, a testimonial and fund-raising dinner will be held in Miami, Fla., in honor of Dr. Ben Sheppard, who was recently named "Citizen of the Year" by the South Miami Elks Lodge No. 1888.

But this is more than an honorific event. Proceeds from the dinner will be turned over to Dr. Sheppard's clinic, St. Luke's Center, to aid in the treatment of drug addicts.

Dr. Sheppard is being cited for his outstanding contributions to the south Florida community and to mankind. As one of the few persons in the United States who hold degrees in both medicine and law, Dr. Sheppard is a member of a select group.

Dr. Sheppard graduated from medical school in 1932. He specialized in child and adolescent problems in clinics in New

York City, and then in child psychiatry at Vanderbilt Clinic. He received his LL.B at the University of Miami in 1952, and his J.D. in 1966. Dr. Sheppard taught medical jurisprudence at the university for 7 years.

He has served on the boards of Children's Center for the Emotionally Disturbed, Dade County Association for Mentally Retarded, and Big Brothers.

From 1960-67 Dr. Sheppard was senior judge, juvenile and domestic relations court, in and for Dade County.

Dr. Sheppard's clinic is just one of the many projects undertaken by the South Miami Elks, and Leo Leonardi, exalted ruler of the lodge, hopes to keep this project as an annual affair. The members of Lodge No. 1888 devote many hours to the aid and assistance of those in distress. They work with Boy Scout groups, give money and food to area families in need, spend time with those in veterans' hospitals, and contribute to the Harry-Anna Hospital for Crippled Children in Umatilla, Fla.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to honor such an outstanding man as Dr. Ben Sheppard. I know our colleagues join me in wishing Dr. Sheppard and the South Miami Elks continued success in their humanitarian endeavors.

GALLAGHER INTRODUCES EX- PANDED RESOLUTION TO CURE AND CONTROL CANCER

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the first week of the new Congress to speak of what I believe should be the first priority of the new Congress. We can, indeed, we must cure and control cancer and the resolution which I introduce today can do exactly that.

We must clearly focus on human needs by declaring it to be the sense of Congress that new and massive funding be provided for cancer research. Every cancer specialist in the Nation feels that the only obstacle to ridding the Nation of this scourge is inadequate funding for research. We stand on the brink of obliterating this dread disease—only money stands in our way.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the slightly mundane ring in that last paragraph, for all too often we in the Congress have hailed expenditures of taxpayer's funds as the final answer to social ills, only to discover that the problem will not yield to money. But in the case of cancer, we are so near to the final solution. I attach at the end of my remarks today a list of over 600 cancer experts who signed a public statement endorsing my resolution from the 91st Congress, saying:

We further express our conviction that with the level of funding and the magnitude of commitment authorized under the Gallagher resolution, cancer can be cured and controlled.

I believe this to be extraordinarily significant, for physical scientists and men

of medicine are more reluctant to speak in absolute terms than are their colleagues in the social sciences. These men speak with a unified voice to the Congress; I say that in the name of humanity we must listen.

CANCER: A COMMON ENEMY

Cancer has touched every home in the Nation. Everyone has had a member of his family, a close friend, or a public figure who he deeply respected, brought down at the height of his powers by cancer's current killing pace. I think especially of the late Vince Lombardi, for if ever a man was killed in the prime of life, it was that inspirational American. I can think of some of our great colleagues who were cut down in the prime of their lives as well.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I can find no reason why many more than the current 100 cosponsors of my resolution today should not join with me in speaking with a clear and unmistakable voice. We can show our concern about the deeply human issues by endorsing and passing my resolution; we can, perhaps, even make a forthright rebuttal to those who say the Congress is incapable of reflecting the will of the people. I can think of no better way to begin what I am sure will be a constructive 92d Congress than by recognizing a major priority in every home.

A SENSE OF PRIORITIES

I do not intend to berate again the jet propelled "white elephant," the SST, or point to the massive defense budget, or the funds we have poured into the seemingly endless Vietnam conflict to justify the fact that my resolution calls for at least \$650 million to be spent each year. If we have not learned by this time that alleviating human agony, as well as expanding human values, is our major job here in the Congress, no speech of mine today can instill compassion in the House.

I would, however, point out that one of the great reasons for the skyrocketing costs of medical care nationally, and a very persistent reason for destroying the life savings of a family, is the expense of terminal care for cancer patients for whom there is no hope. So if we terminate the specter of cancer, if we can give hope to the forlorn and destitute, we can realize sizable economic benefits for our Nation and bring some sense of financial security to American homes.

SOLID FINANCIAL BENEFITS TO THE UNITED STATES

Let me expand just a bit on the cost to our Nation. Assuming a median income of \$10,000 for married taxpayers filing joint Federal income tax returns; and given the fact that at least 1,000,000 Americans are currently afflicted with cancer, then the United States lost at least \$1,820,000,000 in taxes during 1969.

Surely, \$650 million is a piddling sum. It has been widely estimated that the total cost of cancer to the United States in 1969 from lost taxes, reduced earnings, medical assistance, and insurance premiums came to over \$12 billion.

Surely \$650 million each year for 10 years is a piddling sum.

A NASA TO MAKE LIFE ON EARTH BETTER

My resolution also calls for the establishment of a National Cancer Authority which will be able to stimulate valid research and which will have the necessary visibility on the Washington scene to focus our energies. I believe that the National Cancer Institute which now exists is doing a splendid job with their limited funds and in the face of cutbacks in research funding. But I believe that the struggle should be wrenched out of the hundreds of similar agencies within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A fresh, new, vital, and visible agency is needed to capture public attention, and public funds, especially now that the experts in the field say we can cure cancer.

If I may digress just a bit, Mr. Speaker, I am not so naive as to think that the expertise and success of our space probes can automatically be transferred into other sectors. One of the more distressing cliches today is, "The Nation that send a man to the moon can certainly * * *." Complete that with your favorite project. One could say, I suppose, with equal validity that the nation which built the pyramids could certainly solve the problem of slave labor.

But I do realize that in the Federal establishment, institutions create policy, organization is movement. Thus, I think that a new Federal Cancer Authority could assist us in stamping out cancer in an analogous manner to the way NASA put a human footstep on the moon.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that 100 of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives are joining with me today in introducing the cancer cure-and-control resolution. I find it especially significant that so many freshman Members see this as a way to alter priorities, as a way to insist that the needs of our constituents are met.

Interestingly, late last year Premier Kosygin of the Soviet Union responded to a letter I had sent to him, which urged international cooperation between us in this struggle. He agreed with me that it was foolish for the two great superpowers to spend their treasure on ways to destroy each other while ignoring ways to make human beings more secure. I intend to continue my efforts in the international field, for we need to find more ways to bring us together than to drive us apart.

I believe it would be significant, for this reason, if the House of Representatives were to declare itself loudly and clearly. My call was heard in the Kremlin; perhaps it might also be heard in the White House.

Today, I thank my colleagues who have joined me and I urge every Member of the House to ask himself whether he would not like to be remembered as a participant in the Congress which eliminated the specter of cancer from the American people. To repeat: Every expert now says the only thing stopping a complete cure of cancer is money.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my concurrent resolution, a list of the co-

sponsors, and the list of the cancer experts who endorsed my concept:

H. CON. RES. —

Whereas cancer takes the lives of more than three hundred thousand Americans each year; and

Whereas the death rate from cancer is steadily increasing as our population grows; and

Whereas more than one million Americans are currently under treatment for this dread disease; and

Whereas it is clearly in the best interests of mankind that this disease be cured and controlled; and

Whereas prominent medical authorities have indicated that cancer can be cured and controlled if the necessary funds are made available; and

Whereas current appropriations are inadequate to accomplish this task; and

Whereas the Nation's success in space was largely due to centralized direction of expenditures under the National and Aeronautics and Space Administration; and

Whereas it is both necessary and desirable that a national commitment be immediately undertaken to achieve a cure and control for cancer within this decade: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) no less than \$650,000,000 be appropriated annually over the next ten fiscal years for the national cancer research program;

(2) no less than \$250,000,000 of this appropriation be utilized to construct five new cancer research institutes in the United States during the first two years of the new appropriations; and

(3) the funds thus appropriated be controlled and directed by a National Cancer Authority which would have the same absolute direction of the cure and control of cancer that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has over our conquest of space.

LIST OF COSPONSORS OF GALLAGHER RESOLUTION

Bella S. Abzug, Democrat, of New York.
Joseph P. Addabbo, Democrat, of New York.
Glenn M. Anderson, Democrat, of California.
George W. Andrews, Democrat, of Alabama.
Mark Andrews, Republican, of North Dakota.
Herman Badillo, Democrat, of New York.
Walter S. Baring, Democrat, of Nevada.
William A. Barrett, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Mario Biaggi, Democrat, of New York.
Jonathan B. Bingham, Democrat, of New York.
Edward P. Boland, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
John Brademas, Democrat, of Indiana.
Frank J. Brasco, Democrat, of New York.
John Buchanan, Republican, of Alabama.
Philip Burton, Democrat, of California.
James A. Byrne, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Charles A. Carney, Democrat, of Ohio.
Bill Chappell, Democrat, of Florida.
Shirley Chisholm, Democrat, of New York.
Frank M. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
Don H. Clausen, Republican, of California.
William Clay, Democrat, of Missouri.
James C. Cleveland, Republican, of New Hampshire.
Harold R. Collier, Republican, of Illinois.
Jorge L. Cordova, Democrat, of Puerto Rico.
Dominick V. Daniels, Democrat, of New Jersey.
John W. Davis, Democrat, of Georgia.
John D. Dingell, Democrat, of Michigan.
Harold D. Donohue, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

Robert F. Drinan, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
 Thaddeus J. Dulski, Democrat, of New York.
 John J. Duncan, Republican, of Tennessee.
 Don Edwards, Democrat, of California.
 Joshua Ellberg, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
 Dante Fascell, Democrat, of Florida.
 William D. Ford, Democrat, of Michigan.
 Donald M. Fraser, Democrat, of Minnesota.
 James G. Fulton, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
 Richard Fulton, Democrat, of Tennessee.
 Don Fuqua, Democrat, of Florida.
 Nick Galifianakis, Democrat, of North Carolina.
 Tom S. Gettys, Democrat, of South Carolina.
 Robert N. Giaimo, Democrat, of Connecticut.
 Ella T. Grasso, Democrat, of Connecticut.
 Kenneth J. Gray, Democrat, of Illinois.
 Edith Green, Democrat, of Oregon.
 Seymour Halpern, Republican, of New York.
 Lee H. Hamilton, Democrat, of Indiana.
 James M. Hanley, Democrat, of New York.
 Orval Hansen, Republican, of Idaho.
 James Harvey, Republican, of Michigan.
 William D. Hathaway, Democrat, of Maine.
 Augustus F. Hawkins, Democrat, of California.
 Ken Hechler, Democrat, of West Virginia.
 Henry Helstoski, Democrat, of New Jersey.
 Floyd V. Hicks, Democrat, of Washington.
 Louise Day Hicks, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
 Lawrence J. Hogan, Republican, of Maryland.
 Frank Horton, Republican, of New York.
 James J. Howard, Democrat, of New Jersey.
 Andrew Jacobs, Jr., Democrat, of Indiana.
 Harold T. Johnson, Democrat, of California.
 Robert L. Leggett, Democrat, of California.
 Sherman P. Lloyd, Republican, of Utah.
 Manuel Lujan, Jr., Republican, of New Mexico.
 Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., Republican, of California.
 Mike McCormack, Democrat, of Washington.
 Jack H. McDonald, Republican, of Michigan.
 Stewart B. McKinney, Republican, of Connecticut.
 Spark M. Matsunaga, Democrat, of Hawaii.
 John Melcher, Democrat, of Montana.
 Abner J. Mikva, Democrat, of Illinois.
 Joseph G. Minish, Democrat, of New Jersey.
 Parren J. Mitchell, Democrat, of Maryland.
 John M. Murphy, Democrat, of New York.
 Robert N. C. Nix, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
 Dante B. Fascell, Democrat, of Florida.
 Alvin E. O'Konski, Republican, of Wisconsin.
 Thomas P. O'Neill, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
 Edward J. Patten, Democrat, of New Jersey.
 Thomas M. Pelly, Republican, of Washington.
 Claude Pepper, Democrat, of Florida.
 Otis G. Pike, Democrat, of New York.
 Bertram L. Podell, Democrat, of New York.
 Richardson Preyer, Democrat, of North Carolina.
 Melvin Price, Democrat, of Illinois.
 David Pryor, Democrat, of Arkansas.
 Thomas M. Rees, Democrat, of California.
 Robert A. Roe, Democrat, of New Jersey.
 Fred B. Rooney, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
 Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Democrat, of New York.
 William F. Ryan, Democrat, of New York.
 Fernand J. St Germain, Democrat, of Rhode Island.
 Charles W. Sandman, Jr., Republican, of New Jersey.
 Paul S. Sarbanes, Democrat, of Maryland.

James H. Scheuer, Democrat, of New York.
 Louis Stokes, Democrat, of Ohio.
 Charles Thones, Republican, of Nebraska.
 Robert O. Tiernan, Democrat, of Rhode Island.
 Charles H. Wilson, Democrat, of California.
 Jim Wright, Democrat, of Texas.
 Wendell Wyatt, Republican, of Oregon.
 Sidney R. Yates, Democrat, of Illinois.
 Gus Yatron, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
 Lawrence G. Williams, Republican, of Pennsylvania.
 John H. Dent, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.
 J. William Stanton, Republican, of Ohio.
 E. F. Sisk, Democrat, of California.
 Bill Nichols, Democrat, of Alabama.
 Michael Harrington, Democrat, of Massachusetts.
 Clement J. Zablocki, Democrat, of Wisconsin.
 Wayne L. Hays, Democrat, of Ohio.
 Dan Rostenkowski, Democrat, of Illinois.
 W. R. Hull, Jr., Democrat, of Missouri.
 Donald W. Riegle, Republican, of Michigan.
 Louis Frey, Jr., Republican, of Florida.

STATEMENT OF SUPPORT FOR GALLAGHER RESOLUTION

We the undersigned members of the medical and scientific communities express our strong support for the resolution sponsored by Congressman Cornelius E. Gallagher (H. Res. 906) calling for a firm national commitment to cure and control cancer within this decade.

We further express our conviction that with the level of funding and the magnitude of commitment authorized under the Gallagher resolution, cancer can be cured and controlled.

We believe, along with those who have joined in support of H. Res. 906, that there is no excuse for permitting cancer to continue its killing pace with the great resources available for the fight. It is high time to use these resources and conquer this tragic disease.

We who have been working for years against this common enemy of mankind urge our colleagues and our fellow citizens to endorse H. Res. 906 and help us win this battle.

SIGNATORIES

Mr. Sawson N. Abdelhady, Research Associate, Department of Biochemistry, Oklahoma State University.
 D. J. Aberhart, Staff Scientist, The Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology, Inc.
 Dr. George Acs, Department of Enzymology, Institute for Muscle Disease.
 Mrs. Claire Adamo, Waldemar Medical Research Foundation, Inc.
 William S. Adams, M.D., Professor and Vice Chairman, Department of Medicine, University of California.
 Mr. Mariano Adzuan, University of Hawaii, Department of Pathology, School of Medicine.
 Normal Allen, M.D., Division of Neurology, The Ohio State University Hospitals.
 Dr. Elizabeth Ambellan, Department of Chemistry, University of Connecticut.
 Julian L. Ambrus, M.D., Ph. D., Roswell Park Memorial Institute.
 Dr. Joseph C. Arcos, Department of Medicine, Tulane University.
 Dr. Mary F. Argus, Ph. D., Department of Medicine, Tulane University.
 Professor Bertie F. Argyris, Department of Urology, State University of New York, Upstate Medical Center.
 Professor Thomas S. Argyris, Department of Zoology, Syracuse University.
 Eugene A. Arnold, Jr., M.D., Department of Pathology, The Johns Hopkins University.
 Dr. Lewis Aronow, Ph. D., Department of Pharmacology, Stanford University.
 Mr. Leonard H. Augenlicht, Syracuse University, Department of Zoology.

Mr. David W. Baba, University of Hawaii, Department of Pathology, School of Medicine.
 Stanley Balkin, M.D., Hawaii Permanente Medical Group.
 Professor Bernard R. Baker, Department of Chemistry, University of California.
 Tibor Barka, M.D., Anatomy and Pathology, Mount Sinai School of Medicine.
 Dr. Allen O. Battle, Ph.D., The University of Tennessee Medical Units, Department of Physiology and Biophysics.
 Dr. William R. Bauer, Department of Chemistry, University of Colorado.
 Dr. Robert E. Beaudsketm, Manhattan College.
 Professor Joel S. Bedford, Department of Radiology, Vanderbilt University.
 Mrs. James Bell, American Cancer Society.
 Judith S. Bellin, Department of Chemistry, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.
 Dr. Michael A. Bender, Ph.D., Department of Radiology, Vanderbilt University.
 Fred Benjamin, M.D., Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Long Island Jewish Hospital.
 James L. Bennington, M.D., Children's Hospital of San Francisco.
 Professor Wesley G. Bentrude, Department of Chemistry, University of Utah.
 Dr. Victor V. Bergs, Department of Microbiology, University of Miami.
 Mr. Terry L. Bergthold, University of Hawaii, Department of Pathology, School of Medicine.
 Dr. Frederick Bernheim, Department of Physiology and Pharmacology, Duke University.
 Aleck Bernstein, M.D., Marquette School of Medicine, Inc., Cramer Memorial Building.
 Professor Richard Bershon, Department of Chemistry, Columbia University.
 Dr. Daniel Billin, Ph.D., Department of Microbiology, Radiation, University of Florida.
 Stephen B. Binkley, Department of Biological Chemistry, University of Illinois Medical Center.
 Leon Blackwell, University of Tennessee Medical Units.
 Raymond L. Bradley, Department of Biochemistry, University of Iowa.
 Harvey Bland, M.D., Department of Dermatology, University of Miami.
 Erwin J. Blanz, Jr., M.D., Mount Zion Hospital and Medical Center.
 Professor James M. Bobbitt, Chemistry Department, University of Connecticut.
 Dr. Frederick J. Bollum, Department of Biochemistry, University of Kentucky.
 Victor P. Bond, M.D., Associate University of Brookhaven, National Laboratory.
 Mrs. Sue Borchert, Department of Pathology, School of Medicine, University of Hawaii.
 Richard H. Bottomley, M.D., Cancer Section, Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation.
 Professor Charles K. Bradsher, Department of Chemistry, Duke University.
 Gerhard K. Brand, M.D., Dept. of Microbiology, University of Minnesota.
 William W. Brand, Dept. of Chemistry, Purdue University.
 David Brandes, M.D., Dept. of Pathology, Johns Hopkins University.
 E. J. Brandt, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.
 Professor Philip J. Bray, Dept. of Physics, Brown University.
 James T. Brennan, M.D., Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania.
 Robert S. Brodey, Dept. of Clinical Studies, University of Pennsylvania.
 Jerome I. Brody, M.D., Department of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania.
 Dr. William A. Brodsky, Professor of Biophysics, Mount Sinai School of Medicine.
 Dr. Sam C. Brooks, Jr., Ph.D., Michigan Cancer Foundation.
 Professor John D. Broome, Dept. of Pathology, New York University.
 Dr. Phyllis Brown, Ph.D., Division of Bio-

logical and Medical Sciences, Brown University.

Mrs. Shirley D. Brown, The University of Tennessee Medical Units, Dept. of Physiology and Biophysics.

Carlo Bruni, M.D., Associate Professor, Dept. of Pathology, School of Medicine, University of Virginia.

John M. Buchanan, Dept. of Biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Nancy L. R. Buchu, Massachusetts General Hospital.

Max M. Burger, M.D., PhD, Dept. of Biology, Princeton University.

Dr. William T. Burke, Dept. of Natural Sciences, Long Island University.

Thomas K. Burnham, M.D., Dept. of Dermatology, Henry Ford Hospital.

Professor Harris Busch, Baylor College of Medicine, Texas Medical Center.

Professor George B. Butler, Dept. of Chemistry, University of Florida.

William L. Caldwell, M.D., Dept. of Radiology, Vanderbilt University.

Reo A. Carroll, the University of Tennessee Medical Units, Dept. of Physiology and Biophysics.

Anne C. Carter, M.D., Dept. of Medicine, University of New York State.

Christopher Carruthers, Dept. of Biochemical Research, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Dr. Eliahu Caspi, Ph. D., Senior Scientist, the Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology, Inc.

LaRoy N. Castor, Dept. of Biology, Institute for Cancer Research.

Dr. Lindley A. Cates, Jr., Ph. D. Professor of Medicinal Chemistry, University of Houston.

Bibiano Cathagan, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Elmon L. Coe, Dept. of Biochemistry, Northwestern University.

Dr. Sungman Cha, M.D., Ph. D., Division of Biological and Medical Sciences, Brown University.

Chen K. Chal, Jackson Laboratory.

Chu H. Chang, M.D., Department of Radiology, Columbia University.

Warren H. Chapman, M.D., Dept. of Urology, University of Washington.

F. C. Charalampous, M.D., Dept. of Biochemistry, the School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Jesse Charney, Department of Biochemistry, Institute for Medical Research.

Dr. T. S. Chol, Baylor College of Medicine, Texas Medical Center.

Dr. Shih Hsi Chu, PhD., Division of Biological and Medical Sciences, Brown University.

David L. Coffen, Dept. of Chemistry, University of Colorado.

Albert F. Coleman, Institute for Medical Research.

Douglas L. Coleman, Jackson Laboratory.

Mrs. Edythe Collins, Dept. of Pathology, School of Medicine, University of Hawaii.

Dr. Richard A. Consigli, PhD, Department of Bacteriology, Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science.

Mr. George Cooper, Jr., University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Lewis L. Coriell, M.D., PhD, Institute for Medical Research.

Dr. Joseph G. Cory, PhD, Dept. of Chemistry, University of South Florida.

Charles G. Craddock, M.D., University of California, Dept. of Medicine.

Hugh J. Cheech, American Association for Cancer Research.

Sheldon E. Cremer, Marquette University, Chemistry Department.

Stanley T. Crokke, Baylor College of Medicine, Texas Medical Center.

Susa J. Curstal, ABS, M.T., Waldemar Medical Research Foundation, Inc.

David R. Dalton, Dept. of Chemistry, Temple University.

Professor Donald B. Denney, School of Chemistry, Rutgers University.

Harold F. Deutsch, M.D., Physiological Chemistry, University of Wisconsin.

Nokolay V. Dimitrov, M.D., Hahnemann Medical Service, Philadelphia General Hospital Research Fund.

Zacharias Dische, M.D., Dept. of Ophthalmology, Columbia University.

Professor Donald C. Dittmer, Dept. of Chemistry, Syracuse University.

Raymond W. Doskotch, Ohio State University.

Clyde A. Dubbs, M.D., St. Johns Hospital.

N. C. H. Duckworth, M.D., The University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Dr. Bernard S. Dudock, Dept. of Biological Sciences, University of New York.

Dr. Henry F. Edelhauser, Marquette School of Medicine, Cramer Memorial Building.

Mr. Kohki Egawa, Dept. of Pharmacology, Baylor College of Medicine, Texas Medical Center.

Reginald C. Eggleton, Secretary-Treasurer and Senior Research Scientist, Interscience Research Institute.

Robert L. Ehrmann, M.D., Department of Pathology, Boston Hospital for Women.

Edison D. Elaw, American Cancer Society, Maine Division.

Robert B. Epstein, M.D., Division of Oncology, USPS Hospital.

Dr. Sheldon M. Epstein, Dept. of Pathology, University of Pittsburgh.

Dr. Arvid L. Erlandson, Marquette School of Medicine, Inc.

Audrey E. Evans, M.D., Children's Hospital of Philadelphia.

Dr. Edwin H. Eylar, The Salk Institute, University of California.

Dr. Emmanuel Farber, Dept. of Pathology, University of Pittsburgh.

Mr. Donald A. Ferguson, Jr., Syracuse University.

Dr. Phillip R. Ferguson, Dept. of Chemistry, Florida Presbyterian College.

Silvio Fiala, M.D., Veterans Administration Hospital.

Dr. K. F. Finger, Ph. D., Dean, College of Pharmacy, University of Florida.

Professor T. Lloyd Fletcher, Dept. of Surgery, University of Washington.

Maurice Fleysler, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Professor Thomas P. Fondy, Dept. of Zoology, Syracuse University.

Dr. Harry S. Fong, Dept. of Pharmacognosy, University of Pittsburgh.

Mr. Harry Force, Head of Biology Department, Missouri Western.

Dr. Joseph F. Foster, Professor and Head, Dept. of Chemistry, Purdue University.

Dr. K. E. Fox, PhD, University of Oregon Medical School, Dept. of Pharmacology.

Dr. Jerome J. Freed, PhD, Dept. of Biology, Institute for Cancer Research.

Mrs. June C. French, Mount Zion Hospital and Medical Center.

Professor John J. Frenster, M.D., Stanford University, Dept. of Medicine.

Professor Josef Fried, Dept. of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Ben May Laboratory for Cancer Research, The University of Chicago.

Dr. John D. Gabourel, PhD, Dept. of Pharmacology, University of Oregon Medical School.

Edward R. Garrett, PhD, Graduate Research Professor, University of Florida.

Mr. Paul G. Gassman, Dept. of Chemistry, Ohio State University.

Jack Geller, M.D., Dept. of Medicine, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Yeshiva University.

Jack R. Gearley, American Cancer Society, Alabama Division Inc.

Richard K. Gershon, M.D., Department of Pathology, Yale University.

Mr. A. Ghosh, Experimental Therapeutics, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Susan R. Gibbons, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Dixie M. Gimlin, Research Assistant, Department of Biochemistry, Oklahoma State University.

David W. Glenister, Marquette School of Medicine.

Gerald Glick, M.D., Dept. of Pharmacology and Medicine, Baylor College of Medicine, Texas Medical Center.

Dr. J. Leslie Glick, Executive Vice President, Associated Biomedic Systems, Inc.

Gerald Goldstein, M.D. Dept. of Microbiology, University of Virginia School of Medicine.

Professor Harold Goldwhite, Dept. of Chemistry, California State College.

Larry Good, B.A., Waldemar Medical Research Foundation, Inc.

Dr. Leon Goodman, Stanford Research Institute.

E. Jane Goplerud, M.D., Palmerton, Pennsylvania.

Mrs. Janice K. Goss, The University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Joseph S. Gota, M.D., Dept. of Microbiology, University of Pennsylvania.

Liselotte Graf, M.D., Dept. of Pharmacology, New York State Psychiatric Institute.

Dr. Charles E. Graham, Ph.D., Dept. of Histology and Histochem, Emory University.

Paul A. Granato, Syracuse University.

Mr. George Gray, University of Hawaii, Dept. of Pathology, School of Medicine.

Professor David M. Greenberg, Professor Emeritus and Research Biochemist, University of California Medical Center.

Mr. Arthur E. Greene, Institute for Medical Research, Camden, New Jersey.

Professor Frederic Greenwood, Dept. of Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of Hawaii.

Dr. Martin Griffin, Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation.

Rosalind Griffin, Dept. of Physiology and Biophysics, The University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Mr. O. Hayes Griffin, Dept. of Chemistry, University of Oregon.

Dr. Gaston Griggs, PhD., Dept. of Radiology, Vanderbilt University.

George H. Grimes, University of Tennessee Medical Unit, Dept. of Psychology and Biophysics.

Mr. Gerald B. Grindey, Experimental Therapeutics, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Dr. Donald P. Groth, Dept. of Biochemistry, Emory University.

Dr. Leo Gross, Waldemar Medical Research Foundation, Sunnyside Boulevard.

Paul J. Grotzinger, M.D., The American Oncologic Hospital.

Professor Edward J. Grubbs, Dept. of Chemistry, San Diego State College.

Professor Christoph J. Grundman, Carnegie-Mellon University.

Mrs. Ann Gruolzin, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Mr. H. R. Gutman, Senior Scientist, Special Cancer Laboratory, Veterans Administration Hospital.

Professor Herbert I. Hadler, Dept. of Chemistry, Southern Illinois University.

Senitroh Hakomori, M.D., Associate Professor, Dept. of Preventive Medicine, University of Washington.

Rigina Hall, The University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Thomas C. Hall, M.D., Dept. of Medicine, University of Rochester.

Richard M. Halpern, M.D., Dept. of Chemistry, University of California.

Dr. Alexander Hampton, Dept. of Biochemistry, The Institute for Cancer Research.

Dr. Ronald L. Hancock Jackson Laboratory.

Robert E. Handschumacher, Department of Pharmacology, Yale University.

Gerald E. Hanks, M.D., Dept. of Radiology, University of North Carolina School of Medicine.

Dorwin H. Hansch, Pomona College.

Dr. Boyd W. Harding, PhD., Dept. of Medicine, University of Southern California.

Professor Robert E. Harmon, Dept. of Chemistry, Western Michigan University.

John R. Hartmann, M.D., Dept. of Pedi-

atrics, Children's Orthopedic Hospital and Medical Center.

Dr. Emmett J. Hartz, B.S., Waldemar Medical Research Foundation, Inc.

Dr. Alfred Hassner, Dept. of Chemistry, University of Colorado.

Miss Norma Hatton, DeKalb County Unit, American Cancer Society.

Dr. Geoffrey Haughton, The University of North Carolina, School of Medicine.

Professor M. Frederick Hawthorne, Dept. of Chemistry, University of California.

Haruko Hazama, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Peter Hecharf, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Dr. Peter Heidel, The Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology, Inc.

Henry O. Heinemann, M.D., Dept. of Medicine, Cornell University Medical College.

Charles E. Helmstetter, Dept. of Biology, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Dr. Harold G. Hempling, Physiology and Biophysics, Cornell University Medical College.

Frank R. Hendrickson, M.D., Dept. of Radiation Therapy, St. Lukes Hospital.

Dr. Edward Herbert, PhD., Professor of Chemistry, University of Oregon.

Dennis L. Heuring, Dept. of Chemistry, Purdue University.

Professor Leonard A. Herzenberg, Dept. of Genetics, Stanford University.

James S. Hewlett, M.D., Dept. of Medicine, Cleveland Clinic Foundation.

Mr. M. Higarie, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

M. Louise Higgins, Research Associate, Dept. of Biochemistry, Oklahoma State University.

James Hill, Dept. of Pharmacology, Baylor College of Medicine.

Dr. Labomir S. Hnilica, Dept. of Biochemistry, University of Texas.

Dr. John F. Hofert, Dept. of Biochemistry, University of Nebraska.

Grace L. Hoffman, Panther Valley Unit, American Cancer Society.

Yoshitsugi Hokama, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Vincent P. Hollander, M.D., Dept. of Biochemistry, Hospital for Joint Diseases.

Dr. Robert W. Holley, Salk Institute for Biological Studies.

Elizabeth J. Holmes, M.D., Department of Pathology, Temple University.

Edward D. Holyoke, M.D., Dept. of Gastrointestinal Services, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Dr. Jerome P. Horwitz, Scientific Director, Michigan Cancer Foundation.

Henry D. Hoverman, Dept. of Biochemistry, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Yeshiva University.

Dr. F. M. Huennekens, Dept. of Biochemistry, Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation.

Charles M. Huguley, Jr., M.D., Dept. of Medicine, Emory University.

Dr. Emeral Wayne Hull, PhD., Dept. of Biochemistry, University of California.

Mrs. Tenenie Huntington, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Dr. Kenneth H. Ibsen, PhD., Dept. of Biochemistry, University of California.

Dr. Robert L. Iardi, PhD., The University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Professor Julian J. Jaffe, Dept. of Pharmacology, University of Vermont.

Milton Jena, M.D., Medical Education and Research, Western Pennsylvania Hospital.

Bojan H. Jennings, Dept. of Chemistry, Wheaton College.

Mr. B. Jirgensons, Dept. of Biochemistry, University of Texas.

Lorna D. Johnson, M.D., Framingham, Massachusetts.

Mrs. Barbara Jones, M.D., School of Medicine, Dept. of Pediatrics, Morgantown, West Virginia.

Oliver P. Jones, M.D., Dept. of Anatomy, State University of Buffalo.

John P. Kampine, M.D., Marquette School of Medicine, Inc.

Dr. Andrew A. Kandutsch, PhD, Jackson Laboratory.

Mrs. Lucille Kaneshis, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Henry S. Kaplan, M.D., Professor and Chairman, Dept. of Radiology, Stanford University.

Frederick H. Kasten, Dept. of Anatomy, School of Medicine in New Orleans, Louisiana State University Medical Center.

Edward J. Kelly, Board of Directors and General Counsel, Northwest Hospital.

Professor Charles A. Kelsey, Dept. of Radiology, University of Wisconsin.

F. T. Kenney, PhD., Scientific Director, Carcinogenesis Program, Biology Division, Oak Ridge National Lab.

Sam G. Kenzy, Veterinary Microbiology, Washington State University.

Dr. Albert S. Keston, Dept. of Biochemistry, Institute of Medical Research/Studies.

Dr. J. D. Khenne, PhD., The University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Richard Y. Kirdain, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Hadley Kirkman, Dept. of Anatomy, Stanford University.

Wolff M. Kirsch, M.D., Associate Professor, Division of Neurosurgery, University of Colorado Medical Center.

Roy L. Kisliuk, Associated Professor, Dept. of Biochemistry, Tufts University.

Robert R. Klievecz, Dept. of Biology, City of Hope Medical Center.

Thomas C. Klingler, Dept. of Chemistry, Purdue University.

Mrs. Carol Koepe, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Professor Henry Koffler, Head, Department of Biological Sciences, Purdue University.

Professor Izaak M. Kolthoff, Dept. of Chemistry, University of Minnesota.

Mr. Don M. Kordis, Executive Director, Sedgwick County Unit, American Cancer Society.

Stuart A. Kornfield, M.D., Dept. of Internal Medicine, Washington University.

Dr. L. Korngold, Research Laboratories, Hospital for Special Surgery.

Walter Korytnyk, Dept. of Experimental Therapeutics, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Dr. Rudy Kovachevich, M.D., PhD., University of Louisville, Dept. of Radiology.

Dr. Edward T. Krementz, Dept. of Surgery, Tulane University.

Henry A. Kubinski, M.D., Dept. of Surgery, University of Wisconsin.

Mr. Eugene Lahey, M.D., Dept. of Pediatrics, University of Utah.

Dr. Marvin R. Lamborg, Dept. of Research, Charles F. Kettering Foundation Research Laboratory.

Kenneth Lanclos, Baylor College of Medicine, Texas Medical Center.

Professor Arthur Landy, Brown University.

Mrs. Montague Lane, M.D., Baylor College of Medicine, Texas Medical Center.

Miss Barbara H. Larkin, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Mr. Robert E. Larson, Dept. of Pharmacology, Oregon State University.

Dr. John Laszlo, Associate Professor of Medicine, Program Director, Clinical Cancer Research Center, Duke University.

Mr. D. C. Lawrence, Lubbock Christian Schools.

Dr. Franklin R. Leach, PhD, Dept. of Biochemistry, Oklahoma State University.

Dr. Joseph Leighton, Dept. of Pathology, University of Pittsburgh.

Dr. Edwin H. Lennette, Dept. of Public Health, Berkeley, California.

Howard E. Lessner, M.D., Dept. of Medicine, University of Miami.

Dr. Charles Levinson, Dept. of Physiology and Internal Medicine, University of Texas.

Dr. Mortimer Levitz, Dept. of Obstetrics and Gynecology, New York University.

H. Richard Levy, M.D., Syracuse University.

B. C. Lewis, M.D., Baylor College of Medicine, Texas Medical Center.

Mr. Robert M. Lewis, Laboratory of Clinical Cardiovascular Pharmacology, Baylor College of Medicine.

R. D. Lillie, M.D., Dept. of Pathology, Louisiana State University.

Professor David Lipkin, Chairman, Dept. of Chemistry, Washington University.

George Lipkin, M.D., New York University.

Martin Lipkin, M.D., Dept. of Medicine, Cornell University Medical College.

Mr. James A. Lippincott, Dept. of Biological Sciences, Northwestern University.

Mrs. Henry Lockwood III, Waldemar Medical Research Foundation.

Mr. Gwilym S. Lodwick, M.D., Professor and Chairman, Dept. of Radiology, University of Missouri.

Dr. P. D. Lotlikar, Health Sciences Center, Temple University, FELS Research Institute.

Mrs. Dorothy Luneo, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Dr. Robert E. Lyle, PhD, Dept. of Chemistry, University of New Hampshire.

Dr. Larry W. McDonald, Dept. of Pathology, University of California.

Dr. Margaret R. McDonald, Waldemar Medical Research Foundation.

Professor William E. McEwen, Chairman, Dept. of Chemistry, University of Massachusetts.

Robert H. McKay, Dept. of Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of Hawaii.

Dr. Ralph W. McKee, Dept. of Biological Chemistry, UCLA School of Medicine.

Calvin S. McLaughlin, Associate Professor of Biochemistry, University of California.

Mrs. Miri M. McMahon, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Dr. Martin Madsen, Midland Memorial Hospital.

Dr. Frank Maley, New York State Health Department.

J. M. Mandato, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Professor Manley Mandel, PhD, Chief, Section of Molecular Biology, University of Texas.

Professor Martin Mandel, Dept. of Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of Hawaii.

Peter T. H. Mao, M.D., Dept. of Pathology, St. Joseph's Hospital.

James T. Marron, Experimental Therapeutics, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Mr. Robert R. Marshak, Dept. of Clinical Studies, University of Pennsylvania.

James A. Marshall, Dept. of Chemistry, Northwestern University.

William R. Martin, M.D., Dept. of Microbiology, University of Chicago.

James D. Massie, University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Alvin M. Mauer, M.D., Dept. of Pediatrics, The Children's Hospital Research Foundation, Cincinnati.

Dr. C. M. Mauritzen, Baylor College of Medicine, Texas Medical Center.

Professor Henry G. Mautner, Dept. of Pharmacology, Yale University.

Dr. Robert Megirian, Department of Pharmacology, Union University, Albany Medical College.

Dr. George Melnykovich, PhD, Veterans Administration Hospital.

Dr. Olaf Michelsen, PhD, Foods and Nutrition, Michigan State University.

Dr. Ralph P. Miech, M.D., PhD, Division of Biological and Medical Sciences, Brown University.

Enrico Mihich, Dept. of Experimental Therapeutics, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Harry M. Miller, M.D., Dept. of Surgery, University of Rochester.

Arnold Mittelman, M.D., Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Miss Sandra J. Miyoshi, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Mrs. Jonae N. Moikika, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Professor Norman Molomut, PhD, Scientific Director, Waldemar Medical Research Foundation.

William C. Moloney, M.D., Peter Bent Brigham Hospital.

Dr. Richard C. Moon, University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Dan H. Moore, Dept. of Cytological Biophysics, Institute for Medical Research.

Dr. George E. Moore, M.D., Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Dr. Bruce Morton, PhD, Dept. of Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of Hawaii.

Dr. Merwin Moskowitz, Professor of Biology, Purdue University.

Mrs. Rita Mowak, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Howard F. Mower, Dept. of Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of Hawaii.

Perry Franklin Mullinax, M.D., Dept. of Medicine, Virginia Commonwealth University.

Dr. Balaji Mundkur, Dept. of Zoology and Entomology, University of Connecticut.

Dr. George P. Murphy, Acting Director, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Dr. Kazuo Nagai, Division of Myocardial Biology, Baylor College of Medicine.

George S. Nakil, M.D., University of New Mexico, Dept. of Medicine.

Professor Jack Neal, University of Texas.

Stanley R. Nelson, M.D., Dept. of Pharmacology, University of Kansas.

Dr. Martin J. Nemer, Dept. of Biochemistry, Institute for Cancer Research.

Professor Paul M. Newberne, Dept. of Nutrition, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Melvin S. Newman, Dept. of Chemistry, Ohio State University.

Robert L. Ney, M.D., Dept. of Medicine, University of North Carolina.

Jerry Neyman, Dept. of Statistics, University of California.

Mrs. Ethel Nishibata, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Edwin T. Nishimura, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Dr. W. E. Noland, University of Minnesota, Dept. of Chemistry.

Edward K. Novak, Biological Research Laboratories, Syracuse University.

Dr. William L. Nyhan, M.D., PhD, Professor and Chairman, School of Medicine, Department of Pediatrics, University of California.

Hirishi Ochiai, University of Hawaii, Dept. of Pathology.

Dr. S. Okada, Baylor College of Medicine.

Kenneth B. Olson, M.D., Dept. of Medicine, Union University.

Dale W. Onken, Purdue University, Dept. of Chemistry.

Toshikazu Onokocu, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Dr. Sanford E. Ostroy, PhD, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Ryoichi Oyasu, M.D., Dept. of Pathology, Northwestern University.

Dr. Morton Padius, PhD, Waldemar Medical Research Foundation, Inc.

Dr. Joseph S. Pagurlo, M.D., Dept. of Medicine, University of North Carolina.

Mrs. Eileen Palopoli, Waldemar Medical Research Foundation, Inc.

Robert B. Parel, Dept. of Pharmacology, Baylor College of Medicine.

Robert E. Parks, Jr., M.D., PhD, Division of Biological and Medical Sciences, Brown University.

Wallace R. Parnell, Panther Valley Unit, American Cancer Society.

Professor Daniel J. Pasteo, Dept. of Chemistry, University of Notre Dame.

Mrs. Dorothy Payne, University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Mr. Olof H. Pearson, M.D., Dept. of Medicine, Case Western Reserve University.

Tommy W. Penfold, D.V.M., University of Washington.

Carlos A. Perez, M.D., Dept. of Radiology, Washington University

Pasquale E. Perille, M.O., Bridgeport Hospital.

Dr. Arthur W. Phillips, Syracuse University.

Jerry C. Phillips, University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Mrs. Kathie Pierce, The University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Dr. L. H. Piette, Dept. of Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of Hawaii.

Anthony V. Pisciotto, M.D., Marquette School of Medicine.

Purificacion B. Policar, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Professor Frank D. Popp, Dept. of Chemistry, Clarkston College of Technology.

Joseph Post, M.D., Associate Professor, Clinical Medicine, New York University.

Dr. Morton D. Prager, PhD, Professor of Surgery and Associate Professor of Biochemistry, University of Texas.

Dr. A. W. Prestayko, Baylor College of Medicine.

Professor George R. Prout, Jr., Surgery, Chief, Urological Services, Harvard Medical School.

Mrs. Carol C. Quigley, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Yale Rabinowitz, M.D., Loyola University State School of Medicine.

Dr. Jack L. Radomski, PhD, Dept. of Pharmacology, University of Miami.

Dr. Joseph Ransohoff, Dept. of Neurosurgery, New York University.

Dr. Maurice M. Rapport, PhD, Dept. of Pharmacology, New York State Psychiatric Institute.

Robert W. Rasch, M.D., Marquette School of Medicine, Inc.

Aaron R. Rausen, M.D., Mount Sinai School of Medicine, University of New York.

Dr. Ramaehandra Reddy, Baylor College of Medicine.

Kurt R. Reissmann, M.D., Professor of Medicine, University of Kansas.

Dr. Alvin F. Rieck, Marquette School of Medicine.

Bernard F. Rice, M.D., Division of Research, Alton Ochsner Medical Foundation.

Webster Riggs, M.D., University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Werner H. Rirsten, M.D., Dept. of Pathology, Pediatrics, University of Chicago.

Preston D. Ritter, Baylor College of Medicine.

E. Stanfield Rogers, M.D., Group Leader, Oak Ridge National Lab.

Dr. Marvin M. Romsdahl, Dept. of Surgery, University of Texas.

Francis E. Rosato, M.D., Dept. of Surgery, University of Pennsylvania.

Irwin A. Rose, Biochemistry Division, Institute for Cancer Research.

George P. Rosemond, M.D., Dept. of Surgery, Temple University.

Dr. Fred Rosen, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Professor Jay S. Roth, Dept. of Biochemistry, University of Connecticut.

Sheldon P. Rothenberg, M.D., Dept. of Medicine, New York Medical College.

Dr. John J. Rrentin, Ph. D., Baylor College of Medicine.

Dr. John H. Rust, Ph. D., Professor, Dept. of Radiology, University of Chicago.

Professor Robert J. Rutman, Dept. of Chemistry, University of Pennsylvania.

Richard W. Sagebiel, M.D., Dept. of Pathology, University of Washington.

Leo T. Samuels, M.D., Biology Chemistry, University of Utah.

Eugene G. Sander, Dept. of Biochemistry, University of Florida.

Dr. Barbara H. Sanford, Dept. of Pathology, Massachusetts General Hospital.

Daniel V. Santi, Dept. of Chemistry, University of California.

Professor Alan C. Sartorelli, Dept. of Pharmacology, Yale University.

Dr. Anthony J. Sbarra, Dept. of Pathology and Medical Research, Saint Margaret's Hospital.

Mr. Joseph V. Scaletti, Dept. of Microbiology, University of New Mexico.

Violet M. Scherone, M.D., Waldemar Medical Research Foundation, Inc.

Dr. Eric Scholar, PhD, Division of Biological and Medical Sciences, Brown University.

Robert Schrek, M.D., Dept. of Pathology, Northwestern University.

Dr. Arnold Schwartz, Division of Myocardial Biology, Baylor College of Medicine.

Dr. Martin A. Schwartz, Assistant Professor of Chemistry, Florida State University.

Robert S. Schwartz, Dept. of Medicine, Hematology, New England Medical Center Hospital.

Dr. Martin P. Schweizer PhD, International Chemical and Nuclear Corp.

Boyer W. Scinner, M.D., The University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Alastair I. Scott, Dept. of Chemistry, Yale University.

Dr. Jesse F. Scott, Massachusetts General Hospital.

Ron Seale, Dept. of Biological Sciences, Purdue University.

Segfried Seeber, Dept. of Pharmacology, Baylor College of Medicine.

Dr. Alfred W. Sentf, M.D., PhD, Division of Biological and Medical Sciences, Brown University.

Gerald Seta, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Dr. Herbert Shapiro, Dept. of Anatomy, University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Mrs. Paul Sharon, Silver Box County Unit, American Cancer Society.

Dr. Eli Shefter, Dept. of Pharmaceutics, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Dr. Judson D. Sheridan, Dept. of Zoology, University of Minnesota.

Dr. Hirotohi Shibatta, Baylor College of Medicine.

Mun Fook Shinn, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Dr. Tetsuo Shiota, Dept. of Microbiology, University of Alabama.

Herchel Sidransky, M.D., University of Pittsburgh.

Dr. M. M. Sigel, Dept. of Microbiology, University of Miami.

Dr. Alvin Silverstein, National Collegiate Association for the Conquest of Cancer.

Murray N. Silverstein, M.D., Dept. of Internal Medicine, Mayo Foundation.

Walter N. Sim, Assistant Professor of Physiology, Mount Sinai School of Medicine.

Dr. Edward H. Simon, Dept. of Biological Sciences, Purdue University.

Russell O. Sinnhuber, Food Science and Technology, Oregon State University.

Jesse E. Sissen, Dept. of Cell Biology, University of Kentucky.

Walter H. Sloane, M.D., The University of Tennessee, Medical Units.

Dr. Edgar E. Smith, PhD, Dept. of Surgery, Boston University.

Frank S. Smith, M.D., Baylor College of Medicine.

James J. Smith, M.D., Marquette School of Medicine.

Dr. Thomas W. Snelder, Baylor College of Medicine.

Ruy Soeiro, M.D., Dept. of Cell Biology, Yeshiva University, Albert Einstein College of Medicine.

Dr. A. J. Solo, Dept. of Medicinal Chemistry, State University of New York.

Dr. A. J. Solo, Dept. of Medicinal Chemistry, Northwestern University.

Dr. Albert H. Soloway, Professor and Chairman of Medicinal Chemistry, Northwestern University.

Joseph Song, M.D., Mercy Hospital.

Dr. Louis A. Sordahl, Division of Myocardial Biology, Baylor College of Medicine.

Dr. Charles M. Sparacuo, Staff Scientist, The Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology, Ind.

William H. Spohn, Dept. of Pharmacology, Baylor College of Medicine.

Gunther S. Stant, Harvard Medical School, Dept. of Neurobiology.

Dr. W. C. Starbuck, Baylor College of Medicine.

Richard J. Steckel, M.D., Dept. of Radiology, University of California.

Dr. William J. Stekiel, Marquette School of Medicine, Inc.

Mrs. Margit Stepp, University of Hawaii, Dept. of Pathology.

Malvin L. Stern, Syracuse University.

Calvin L. Stevens, Dept. of Chemistry, Wayne State University.

Dr. Leroy C. Stevens, Ph. D., Senior Staff Scientist, Jackson Laboratory.

Karen Stone, Dept. of Pharmacy, Baylor College of Medicine.

Clifford Straekley, M.D., President Oahu Unit American Cancer Society.

Dr. J. E. Strassner, Baylor College of Medicine.

Cyril S. Stulberg, Dept. of Microbiology, Child Research Center of Michigan.

Dr. Daniel Swern, Chemistry Dept., Fels Research Institute.

Dr. Tatsuya Takano, Baylor College of Medicine.

Robert W. Talley, M.D., Dept. of Medicine, Henry Ford Hospital.

Raymond Tanner, University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Charles W. Taylor, Baylor College of Medicine.

Professor Edward C. Taylor, Dept. of Chemistry, Princeton University.

Dr. Howard J. Teas, Dept. of Biology, University of Miami.

George W. Teebor, M.D., Dept. of Pathology, New York University.

Charles Terner, Dept. of Biology, Boston University.

L. Gilbert Thatcher, M.D., Dept. of Pediatrics, Marquette School of Medicine.

Edward Donnell Thomas, M.D., Professor; Medicine Head, Division of Oncology, University of Washington.

Eolin G. Thomas, Jr., M.D., Dept. of Surgery; School of Medicine, University of North Carolina.

William G. Thurman, M.D., Dept. of Pediatrics, University of Virginia.

Dr. Howard Tiechelmann, Dept. of Chemistry, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Lee J. Todd, Dept. of Chemistry, Indiana University.

Dr. Sei Tokuda, Ph. D., Dept. of Microbiology, University of New Mexico.

Dr. Donald H. Traurig, Dept. of Anatomy, University of Kentucky.

Frank E. Trobaugh, Jr., Dept. of Hematology, St. Luke's Hospital.

Walter Troll Environmental Medicine, New York University Medical Center.

William E. Truch, Dept. of Chemistry, Purdue University.

Dr. K. C. Tsou, Associate Professor of Chemistry, University of Pennsylvania.

Joseph J. Turchi, M.D., Pathology and Medicine, Misericordia Hospital.

Assistant Professor Joseph G. Turcotte, Dept. of Pharmacy, University of Rhode Island.

Richard B. Turner, Dept. of Chemistry, Rice University.

Dr. Kenyon S. Twedell, Dept. of Biology, University of Notre Dame.

Mrs. Kazit Uamel, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

George Ungar, M.D., Professor of Pharmacology, Baylor College of Medicine.

Nalin J. Unakar, Associate Professor of Biological Sciences, Michigan State University.

Paul Urone, Dept. of Chemistry, University of Colorado.

W. L. Valik, M.D., Professor of Surgery, University of Kansas Medical Center.

Dr. Benjamin L. Van Douren, Institute Environmental Medicine, New York University.

Mr. Rita Varnado, University of Tennessee Medical Units.

Professor Donald W. Visser, Dept. of Biochemistry, University of Southern California.

Dr. Joseph J. Vitale, Tufts University School of Medicine, Mallory Institute of Pathology.

Dr. Howard H. Vogel, Jr., Ph. D., Dept. of Radiology, University of Tennessee.

Mary L. Voorhees, M.D., Dept. of Pediatrics, University of New York.

Mrs. Mary Ann Wade, The University of Tenn. Medical Units.

Dr. H. M. Walborsky, Chemistry Department, The Florida State University.

Dr. Roland Walker, Professor of Biology, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

Donald F. Hoelzl Wallach, M.D., Massachusetts General Hospital.

Kenneth N. Walton, M.D., Professor of Surgery, Dept. of Urology, Emory University Clinic.

Louis R. Wasserman, M.D., Dept. of Hematology, Mount Sinai School of Medicine.

Sidney Weinhouse, Ph. D., Director, Fels Research Institute, Temple University.

Gerald D. Weinstein, Dept. of Dermatology, University of Miami.

Abraham White, Dept. of Biochemistry, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Yeshiva University.

Dr. Emil H. White, Dept. of Chemistry, Johns Hopkins University.

Dr. John E. Whitney, University of Arkansas, Medical Center.

Dr. Jan Wikman, Ph. D., Baylor College of Medicine.

George F. Wilgram, M.D., Dermatologic Genetics Lab, New England Medical Center Hospital.

Dr. Robert E. Willette, Ph. D., School of Pharmacy, University of Connecticut.

Charles B. Wilson, M.D., Dept. of Surgery, University of California.

Dr. Irwin B. Wilson, Dept. of Chemistry, University of Colorado.

R. Keith Wilson, Baylor College of Medicine.

H. Rodney Withers, Dept. of Radiology, University of Texas.

Dr. Carl A. Woke, Ph. D., Dept. of Biology, American University.

Professor John L. Wong, Dept. of Chemistry, University of Louisville.

Summer Wood, Jr., M.D., Dept. of Pathology, Johns Hopkins University.

Dr. William G. Wood, Ph. D., Division of Myocardial Biology, Baylor College of Medicine.

Dr. Ray Wu, Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Cornell University.

Hong Y. Yang, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

J. W. Yarbro, M.D., Albert Chandler Medical Center, University of Kentucky.

David S. Yohn, M.D., Ph.D., M.P.H., The Ohio State University, Dept. of Veterinary Pathology Building.

Eugene Youagihara, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Mrs. Victoria Young, Dept. of Pathology, University of Hawaii.

Sigmund F. Zakrzewski, Experimental Therapy Dept., Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Norman Zamcheck, Gastrointestinal Research Lab, Boston Dept. Health and Hospitals, Boston City Hospital.

Marvin Zelen, Dept. of Mathematics, State University at Buffalo.

Frederick E. Ziegler, Dept. of Chemistry, Yale University.

Dr. Thomas P. Zimmerman, Ph.D., Brown University.

Aaron R. Rausen, M.D., Associate Professor Pediatrics, Mount Sinai School of Medicine of the City University of New York, Chief Pediatrician, Mount Sinai Services, City Hos-

pital Center at Elmhurst, Chief of Pediatric Hematology, Mount Sinai Hospital, New York.

REPLACE U.S. SENATE WITH A HOUSE OF LORDS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to direct the attention of my colleagues to a proposal which reached my office only last week. This unique piece of legislation was the suggestion of my good friend and colleague, Congressman CLARENCE BROWN, of Ohio. The bill calls for a constitutional amendment abolishing the U.S. Senate and replacing it with a House of Lords. I commend this measure to the attention of my colleagues and ask that its text be included in the RECORD:

H.J. RES. —

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the abolishment of the U.S. Senate and its replacement by a House of Lords

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Senate of the United States is hereby abolished and in its place there is established the House of Lords.

"Sec. 2. The House of Lords shall initially consist of one hundred members to be selected by a committee made up of United States television and radio network newscasters and newspaper columnists syndicated in no less than 100 newspapers in the United States. All ties for such designation shall be resolved by the senior editors of the United States News & World Report, Time and Newsweek with each newsmagazine casting one vote. Preference for selection to membership in the House of Lords shall be given to millionaires, former stars of the motion picture and professional sports industry, persons with mellifluous voices, poets, women from Maine and men from Massachusetts. All members of the House of Lords must be citizens of the United States of America, whether foreign or native born, and have attained the age of 35 years or some other proof of adolescent maturity. To qualify, each member must swear or affirm publicly that he is a sincere candidate for the Presidency of the United States and that he and at least three other friends or relatives consider him to be so qualified.

Sec. 3. Following initial selection, which shall be made without reference to state of residence or nativity because members of the House of Lords should think more broadly than the interests of the people of their home state, members of the House of Lords may select a state of the United States from which to run and one-third of the House of Lords shall seek office each even-numbered year and he designated for a term of six years. No limit shall be set upon the amount of money which can be spent by a candidate seeking office as a member of the House of Lords because such campaigns are good for

the economy. Members of the House of Lords may "finney" or establish their personal right to the state in which they are to seek office on the basis of their net wealth as certified by the Internal Revenue Service. Members shall not be designated by states, however, but by the issue which they have adopted as a personal platform for seeking the Presidency, such as, pollution, starvation, youth, electoral reform, alcoholic reform, postal reform or personal reform. For purposes of recall, states may "finney" members of the House of Lords on the basis of their seniority in that body (counting previous service in the late United States Senate) and hold a public vote on whether or not a member of the House of Lords should be retired to private life. No state may so designate more than two members during any six year period and no member may be thus threatened with retirement more often than once per quarter. Members may serve in the House of Lords until the age of 91 or death, whichever occurs first, and can be legally certified and no other limitations shall be placed on their competence to serve.

"Sec. 4. The House of Lords shall not initiate any legislation having any force or effect, shall not advise or consent to appointments by the President or foreign affairs of the nation. All such matters of legislation, advice and consent are hereinafter reserved to the House of Representatives. It may, however, authorize resolutions viewing with alarm or pointing with pride. And of course it shall have no right to appropriate public funds or levy taxes. Legislation passed by the House of Representatives shall be referred to the House of Lords for debate purposes only and shall repose in the House of Lords following passage and prior to Presidential approval or disapproval for no more than three months. Nothing in this section will limit the right of the House of Lords to debate or filibuster against such legislation except that no debate or filibuster by the House of Lords shall delay such measures from becoming law.

"Sec. 5. A full record of the proceedings of the House of Lords shall be recorded for the benefit of members of the House of Lords and shall be retained in public records should anyone else be interested. But no distribution shall be made of copies of such debate since much more than adequate coverage is already afforded such debate by the public information media.

"Sec. 6. The House of Lords may organize itself and elect such officers as it wishes every two years within three months after each biennial election of one-third of its membership. Should the House of Lords fail to organize itself within two years following a biennial election, it shall be considered adjourned and that numerical designation for its session shall be skipped. Nothing in this section shall be construed as impeding the House of Representatives from convening, organizing or adjourning without reference to the action of the House of Lords.

"Sec. 7. The one-hundredth member of the House of Lords left over when the membership divides itself into thirds shall be designated as liaison with the President of the United States for whatever it is worth."

A JOINT RESOLUTION ALLOWING 18-YEAR-OLD CITIZENS TO VOTE IN LOCAL AND STATE ELECTIONS

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, today with a number of my colleagues, I am intro-

ducing a joint resolution that will enfranchise our 18-year-old citizens for local and State elections.

I am aware that reasonable men have honest differences over the advisability of allowing our younger citizens to vote. The Congress in the last session passed a bill which was upheld by the Supreme Court that enfranchised our young citizens for Federal and State elections.

The Supreme Court taking a narrow view of the Constitution limitations struck down the provision of that part of the act that enfranchised the young voters for State and local elections. I do not question the authority of the High Court to strike down this section of the Voting Rights Act, but I do feel that the Congress has the obligation to place this crucial subject before the American people again. This time, the means will be a constitutional amendment.

The State and local governmental units are the most readily accessible to our citizens. It seems to be contradictory to allow these young citizens to vote for national elections and deny them the ballot for State and local elections. A responsible Government must have the participation of all the citizens.

By 1972, it is estimated that 11.5 million citizens will be between 18 and 21. This is 8 percent of the voting population. The influx of young voters has been treated by some people as a plague that must be stopped. I disagree.

The concept of participatory democracy—which has served us so well for almost 200 years—will be strengthened by the addition of young voters. My contact with young people has convinced me that on balance their idealism and concern will be beneficial to the myriad of problems that now confront our local governmental institutions.

THE EMPLOYEE BENEFIT SECURITY ACT

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am today introducing the Employee Benefit Security Act. This legislation was originally proposed during the Johnson administration and was first introduced in the 90th Congress. It was the result of years of study and was designed to meet needs which are even more acute today than they were at that time. The legislation will, for the first time, establish uniform Federal standards of fiduciary conduct and establish procedures for their civil and criminal enforcement. In addition, it establishes stricter requirements for reporting a plan's financial dealings.

Even more importantly, however, this legislation establishes minimum standards of vesting and funding and a system of vested benefit insurance. I consider vesting and funding requirements the most crucially needed part of this

legislation. By this, I do not mean to imply that the establishment of fiduciary standards and fuller disclosure requirements are unimportant. Far from it. The 40 million participants in private plans have a right to be fully protected from irresponsible trustees and administrators, but losses caused by fiduciary abuses seldom affect the retirement security of the individual participant while unduly long vesting requirements and the lack of adequate funding frequently wreak havoc with the individual's dream of retirement security. When vesting provisions are harsh and funding inadequate, the private pension promise in which millions of American workers have placed their trust turns out to be a cruel hoax.

The very nature of our modern economy makes an employee's ability to fulfill plan eligibility requirements contingent on forces usually beyond his control, a fact made even more evident by our current economic recession. In all too many cases, the pension promise is nothing more than this: If you remain in good health and stay with the same company until you are 65, and if the company is still in business, and if your department has not been abolished, and if your job has not been made technologically obsolete, and if you have not been laid off for too long a time, and if there is sufficient money in the fund, you will get a pension. Secretary Shultz, when he testified before my Labor Subcommittee, estimated that one out of three participants never receives a benefit. From what we have seen at the hearings, I would say that figure is much too conservative. In low-paying, high-turnover industries, experts have pointed out that only 1 in 10 ever receives a pension.

The funding standard which my bill provides will be extremely helpful in assuring that the pension promise will be fulfilled, but no funding standard can be expected to provide complete protection for all plans immediately. Thus, benefit insurance is essential to meet the problem of plan termination before a plan has fully funded its vested liabilities.

Pension plans are so widespread and are so depended upon to supplement the acknowledgedly inadequate Social Security System that their protection must be accepted as an essential public policy. The catastrophe to the worker who sees the security which his pension rights represent to him swept away by the failure of an employer is just as great as that of the depositor who loses his lifetime savings in a bank failure. Both deserve protection.

At this point I am submitting a summary of the major provisions of my bill:

SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE PROPOSED EMPLOYEE BENEFIT SECURITY ACT

PURPOSES

The purposes of the proposed Employee Benefit Security Act are:

(1) to establish minimum standards of fiduciary conduct for plan trustees and administrators, to provide for their enforcement through civil and criminal means, and to require expanded reporting of the details of a plan's administrative and financial affairs; and

(2) to improve the equitable character

and soundness of private pension plans by requiring them to: (a.) make irrevocable (or vest) the accrued benefits of employees with significant periods of service with an employer; (b.) meet minimum standards of funding; and (c.) protect the vested rights of participants against losses due to essentially involuntary plan terminations.

TITLE I. FIDUCIARY RESPONSIBILITY AND DISCLOSURE

Coverage

Sec. 101—Title I of the Act would apply to any employee welfare or pension benefit plan which covers eight or more participants including State, County and municipal plans. It would not apply to plans established by the Federal Government or any of its agencies.

Duty of disclosure and reporting

Sec. 102—The administrator of an employee benefit fund would be required to publish to each participant or beneficiary a description of the plan. The report would include the information required by sections 103 and 104 of title I in such form and detail as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation. Whenever a plan terminates, special reports would also be required. The Secretary may provide by regulation for exemption from all or part of the reporting and disclosure requirements of any class or type of plan, if he finds that the application of such requirements to them is not required in order to effectuate the purposes of Title I.

Description of the plan

Sec. 103—Plan descriptions would be required to be published within ninety days after the establishment of a plan or within ninety days after a plan becomes subject to this title, whichever is later. Descriptions would be required to be republished every five years after initial publication. The description would have to be comprehensive and written in a manner calculated to be understood by the average plan participant. Among other things it would have to include: the name and address of the administrator; the schedule of benefits; a description of the plan's vesting provisions; the source of the plan's financing; and the procedures to be followed in presenting claims for benefits as well as those for appealing claims which are denied.

Annual reports

Sec. 104—An annual financial report would be required by this section. Information required in the report would include:

The amount contributed by each employer;
The amount of benefits paid;

The number of employees covered;

A detailed statement of the salaries, fees and commissions charged to the plan, to whom paid and for what purpose;

The name and address of each fiduciary, his official position with respect to the plan, and his relationship to any party in interest;

A schedule of all loans made from the fund;

A schedule showing the aggregate amount of purchases, sales, redemptions and exchanges of all investments, by categories, made during the year.

Supplementing this information would be schedules designed to highlight party in interest transactions and schedules highlighting investments of over \$100,000 or 3% of the fund.

If some or all of the plan's assets are held in a common or collective trust maintained by a bank or similar institution or in a separate account maintained by an insurance carrier, the report also would have to include a statement of assets and liabilities.

If some or all of the benefits under the plan are provided by an insurance carrier or other organization such report would also have to include: the premium rate or subscription charge and the total premium or

subscription charges paid to each carrier and the approximate number of persons covered by each class of benefits; the total premiums received, the approximate number of persons covered by each class of benefits, and the total claims paid by such carriers; or, if separate experience ratings are not kept, a statement as to the basis of a carrier's premium rate or a copy of the financial report of the carrier.

In addition to the required financial information, each plan would have to provide a copy of its most recent actuarial report. It would also submit a statement showing the number of participants who terminated with vested benefits.

PUBLICATION

Sec. 105—The Secretary would be required to prescribe forms for the plan descriptions, annual reports, and actuarial reports required by the previous section.

A copy of the plan description and each annual report would have to be filed with the Secretary of Labor who would make them available for inspection in the public document room of the Department of Labor. The administrator would be required to make copies of the annual report and plan description as well as the bargaining agreement, and trust instrument creating the plan available for examination by any plan participant or beneficiary in the administrator's principal office, in the local office of the employee organization representing the plan's participants, and in such other places as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe.

While a full copy of the annual report would not have to be provided to each participant, the administrator would be required to furnish participants with a fair summary of the latest annual reports. If a written request is made for a full copy of the annual report or any other document relating to the trust, the administrator would be permitted to make a reasonable charge to cover the cost of complying with the request.

The administrator of each pension plan would be required to furnish to any plan participant or beneficiary, at least once each year, a statement indicating: (1) whether such person has a vested right to pension benefits; (2) the vested benefits, if any, which have accrued or the earliest date on which benefits will become vested.

Whenever a participant terminates employment with vested benefits, the plan administrator would be required to furnish him with a statement of rights and privileges under the plan.

Enforcement

Sec. 106.—Any person who wilfully violates the disclosure provisions of this act would be subject to a fine of up to \$1,000 and/or up to one year imprisonment. Violation of the provisions dealing with the retention of records subjects a person to a fine of up to \$5,000 and/or imprisonment of up to two years. Violations of the provisions of Sec. 111(b)(2) (dealing with prohibited transactions) would subject a person to a fine of up to \$10,000 or up to five years imprisonment, or both.

This section would give the Secretary of Labor authority to investigate any plan. He would be given authority to demand sufficient information as he may deem necessary to enable him to conduct his investigations.

Plan participants, beneficiaries, or the Secretary of Labor on behalf of the participants, beneficiaries would be allowed to bring civil actions to redress breaches of a fiduciary's responsibility or to remove a fiduciary who has failed to carry out this duties. The Secretary would also be empowered to bring an action to enjoin any act or practice which appears to him to violate the title. Civil actions brought by a participant or beneficiary may be brought in either a State or Federal Court. However, the Secretary would have the right to intervene

in a case and remove it to a Federal District Court. In any action by a participant or beneficiary, the court could, at its discretion, allow reasonable attorneys fees and costs. No action would be allowed to be brought, however, except upon leave of the court after a showing of cause.

Bonding

Sec. 110. Every person subject to the fiduciary provisions of the act would have to be bonded.

Fiduciary responsibility

Sec. 111. This section would deem every employee benefit fund to be a trust held for the exclusive purpose of providing benefits to participants and their beneficiaries as well as defraying reasonable administrative expenses. Each plan would have to be in writing. No plan amendments could be made until thirty days after proposed amendments are published to all participants or beneficiaries. Funds would never be permitted to return to the employer.

Fiduciaries are defined in the Act as anyone who exercises any power of control, management or disposition with regard to a fund's assets or who has authority to do so or who has authority or responsibility in the plan's administration. Fiduciaries would be required to discharge their duties with respect to the fund: "solely in the interests of the participants and with the care, skill, prudence and diligence under the circumstances then prevailing that a prudent man acting in a like capacity and familiar with such matters would use in the conduct of an enterprise of a like character and with like aims."

A fiduciary would be specifically prohibited from making the following transactions:

Leasing or selling property of the fund to any persons known to be a party in interest (defined to be the employer, employee organization, trustees, fiduciaries, relatives of the above or joint ventures);

Leasing or buying on behalf of the fund any property known to be owned by a party in interest;

Dealing with a fund for his own account;

Representing any other party dealing with the fund or act on behalf of a party adverse to the fund or the interests of its participants;

Receiving any consideration from a party dealing with the fund in connection with a transaction involving the fund;

Loaning money to any person known to be a party in interest;

Benefiting personally, directly, or indirectly, from any transaction involving property of the fund.

Fiduciaries would be free to purchase securities of an employer provided that no purchase is for more than adequate consideration. However, after the effective date of this act, no fiduciary would be permitted to invest more than 10 percent of the fund's assets in the securities of an employer. Investments in the securities of an employer would be subject to all fiduciary standards imposed by this section.

TITLE II. VESTING

Sec. 201. This title will apply to any pension plan to which an employer makes contributions as well as to profit sharing plans which provide benefits after retirement. This title will not apply to plans administered by any Federal government agency nor will it apply to pension plans to which only employees contribute.

Eligibility requirements

Sec. 202. No plan, after the effective date of this title, will be allowed to require as a condition for eligibility to participate in it a period of service longer than 3 years or an age higher than age 25 whichever is later. Existing plans will be permitted to retain their eligibility requirements for 10 years or until they are amended to provide increased benefits, whichever is sooner.

Nonforfeitable benefits

Sec. 203. Every pension plan subject to title II will be required to vest rights to regular retirement benefits when the plan has been in effect for 5 years or more.

Sec. 203 (a). Plans in existence before the date of enactment of this title must vest accrued benefits by one of the following alternatives: (1) vest in full, after a period of service not exceeding 10 years, the accrued portion of the regular retirement benefits (including benefits provided under amendment) which is attributable to periods after the effective date of this title; or (2) vest, after a period of service not exceeding 10 years, 10 percent of the entire accrued portion of the regular retirement benefits (including benefits provided under amendment) which percentage shall be increased thereafter no less than 10 percent per year until 100 percent of the accrued portion of the regular retirement benefits is vested; or (3) vest, after a period of service not exceeding 20 years, the entire accrued portion of the regular retirement benefits (including benefits provided under amendment), the period of service required for vesting then being reduced at least 1 year for each year the plan has been in effect after the effective date of this title until the required period of service does not exceed 10 years; (4) vest in accordance with such other provisions as the Secretary of Labor might hold consistent with the purposes of this title.

Sec. 203 (b). Plans created on or after the date of enactment of this title must vest benefits by one of the following alternatives: (1) vest in the sixth year of the plan's operation, after a period of service not exceeding 15 years, the entire accrued portion of the regular retirement benefits, the period of service required for vesting thereafter being reduced at least 1 year for each subsequent year of the plan's operation until the required period of service does not exceed 10 years; or (2) vest in the sixth year of the plan's operation after a period of service not exceeding 10 years, 50 percent of the entire accrued portion of the regular retirement benefits, the percentage vested thereafter increasing in each of the succeeding years of the plan's operation by at least 10 percent until the entire accrued portion of the regular retirement benefits is vested.

Period of service

Sec. 203 (d). In computing the period of service under a plan, an employee's entire service with the employer contributing to or maintaining the plan shall be considered. However, service prior to age 25, service during which the employee declined to contribute to a plan requiring employee contributions, service with a predecessor of the employer contributing to or maintaining the plan (except where the plan has been continued in effect by the successor employer), and service broken by periods of suspension of employment (provided the rules governing such breaks in service are not unreasonable or arbitrary) may be disregarded.

Distribution of vested benefits

Sec. 204. Vested benefits must be distributed at regular retirement age. In no case shall that age be later than age 65.

Sec. 205. The effective date of this title would be two years after enactment.

TITLE III. FUNDING

Funding

Sec. 302. Every pension plan subject to title II must provide for contributions to the plan in amounts necessary to meet the normal costs of the plan plus interest on any unfunded past service costs. Vested liabilities are to be funded according to a prescribed schedule which will fund those costs in 25 years. Special transitional provisions are included for plans already in existence.

Plan amendments

Provisions are made to adjust a plan's funding schedule in the event of an amendment, however, if the amendment results in a 25 percent or greater increase in vested liabilities, the amendment may be regarded as a new plan and subject to the same funding requirements as new plans.

Reports of funding status

Sec. 303. A report must be filed each year with the Secretary of Labor indicating a fund's assets and vested liabilities.

Enforcement of funding standards

Sec. 304. When the contribution to a pension plan falls below the amount necessary to meet the plans' funding schedule, the Secretary of Labor may prevent the plan from increasing by amendment its vested liabilities until the funding schedule is met. When a pension plan fails to meet its schedule for five years, the Secretary may require by order, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that the fund suspend further accumulation of vested liabilities until the funding deficiency has been removed. At any time when a pension plan is in suspended status, the Secretary may require, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that the plan terminate and wind up its affairs in accordance with the provisions of title III and procedures established by the Pension Benefit Insurance Corp. if he determines such action necessary to protect the interest of participants.

Sec. 305. The effective date of this title would be two years after enactment.

TITLE VI. BENEFIT INSURANCE

Insurance coverage

Sec. 401. Every pension plan required to meet a funding schedule in accordance with title III would be required to obtain insurance covering unfunded vested benefits which might arise from an essentially involuntary termination of the plan. The amount to be insured would be the plan's vested liabilities less the greater of: (1) 90 percent of the assets needed to meet the funding schedule required under the act, or (2) 90 percent of the plan's actual assets.

The Pension Benefit Insurance Corp. (established in title IV) will be the insurer.

The Pension Benefit Insurance Corp. would not insure: (1) any unfunded vested liabilities created by a plan amendment which took effect within 3 years immediately preceding termination of a plan, or (2) any unfunded vested liabilities resulting from the participation in the plan by a participant owning 10 percent or more of the voting stock of the employer contributing to the plan or by any participant owning a 10 percent or more interest in a partnership contributing to the plan.

Premiums

Sec. 402. Each plan would pay a premium for insurance at rates prescribed by the Pension Benefit Insurance Corp., based upon the amount of unfunded vested liabilities which is to be insured and upon such other factors as the Corporation determines to be appropriate. The premium for the initial 3-year period will not exceed 0.6 percent of the amount (0.2 percent per year).

Claims procedure

Sec. 403. A claim must be filed with the Pension Benefit Insurance Corp. in the event a plan is terminated for reasons of financial difficulty or bankruptcy, plant closing, by order of the Secretary, or such other reasons as the Corporation may specify as reflecting as essentially involuntary plan termination. The Corporation is given authority to investigate and pay claims.

Uninsured plans

Sec. 405. It would be unlawful to operate a pension plan without insurance.

TITLE V. PENSION BENEFIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

SEC. 501-511. This title establishes the Pension Benefit Insurance Corp. and provides initial capital from the Treasury on a loan basis.

TITLE VI. MISCELLANEOUS

Variations

SEC. 601. The Secretary of Labor may on his own initiative, after having received the petition of an administrator, prescribe an alternative method for satisfying the requirements of title II or III. Variations may be granted as is necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of the act and provide adequate protection to the participants and beneficiaries in the plan whenever the Secretary finds that the application of title II or III would: (1) increase the costs of the parties to the plan to such an extent that there would result a substantial risk to the voluntary continuation of the plan or a substantial curtailment of employers' pension benefits levels, or (2) impose unreasonable administrative burdens with respect to the operation of the plan. Such variations are intended to be temporary only.

Denials of variations could be appealed to a Variations Appeals Board which would consist of the Secretary of Labor or his delegate, the Secretary of Commerce, or his delegate, and a person selected jointly by the Secretaries of Labor and Commerce.

Investigations

SEC. 602. The Secretary of Labor will be given authority to investigate violations of the provisions of titles II, III and VI, or other rules or regulations issued thereunder.

Civil enforcement

SEC. 603. The Secretary may seek to enjoin violations of the provisions of titles II, III and VI, or any rule or regulation issued thereunder.

SEC. 605. The Secretary is authorized and directed to undertake research studies relating to pension plans, including methods of encouraging future development of pension plans.

Penalties

SEC. 607. Any person who willfully violates any provision of titles II through VI or any rule, regulation, variation, or order issued thereunder, or forges, counterfeits, destroys, or falsifies records or statements necessary to the operation of this act will be subject to criminal penalties.

Rules and regulations

SEC. 608. The Secretary of Labor is given authority to prescribe the rules which he may find necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of titles II, III, and IV. These rules and regulations may define accounting, technical, and trade terms used in such provisions; may prescribe the form and detail of all reports required to be made under such provisions; and may provide for the keeping of books and records as well as for the inspection of such books and records.

A CURIOUSER CALENDAR

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, even during my brief tenure in this body, I have become accustomed to being drowned in a furiously surging flood of paper as the sessions draw to a close.

I found it strange, however, that the torrent began on the opening day of the 92d Session.

The Government Printing Office produced at what I am sure is a mind-boggling cost a 40-page calendar which, with the exception of the standard headings, was blank—absolutely devoid of mentally nutritious material.

I realize the rules call for a calendar to be printed each legislative day. I realize that this is not the only point on which the rules and commonsense are divergent.

I apologize for the space this comment takes in the RECORD, but I wish to point out that I have resisted the urge to have yesterday's calendar inserted as an exhibit at this point in the RECORD.

AMERICAN STEEL ASKS FAIR AND FREE TRADE

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week when I was in Texas, I discussed steel developments with George Wilson. George is president of Lone Star Steel Co., with the home office in Dallas and the plant in east Texas. It is a small company but has the same operational problems as the industry.

I was concerned with full production and full employment. I asked George how we could encourage industry from up here in Washington. He told me of their handicaps in competing domestically and in the foreign market. It is such a confusing situation that I asked George to write me a letter and summarize the facts. I do not understand it, and am asking the State Department to explain it to me. Here is the letter from George Wilson of Lone Star Steel concerning plain steel pipe:

Here is the example that I mentioned in support of my conviction that prevailing international trade policies of our own government place our domestic industry at a hopeless disadvantage with our foreign counterparts.

A French manufacturer who developed a sale for 100' of 2" plain steel pipe to a customer in Texas would have to pay a total import charge of less than \$2.00 (tariff and all other governmental charges); conversely, if we developed an identical sale to a customer in France, the foreign governmental charges (tariff, licenses and assorted transaction fees applicable only to importation of the same 100' of pipe into France) would be in excess of \$20.00! In addition, the French manufacturer would be permitted by his government to exclude from his taxable income all profit attributable to the sale of the pipe to the buyer in Texas! If this is "Fair Trade" I simply do not understand the English language.

I do understand and am deeply envious of the extent to which the governments of other industrialized nations assist their nationals to compete in foreign trade. I equally deplore the policy of our government that diligently protects foreign industry and simultaneously subjects its own tax-paying industry to harassment and patent disadvantage as a competitor. If our government had even a little sense of self-preservation it would at least apply the same treatment to our foreign competitors doing business here

as we receive in the corresponding foreign countries. That would be the start of true "Free Trade."

MILTON FRIEDMAN ON IMITATING FAILURE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the noted economist Milton Friedman has finally laid to rest the myth of wage and price controls in a very effective and concise manner.

With the hope that the article will receive the serious consideration of all of my colleagues, I am pleased to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

MILTON FRIEDMAN ON IMITATING FAILURE

The Johnson Administration tried wage-price guidelines. The guidelines failed and were abandoned. The British tried a wage-price board. It failed and has just been abolished. The Canadians tried voluntary wage-price controls. Their Prices and Incomes Commission recently announced the program was unworkable and would be abandoned Jan. 1.

Yet, in the U.S., the Committee for Economic Development, an influential organization of businessmen, issues a report recommending (though with some vigorous dissents) a wage-price board on British lines and voluntary wage-price controls on Canadian lines. Arthur F. Burns, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, supports the recommendation for a wage-price board. The Council of Economic Advisers' second "inflation alert" uses stronger adjectives than the first to describe price developments. Mr. Nixon, in a speech to the National Association of Manufacturers, tried mild jawboning, calling on labor and business to exercise restraint in the national interest.

Surely, this must mean that the experience of the Johnson Administration, of Britain and of Canada is the exception, that there are other examples of the successful use of incomes policy to slow inflation. Not at all. I do not know a single successful example and the current proponents of an incomes policy do not claim that they do. The refrain is rather, "despite the limited success of these measures elsewhere, they offer promise."

SOFT PROMISE

If the promise is not based on direct experience, it is based on economic analysis? Hardly. Economic analysis largely reinforces experience. It suggests that voluntary wage and price controls are likely to be honored in the breach—because those who observe them will suffer at the expense of those who do not—and that compulsory wage and price controls simply repress rather than eliminate inflationary pressure. The only analytical case for wage-price control is to shorten the delayed impact of an inflationary episode after excess demand has been eliminated, not temporarily, but for good (see my Newsweek column, June 15, 1970). That case is indeed cited by proponents of incomes policy, but it is a weak reed, since most of them regard the incomes policy as a substitute for demand restraint, not a supplement. The policy is based on neither experience nor analysis but simply on the "For God's sake, let's do something" syndrome.

The talk about incomes policy reflects a general tendency: the belief that there is a

sugar-coated pill for every economic and social ill, and that only malice and ill will prevent its use. Time and again, I have had anguished letters from sincere readers to the effect, "Since you acknowledge that there is a real problem, it is irresponsible of you to criticize a proposed solution unless you offer an alternative. What is your solution?"

Suppose an expert on cancer criticized a proposed cure. Would any of my correspondents regard him as irresponsible because he did not offer an alternative cure? Why is economics different? In economics, as in medicine, we have imperfect knowledge. Some ills we cannot cure at all, and some only with undesirable side effects. In economics, as in medicine, our knowledge will improve further but there will always remain unsolved problems of both kinds.

HARD FACT

We know very well how to cure inflation: by restricting the growth of money demand through monetary and fiscal policy. At present, we know no other way to do it. We know also that this cure has the unpleasant side effect of a recession and of temporarily higher unemployment. We do not know how to avoid this side effect. There have been many inflations in history. I know of none that has ever been stopped in any other way or that has been stopped without temporary economic difficulties.

In the present episode, monetary and fiscal restraint have been working as they always do. The rate of inflation is slowing down and will continue to do so if restraint is maintained. As always, a side effect has been a recession. So far, it has been mild, milder indeed than past experience gave us any reason to expect. We have been attacking the severest U.S. inflation on record except in time of major war; yet we have experienced one of the mildest recessions in our history.

But standards of performance have been driven so unrealistically high that an extremely successful policy, as judged by past experience, is widely regarded as a major failure. What a triumph of rhetoric over reality.

FAMILY FILMS ALIVE AND WELL THANKS TO M-G-M

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I enclose with these brief remarks an editorial published in the Friday, December 25, 1970, issue of the Brooklyn Record:

FAMILY FILMS ALIVE AND WELL THANKS TO M-G-M

The family film is alive and well thanks to those wonderful people at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc who have made exciting classics of the screen once again available for showing on week-end matinees at your favorite local theatre where they belong.

There now can be a family togetherness at Children's Matinees where all the neighborhood can mingle once again in a happy, happy atmosphere so long absent from community life. People need people and there is no better place to gather than at the neighborhood theatre and for those fellowships to be further cemented over an ice cream soda or hot chocolate at the usually adjacent drug store.

M-G-M has released such inspiring and classic films of wonder as "The Wizard of Oz," "Jumbo," "Adventures of Huckleberry

Finn" and "Flipper" to name a few. Thus it brings hours of enjoyment to the childhood-school time years which should be the time to build character and spark the curiosity which will make our young ones productive citizens in their world—tomorrow's society.

Too much of society's efforts have been pressuring the youngsters and turning them onto drugs and harmful ways of life as means of escape. The film world brings them excitement and mind-opening direction to prepare them for the challenges of the 'morrow.

With the lowering of the voting age to 18, those childhood years are all the more few and more and more priceless. Thanks to M-G-M kids will be able to live a happy make believe world inspired by great classic films. Nothing is more precious than a child's happiness and laughter. They move the world.

PROTECT THE JOBS OF SHOEWORKERS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the first 11 months of 1970 saw the continuation of the dangerous erosion of America's shoe industry. Figures recently reported by the American Footwear Manufacturers Association show a startling 27-percent increase in the amount of nonrubber footwear imports over the comparable 11-month period in 1969. Since the beginning of the new year, at least two

more New England shoe factories have closed their doors due to the flooding of the domestic market by foreign shoe imports—leaving another several hundred workers jobless.

During the 91st Congress the House passed the first revision of the Nation's trade laws since 1962. The Trade Act of 1970, by establishing reasonable quotas, would have provided an equitable portion of the American market for both domestic and foreign manufacturers. Unfortunately, congressional action in the other body was not completed prior to adjournment. The U.S. Tariff Commission recently had the problem under consideration and in a split decision succeeded only in putting the problem in the President's lap.

No matter how you slice it—quotas or tariffs—the U.S. shoe industry is way past the peril point. The jobs of hundreds of thousands of Americans, and the livelihood of their families, depends on resolving the question of reasonable protection for this critically affected U.S. industry. I respectfully urge such action as a matter of domestic priority.

American Footwear Manufacturers Association report and U.S. Tariff Commission release follow:

IMPORTS—JANUARY-NOVEMBER 1970

With 16,347,200 pairs of nonrubber footwear imported into this country in November, the first eleven months of the year showed a staggering total of 215,850,800 pairs—a 20% increase over the same period in 1969. The f.o.b. value of this footwear amounted to \$500,171,800 for the eleven months, repre-

senting a 27% increase over the comparable period last year.

AFMA's early estimates and constant warnings concerning the bombardment of imports during 1970 have been sadly realized. Imports of nonrubber footwear for 1970:

- (1) will total 235,000,000 pairs.
- (2) will be worth \$550,000,000 at the f.o.b. level.
- (3) will be worth \$891,000,000 at the wholesale level.
- (4) will be worth \$1,782,000,000 at the retail level.

Following is a summary of imported non-rubber footwear by major types and by principal sources for eleven months 1970:

Type of footwear	Percent change 11 months 1970-69 (pairs)	Average dollar value per pair	Estimated retail dollar value
Men's, boys' leather.....	+14.1	\$4.52	\$14.64
Men's, boys' vinyl.....	+68.0	1.31	4.24
Women's, misses' leather.....	+25.7	3.32	10.76
Women's, misses' vinyl.....	+9.4	.95	3.08
Children's, infants' leather.....	+28.3	1.50	4.86
Children's, infants' vinyl.....	+4.2	.83	2.69

Major sources	Pairs (thousands)	Value f.o.b. (thousands)	Average dollar value per pair
Italy.....	73,053	\$238,421	\$3.26
Japan.....	54,249	55,155	1.02
Taiwan.....	36,198	25,011	.69
Spain.....	18,948	69,746	3.68
Hong Kong.....	4,140	3,377	.81

TOTAL IMPORTS OF OVER-THE-FOOT FOOTWEAR

[Thousand of pairs]

Type of footwear	November 1970 (pairs)	Percent change, 1970/1969	11 months, 1970			Percent change, 1970/1969	
			Pairs	Value (in thousands)	Average value per pair	Pairs	Dollars value
Leather and vinyl, total.....	15,262.9	+24.5	204,579.5	\$483,794.9	\$2.36	+18.6	+25.6
Leather, excluding slippers.....	8,743.3	+28.8	108,927.1	388,030.3	3.56	+22.2	+22.7
Men's, youths', boys'.....	2,418.0	+27.1	30,496.6	137,875.4	4.52	+14.1	+18.5
Women's, misses'.....	5,414.1	+24.9	69,154.7	229,325.0	3.32	+25.7	+27.8
Children's, infants'.....	623.4	+90.3	6,101.7	9,143.2	1.50	+28.3	+22.2
Moccasins.....	39.5	-9.2	497.5	570.8	1.15	-15.6	-20.0
Other leather (including work and athletic).....	248.3	+38.3	2,676.6	11,115.9	4.15	+33.9	-9.8
Slippers.....	43.3	+13.1	278.5	720.8	2.59	-18.3	-1.3
Vinyl supported uppers.....	6,476.3	+19.3	95,373.9	95,043.8	1.00	+14.9	+39.3
Men's and boys'.....	1,264.0	+88.8	14,933.9	19,685.1	1.31	+68.0	+81.5
Women's and misses'.....	4,734.9	+14.1	71,178.9	67,883.3	.95	+9.4	+32.4
Children's and infants'.....	401.2	-18.0	7,750.0	6,417.9	.83	+4.2	+22.2
Soft soles.....	76.2	-35.4	1,511.1	1,057.5	.70	-8.0	+23.5
Other nonrubber types, total.....	1,084.3	+28.6	11,271.3	16,376.9	1.45	+52.4	+97.1
Wood.....	200.6	-16.2	3,687.8	9,467.8	2.57	+206.3	+218.9
Fabric uppers.....	790.0	+44.1	6,649.7	5,573.0	.84	+24.0	+31.6
Other (not elsewhere specified).....	93.7	+69.7	933.8	1,336.1	1.43	+12.3	+21.1
Nonrubber footwear, total.....	16,347.2	+24.8	215,850.8	500,171.8	2.32	+20.0	+27.1
Rubber-soled fabric uppers.....	3,529.9	+30.5	45,230.8	40,876.0	.90	+9.8	+33.1
Grand total, all types.....	19,877.1	+25.8	261,081.6	541,047.8	2.07	+18.1	+27.5

Note: Details may not add up due to rounding. Figures do not include imports of waterproof rubber footwear, zories and slipper socks. Rubber soled fabric upper footwear includes non-American selling price types.

Source: American Footwear Manufacturers Association estimates from census raw data.

TARIFF COMMISSION REPORTS TO THE PRESIDENT ON NONRUBBER FOOTWEAR

VOTE OF COMMISSION DIVIDED IN INVESTIGATION
UNDER THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

The U.S. Tariff Commission today reported to the President the results of its investigation of the effect of imports of nonrubber footwear on the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products, which

it had made under section 301(b) (1) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The investigation had been requested by the President on July 15, 1970.

In the investigation (TEA-I-18), the Commission was to determine whether nonrubber footwear is, as a result in major part of concessions granted thereon under trade agreements, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to cause, or

threaten to cause, serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles.

The vote of the Commission was divided. Commissioner Young did not participate in the investigation.

Commissioners Clubb and Moore found that nonrubber footwear for men, youths, and boys and for women and misses (except for work and athletic footwear, and slippers), is,

as a result in major part of concessions granted under trade agreements, being imported in such increased quantities as to threaten to cause serious injury to the domestic industries producing men's and women's leather footwear. They further found that, in order to prevent serious injury, the rates of duty on the types of footwear described above and provided for in TSUS items 700.30, 700.43, 700.45, and 700.55 must be increased as follows: 700.35 to 10 percent and the other three items to the 1969 rates. They concluded that adjustment of the industry to the import competition depended on the grant of adjustment assistance to the firms and workers concerned. Commissioners Clubb and Moore also determined that work and athletic footwear and slippers for men, youths, and boys, and women and misses are not, as a result in major part of trade-agreement concessions, being imported in such increased quantities as to cause, or threaten to cause, serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles.

Commissioners Sutton and Leonard found in the negative.

Under the law, the President may consider the findings of either group of Commissioners as the findings of the Commission. If the President agrees with the affirmative finding of Commissioners Clubb and Moore, he may provide tariff adjustment or adjustment assistance or both.

Copies of the Commission's report (TC Publication 359), which contains statements of the reasons for the Commissioner's findings, are available upon request as long as the limited supply lasts. Requests should be addressed to the Secretary, U.S. Tariff Commission, 8th and E Sts., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20436.

CATASTROPHIES OF SHELTON COLLEGE AND NEWARK, N.J.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, we hear tragic reports from the State of New Jersey.

The mayor of Newark, N.J., testifying before a congressional committee, has reportedly denounced his own city as being first in crime, first in venereal disease, first in infant deaths, and predicts it will be the first city likely to go under, because of its own moral decay.

Yet, at the same time, we learn that the board of higher education of New Jersey has decreed that Shelton College, a Christian institution at Cape May, N.J., must be shut down for failing to meet State standards.

Apparently, its new immigrant citizens, congregated by promises of a new Utopia through welfare, have lost the faith in plantation life in Newark.

On the other hand, there is academic freedom the Nation over except for Dr. McIntire's Shelton College, which in New Jersey doesn't even have the right to have an academy.

It would appear that what New Jersey needs most is less faith in the "bread and wine" promises of the Washington money changers and more trust in the type of fundamental teachings of Christian colleges like Shelton, at Cape May.

CXVII—17—Part 1

New Jersey should serve as a clear reminder to all, that when God is dead, his people suffer.

I include several newspaper clippings:

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 22, 1971]

CRIME, VD, AND INFANT DEATHS: NEWARK LEADS THE WORST LIST

The mayor of Newark today described his city as first in crime, first in venereal disease, first in infant deaths and the first—but not the last—city likely to go under because of its own decay.

Mayor Kenneth Gibson gave strong support to the revenue sharing plan President Nixon will call for tonight in his State of the Union address.

Mayor Gibson testified before a House-Senate economic committee looking into the state of the nation's economy. Also scheduled to be heard were Mayor John Lindsay of New York and Gov. Milton Shapp of Pennsylvania.

Mayor Gibson presented an awesome picture of a city in trouble in outlining the problems of his community of 400,000, of whom 29 per cent are white. He said:

30 per cent of its people live on welfare, the cost of which has more than doubled in four years.

One quarter of its pupils drop out of schools, and half the schools are 60 years old or older.

41,000 housing units—nearly one in three—are in such bad shape they can't be repaired. So many property owners are abandoning their buildings that the city, taking them over when taxes go unpaid, is fast becoming the biggest landlord in the city.

Mayor Gibson urged Congress to assume all welfare costs with higher payments and to enact revenue sharing without cutting back on other forms of aid.

"The cry from Newark," he said, "is becoming the all-too-familiar appeal for national solutions to urban problems.

"I caution you: Do not misunderstand the complications of urban decay and collapse. As I have said many times before, wherever America's cities are going, Newark will get there first.

"We are not only talking about saving the Newarks of America, we are talking about saving America itself."

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Jan. 16, 1971]

MCINTIRE'S SCHOOL MUST CLOSE, RULES N.J. BOARD OF EDUCATION
(By Stephen M. Fogust)

The New Jersey Board of Higher Education voted unanimously Friday to shut down the Rev. Carl McIntire's Fundamentalist Shelton College in Cape May.

The decision was heard by more than 100 of Shelton's students, Mr. McIntire and several faculty members who were jammed into the board's small conference room in Trenton.

The ruling revokes the college's license at the end of the spring semester for failing to meet minimum state standards for granting baccalaureate degrees. Mr. McIntire called the decision a "liberal frameup."

The board found that Shelton, a four-year liberal arts college with 71 faculty members, had demonstrated "substantial academic deficiencies coupled with a lack of institutional integrity and administrative competence." It also found "lack of candor in dealing with the public, students and the state."

The board supported 12 of 19 charges by the chancellor of higher education, Ralph Dungan. They included listing of courses in the catalogue that are not actually taught and employment of an inadequate faculty.

Mr. McIntire announced that the decision would be appealed immediately and that he

would try to get a court order to keep the decision from being enforced.

As the board meeting ended, some of the students began crying. Others, led by Samuel Shropshire of Cape May, shouted, "We want Shelton."

Another group sang hymns, among which were "Onward Christian Soldiers." The demonstration was brief and orderly.

Mr. McIntire, internationally known for his "20th Century Reformation" movement, radio broadcasts and Vietnam victory rallies in Washington, led the students to the nearby State Museum auditorium.

In a talk there, he branded the board's action as "calculated, premeditated murder."

In addition to the court appeal, he said he would sue the state for \$1 million in damages.

[From the Christian Beacon, Jan. 21, 1971]

NEW JERSEY MOVES TO KILL SHELTON

A Word From the President of Shelton College:

The decision of the Board of Higher Education of the State of New Jersey to close Shelton College as of the end of May is not a surprise. It was expected. All that has happened is that the liberal leftist ruling party which controls the Board of Higher Education has decided to eliminate the one and only fundamental Christian college in the state which is "Training Christian Warriors" for the Twentieth Century Reformation.

Here we have liberal intolerance and bureaucratic tyranny which we hear so much about today. The bureau makes the law, administers the law, and judges the offender of the law. It is frightening to see it in operation.

Shelton College has been in the State of New Jersey 16 years. It has been approved year after year by the state. When I became president of Shelton the state approved of my being president. The real trouble started in 1965 when Shelton was forced to move out of Ringwood in northern New Jersey and come to Cape May. It had shown signs of real growth. The liberals cracked down suddenly, but this was defeated.

Then in 1967 Dr. Ralph Dungan came from Chile, where he was called the "pink ambassador," and became chancellor of higher education of the State of New Jersey. It is clear now from the very beginning that he laid the groundwork for the destruction of Shelton College. He issued a new set of standards. To read them today in the light of the action of the state in ordering the College closed makes one think that they were designed specifically to "get" Shelton. Over and over again these standards, without being specific, use the word "adequate"—"adequate" preparation for teachers, "adequate" library space, "adequate" laboratory facilities. Never has the word been defined and spelled out or any ratio between the size of the student body and the varying degrees of adequacy spelled out. Moreover, this new set of standards was never presented by Dr. Dungan to me on the various occasions when he saw me, nor did he even so much as suggest that new standards had been erected from the older ones of 1955. It was not until January 20, 1969, that the standards were actually sent to us.

Dr. Dungan then sent an examining committee to the college in April, 1969, made up of National Council of Churches supporters, from Upsala College, a Lutheran school, and from Drew, a Methodist university. They reported, under the "adequate" provisions, that Shelton was inadequate and in violation of the standards. This, however, was never told to Shelton, and the state never gave to Shelton a copy of the report. Shelton received it only during the hearing which was called after threatening to go to court to force the release of the report.

Nineteen charges were filed against the College on May 16, 1969, charging violation of the standards, and this only four months after Shelton had ever seen the new standards. Of these 19 charges, after nine months of delay, the Board had to drop seven of the charges because they were so absurd.

For the first time in the decision it was learned that the Board objected to the listing of honorary degrees alongside of the faculty members' names. This has always been done, and the previous catalogs were approved.

The most serious aspect of the entire attack was against the faculty of the College. Charge number seven condemned the entire faculty as not having adequate preparation in the fields of their instruction. Of this the College was declared to be guilty. The effect of this on the radio, the press, and on television has damaged every member of the faculty, with their Ph. D.'s and masters degrees, all of whom are teaching in the fields in which they have been prepared by their studies and experience.

The state ruled that the College did not have financial resources sufficient to maintain itself, but the fact is that the College had maintained itself. The state refuses to recognize the way in which the fundamental Christians and churches by their gifts, and the backing of the 20th Century Reformation Hour itself, give support to Shelton. The state simply will not permit a school to exist which depends upon the tithes and offerings of Christian people. This, to the state, is too insecure. A big point was made of the low salaries, and the school was declared incompetent because of this. The right of teachers to contribute part of their services as unto the Lord with the faculty accepting adequate salaries, as they considered adequate, was simply rejected by the state. These various matters, as they related to specifics, had never previously been spelled out for the College.

The state also took the position that it had to approve the majors—all majors. This, too, was something new and a denial of the independence of the religious institution. The Association of Independent Colleges in the state has vigorously opposed this new demand of Dr. Dungan.

Repeatedly the charges against the College, as they were upheld, were said to involve the integrity of the president and of the administrative offices under him. The entire document was contrived to make things sound as bad as possible and to discredit the degrees which the College has given.

The reaction has been vigorous and emotional. The students of the College wept and resolved to fight. They have just collected \$200 and placed a full-page ad in the Cape May *Star and Wave* appealing to the public to help them save the College which has just moved into a brand new, one-million-dollar three-building complex—the James E. Bennet Library, the Clyde J. Kennedy Administration Building, and the J. Gordon Holdcroft Academic Building.

The significant thing about the whole affair is that had the Board of Higher Education simply told the administration, as was repeatedly requested, what these specifics were, they could and would have been corrected. None of them or all of them were sufficient to destroy a Christian college. The action was arbitrary, and can be explained only on the basis that the liberal leftist powers were determined to eliminate a college which is "Training Christian Warriors"—the motto of Shelton. The action is arbitrary and can be explained only as coming from the liberals with their determination to destroy their opposition. This is what all America must see. There will no longer be any place for militant colleges that are fundamental. Christian high schools will go, and the liberals will contrive a way to

destroy the many elementary schools that are arising. Shelton symbolizes all that is involved in this fight. Never was it truer: "Freedom is everybody's business."

Now for the defense. An appeal is being taken to civil courts. A stay of execution will be secured. The faculty and students are resolved to stay and fight. Second, well-justified damage suits are going to be filed against the State of New Jersey, each faculty member filing a separate suit, and I will also file one because this has already been used all over the world to destroy my character and to hurt the International Council of Christian Churches. This is so clearly Satanic and one of the signs of the end times. For the Apostle Paul said: "perilous times shall come," which would include "false accusers."

We are asking everyone to go to the throne of grace in prayer and appeal to the promises of Scripture. Live close to the Word of God for the days are evil. Letters should now be sent directly to the Governor, the honorable William T. Cahill, Trenton, N.J. Everyone who reads this report, I request, please, to write the Governor, send a copy to the President of the United States and a copy to the 20th Century Reformation Hour. The Governor, who is a liberal and a Roman Catholic, just as Dr. Dungan is a liberal and a Roman Catholic, will realize that there is strong public reaction. The Governor could himself direct that another examining team look over Shelton. A team of qualified experts visited Shelton at Shelton's expense and reported to Dr. Dungan that the College's accreditation should be continued.

The March 20 March for Victory in New Jersey will also carry the emphasis of Victory for Shelton College. Already this matter has become a subject for talk shows and letters to the editors. The more the better. The same element which sought to have WXUR put off the air was represented in the New Jersey Board of Higher Education. Everywhere it is opposition, abuse, and suppression for those who would fight apostasy and Communism. Let no one fail to read the true meaning of this disgraceful action. But Shelton, with its many friends and its approximately 1000 graduates will now arise to fight for all, and will use the opportunity to be genuine "Christian Warriors."

Let everyone help, and let us watch what God will do in His providence.

If this had been a Jewish college the cry would be "anti-Semitism!" or a Negro college, the cry would be racism!" or a Roman Catholic college, the cry would be "bigotry!" The fundamental Christian must stand up against what is in truth anti-Christian. Let us use the occasion to let everyone know that what is called Christianity of the apostasy is the very thing that Shelton stands against. Do not the fundamental Christians have a right to have a school to which they can send their youth and their gifts? The state has now offered to help Shelton students transfer to another college . . . but what college? This is like rubbing salt in the wounds.

Christian people must now conserve their means. We are going to have to give and sacrifice, but we must use every lawful and proper means to defend our rights to freedom. I am writing a complete rebuttal to the decision paragraph by paragraph, and it is being offered to the radio audience free upon request. Do not worry, my friend; the Lord said it would be this way. Don't forget that there will be something the Devil will do tomorrow, but our formula of victory is, "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you" (Jas. 4:7). A weak, soft fundamentalism that won't fight except to fight those who believe in fighting the devil should now recognize that those of us who are fighting the battle are actually preserving their freedom to worship and even to counsel their compromise. There must be no compromise and no sur-

render! Let this cry ring in the camp of the fundamentalists throughout the whole Christian world.

Yours for Victory,

CARL MCINTIRE,
President, Shelton College.

BIBLE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Cape May, N.J., January 17, 1971.

HON. WILLIAM CAHILL,
State Capitol,
Trenton, N.J.

DEAR GOVERNOR CAHILL: We, the Congregation of the Bible Presbyterian Church of Cape May, deplore the decision of the State Board of Higher Education in removing the accreditation of Shelton College.

As members of this community, we have found the young people to be of the highest calibre and a credit to our local youth. The college has made its facilities open to the general public and has actively recruited area youth to attend, thus affording them the opportunity to become better citizens. Senior Citizens were given special invitations to the Artist Series sponsored by the college. A teenage youth center meets each week in the gym, directed by students from the college.

Young people need a college like Shelton. Its stand for the Bible as the Word of God, and its teachings of the American way of life are the very voices that are being silenced throughout our land. Yet it is this philosophy of education that has made our Republic the great nation that it is.

We ask you, as our Governor, to take all necessary action to restore the degree granting authority to Shelton College. We are puzzled when we read about a shortage of colleges in our State and then see the action taken by the Board of Higher Education to stop a liberal arts college that asks nothing from the State, but contributes everything to its well being.

Sincerely yours,

JEROME DAVENPORT, Clerk.

Approved unanimously, without absence, at the morning worship service, January 17, 1971.

SENATOR RICHARD BREVARD
RUSSELL

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on rare occasions leaders rise to speak for their beliefs and grow beyond the confines of region or philosophy. RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL did that, but now he is gone. A great public servant, national statesman, and patriot has passed on. A man of strong convictions and honor, he fought hard to defend the right as he saw it. He worked hard to defend the national honor as he perceived it. A conservative by nature and inclination, he was not stamped from a rigid mold, but he did have that rare quality—fundamental honesty. With cautious good judgment, he warned Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy against involvement in the war now raging in Southeast Asia. Once in, he became a staunch defender of hitting hard and expediting withdrawal. He was no "Monday morning quarterback." He taught many another public servant more "liberal" than he by example. He was a legislator's legislator.

Mr. Speaker, I had not the opportunity

to know the late Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, well, but it was my privilege to have witnessed his leadership firsthand. Watching him from my context—that of a northeastern constituency and from the House of Representatives—we often disagreed. Yet, to quote Senator RUSSELL's own tribute to the late President John F. Kennedy:

Among his other admirable attributes, he was a man of tolerance and understanding. He fought hard for those things in which he believed, but he well knew that all men would not see the same issue in the same light. He would have been the last to have expected anyone to stultify conviction merely to conform to his opinions.

May we learn from his example greater tolerance for those with whom we disagree, and may we resume a meaningful national dialog on crucial issues. May he rest in peace.

REFUSE RECYCLING

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the things which most impressed me during my visit to Southeast Asia in 1969 was the imaginative uses to which Asians put their recycled metals. For example, one often sees traffic signs which carry the imprint of old beer cans or other recycled metals on the back. I also understand that the Japanese use compressed blocks of solid waste material as a construction material. Recycling of solid waste disposal must be given much attention in the United States as one of the methods for not only disposing of our refuse, but also deriving some benefit from it.

I was pleased to read recently that the U.S. Bureau of Mines Metallurgy Research Center at the University of Maryland is currently operating an experimental recycling plant in Edmonston, Md., in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the magazine article describing this process and the Edmonston plant be inserted in the RECORD at this point for the perusal of our colleagues who might be interested in this form of environmental control:

CAN WE USE MAX SPENDLOVE'S TRASH MACHINE?

(Our refuse need not be a mountainous liability. It can be disposed of profitably, says the director of an experimental recycling plant in Maryland)

(By John Morton)

A quart jar of pickles brings together in one convenient package 16 pickles, a cup of brine, an ounce of metal in the cap, a bit of paper label and 12 ounces of glass. All of these facts do not fill the housewife's mind as she cruises the supermarket aisles. It's the pickles she wants, and that's what her family gets. The rest is thrown away.

A lot of everything else she buys is thrown away, too, after the edible contents are unwrapped from paper, squirted from aerosols, squeezed from tubes and poured from thousands of cans and nonreturnable glass bottles. Truly it is a disposable feast.

Americans throw away 150 million tons of

household refuse annually, and the total goes up each year. The cost to collect and dispose of it is staggering—close to \$4 billion annually. Some of the junk is burned, some is buried, some is dumped at sea, and a lot of it just blows across the land.

The harvest of refuse is a major headache for cities, which everywhere are plagued by a lack of new dumping sites and the high cost of building and running refuse incinerators. Yet this effluent of our hardsell, super-packaged marketing system itself offers the answer to the problem of its existence. For if properly treated, all of this junk is worth money.

A federal research project quietly underway in Edmondston, Md., in Prince Georges County, has developed a recycling plant that takes refuse at one end and produces commercially valuable products at the other end—at a profit. The reason a profit can be made is simple: Household refuse is rich in all the materials that were thrown into it—aluminum, iron, copper, brass, tin, glass, paper and plastic. Indeed, for some of these materials, household refuse is a resource richer than ore that is profitably mined and processed in a mill.

A visit to the Edmondston recycling plant is a surprising experience for anyone accustomed to the dirt and obnoxious smell usually found in ordinary refuse-disposal plants. There is plenty of noise—the huge machines used in the recycling process chop, tumble, crush and shake the junk fed into them with an awesome racket. But the refuse is carefully contained along the chain of connected machinery, and water sprays in the machines to wash out fine particles keep down the dust. The floor is spotless.

The man in charge is Max Spendlove, research director at the U.S. Bureau of Mines' Metallurgy Research Center at the University of Maryland. Spendlove, a serious-faced, orderly man in his 50s who looks as if he might be a high school physics teacher, has a matter-of-fact way of speaking that often harbors wit. Giving directions to his office on the University of Maryland campus, he advised: "Follow Campus Drive until you pass the Student Union Building—that's the one with all the trash out in front—and I'm in the next building on your left."

Spendlove's career as a government metallurgist devoted to getting something valuable out of what appears to be worthless goes back to 1940, long before the disposable explosion in American merchandising began overwhelming municipal trash systems.

His first job with the Bureau of Mines was to figure out a way to extract the valuable metal in the smoke and gases belched out by copper smelters near Salt Lake City, Utah. After World War II he was in College Park, developing techniques for reclaiming aluminum from thousands of scrapped military planes. When Congress enacted the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965 with the idea of combating pollution and reclaiming lost resources, Spendlove was appointed to direct the bureau's research under the act. This led to the development of the Edmondston recycling plant, which first started processing refuse on an experimental basis in May, 1969.

So Spendlove is used to looking at the worthless, the discarded objects of America, in a different light. Thus he speaks of household trash with admiration, even a bit of affection, and with an absolutely straight face. To Spendlove, it's not trash, but "urban ore," and he likes to talk about how coat hangers and tin cans are "high" in iron, that broken toys and alarm clocks produce a lot of brass and aluminum, and that all of those throw-away bottles give off a nice quality of marketable glass, if handled right.

He even sounds a little protective of the qualities of his urban ore at the mention of banning throw-away bottles by municipal ordinance, a step recently taken by Bowie, Md.

"What good does it do to ban throw-away pop and beer bottles and not ban them for pickles, vegetables, ketchup, olives and everything else that comes in a throw-away container?" he asks. "What about the shoe box and all the other containers we throw away? Besides, the consuming public will always resist this. They'll just go buy them somewhere else."

Let the people buy and throw away, says Spendlove. Human nature is not easily changed but recycling plants that make money can be easily built, and the profits can be spent on doing a better job of collecting refuse.

Trash disposal in the United States, for the most part, relies on the same basic processes used centuries ago—burn and bury. Nothing better was ever developed because, until fairly recently, land was cheap enough and plentiful enough to make burn-and-bury a sensible disposal system.

But suburban sprawl, the population explosion and the boom in throw-away packaging have combined to overwhelm existing municipal dumps and make sites for new ones hard to find. Fairfax County in Virginia, for example, is nervously seeking a new dumping site; in about a year, the county's landfill operation west of Fairfax City will have taken about all it can hold.

Similarly in Maryland, Montgomery County should have closed its overstuffed landfill near Rockville a year ago, county officials acknowledge. But land close in is expensive, and few communities farther out are eager to become somebody else's dumping ground. Alternatives being considered by some local governments include baling trash and shipping it elsewhere by rail. The District of Columbia may send its trash on barges 20 miles down the Potomac to Cherry Hill, Va., when its dumping site at Oxon Cove, Md., is filled up.

One method of reducing the sheer volume of refuse is to burn it in an incinerator, which removes the paper, plastic, wood, food, and anything else that will burn. There are now about 400 incinerators in use in the United States, and scores more will be built in coming years. The District has had at least one incinerator since the 1930s, and is planning to build its fifth soon. And there are several others in metropolitan Washington. But incinerators still leave an unburnable residue of metal and glass that must be buried in a landfill somewhere.

The Edmondston recycling plant developed under Spendlove's direction was designed to process this incinerator residue—extract the valuable materials in pure enough form to make them commercially valuable. Using residue collected from incinerators in suburban Maryland, Virginia, the District of Columbia, Baltimore, Atlanta and New Orleans, Spendlove and his fellow researchers experimented with machines that chopped, chewed and separated incinerator residue. By November, 1969, six months after they had perfected the process.

Perfecting the process achieved these financial results: The cost in labor, equipment and building to process incinerator residue is \$3.52 a ton. The end products—commercial grade metals and glass—are worth \$12 a ton. This means that cities with incinerators are burning and burying \$77 million worth of resources a year—the recycled value of the 22 million tons of refuse fed to incinerators each year in the United States.

Attracted by reports in technical journals, representatives from the iron, aluminum and glass industries have visited the Edmondston project to see for themselves that the recycling plant can produce valuable material. Other visitors have included officials from several major cities in the United States and abroad.

If money can be made from household

trash, and the Bureau of Mines has a plant that proves it, why aren't mayors and city councils all over the country plunging into engineering reports and making feverish plans to build their own recycling plants? Part of the answer is that the Bureau of Mines experiment was so recently completed that word of its successes has not spread out to municipal public works departments. Even in metropolitan Washington, which would seem to have the edge on the rest of the country because of proximity, checks with public works departments failed to turn up any officials who had actually visited the Edmonston project, although there were varying degrees of awareness of it.

Moreover, the public works officials tended to view the whole concept of recycling as something too experimental and far off to be of much use to them in their day-to-day struggles with collection, burning and burying. Says Norman Jackson, director of the District's Department of Sanitary Engineering: "Recycling is a very fundamental principle that we must observe in the future, but I think a lot of work remains to be done on it."

Others apparently were not acquainted with Spendlove's recycling techniques. Both Nicholas Stollaroff, urban engineer with Prince Georges County, and Frederick Doe, Arlington County's utilities director, asserted that household trash is such a complex mixture of materials that sorting it out never would be profitable. "You can't tell from looking at a can whether it's aluminum or tin," says Doe. The Edmonston plant, however, does not rely on visual identification; it shreds all incoming materials and separates them with mechanical, magnetic and chemical methods.

Doe also refused to accept that tin cans and glass bottles could produce raw materials that would bring a profit, regardless of the cost-profit studies done by the Bureau of Mines. "For example, tin cans have fallen in value considerably because the tin coating on the iron contaminates the new types of steel furnaces being used," he says.

Spendlove acknowledges that the tin contamination problem remains to be solved, along with problems caused by solder from the seams of cans and copper that somehow attaches itself to tin cans during incineration. But the profit figures he cites for his recycling process are based on receiving the low prices that tin-contaminator iron brings on the market. "When we solve the contamination problem, the iron will be good enough to make steel, and then we can make more than \$12 a ton profit on incinerator residue," he says.

Spendlove believes there will be two major barriers to overcome before very many communities will be able to put to work the recycling processes developed in Edmonston. "In many cities, just getting out from under the refuse-disposal problems that they have right now will put them off," he says. "And I am assuming that, whenever a recycling plant is built, it will be a combined effort—a combination of city and state or federal governments and perhaps even some private interest. None of these relationships has been determined, and it will take time. But I'll be surprised if some serious proposals don't start coming in."

As for the recycling process itself, Spendlove emphasizes that no esoteric machinery or unusual new processes are involved. "All the machinery we use is conventional," he says. "We just use the basic minerals-processing techniques, but we've brought all the techniques together to work on urban ore."

There are three basic operations: 1. Shredding and grinding the incinerator residue into small particles. 2. Separating out different materials with magnets and screens of different sizes. 3. Washing to remove dust particles.

The first machine in the recycling chain is a trommel—a large, rotating cylinder full of 1¼-inch holes that normally is used to sort out gravel. The incinerator residue brought in at the unloading dock is dumped onto a conveyor, which carries it to the trommel; small particles drop through the trommel's holes as it rotates and feeds larger pieces to a shredding machine. In later stages, magnets pull out magnetic metals, and grinding mills crush glass into tiny particles and flatten pieces of nonmagnetic metals so they can be screened out of the glass.

Traditional refining techniques, such as acid leaches and filtration, further separate metals into aluminum, copper, zinc and brass. The glass particles can be used as is to make building bricks and glass wool, but more money can be made from glass that is separated by color, which is done both by magnetic means (color in glass is created by iron and chromium) and with an optical sorter.

The cost and profit figures cited above are based on a recycling plant serving a city of 250,000. A larger plant, say for a city of a million, would use the machinery more efficiently, reducing processing costs to \$1.83 a ton. How much to build a plant for a city of a million? About \$2.2 million, certainly not unmanageable, especially in view of the profit potential.

OFFICIALS TEND TO VIEW THE CONCEPT OF RECYCLING AS TOO EXPERIMENTAL

"Now that we know how to process incinerator residue and make money at it," says Spendlove, "we're setting up another plant to take refuse straight from the garbage can—no incinerator—because the paper and plastic refuse is valuable, too, and we hate to see it burned up." He expects to spend about a year perfecting the process for raw refuse. "We already know how we hope to do it, but there are always unexpected kinks to work out."

Processing raw refuse both eliminates and raises some problems. It would eliminate the need for an incinerator, which costs about \$23 million to build for a city of a million. But it poses expensive difficulties in reclaiming paper and plastics and fabrics. To be separated from other trash, these lightweight articles must be put through what is called air classification.

Essentially, air classification is a stream of air into which the refuse is dribbled. The air blast blows out the paper, cardboard, plastic and other light materials, and an additional air stream can further separate the lightweight materials into distinct grades.

Adding air classification to a recycling plant (the heavier materials would continue to be processed just like incinerator residue) would raise the cost of a plant for a city of a million to about \$7.2 million.

This more sophisticated, raw-refuse process is yet to be perfected, however. But Max Spendlove says it's just a question of time. Working on the mechanical problems involved is simple, compared to the obstacles in other phases of waste management—for example, taking almost invisible pollutants out of air and water. "Solid waste is easy to work on," says Spendlove. "You can put your hands on it. You can do almost anything you want with it."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

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 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on December 21, 1970, the Supreme Court, in United States against State of Arizona, announced that part of the Voting Rights Amendments of 1970 enfranchising 18-year-old voters in State and local elections was unconstitutional.

The Court argued that while Congress has the power to supervise congressional elections, and also to set qualifications of voters for presidential and vice-presidential elections, the essential separateness and independent existence of the States is traced to "the power of the States and their governments to determine within the limits of the Constitution the qualifications of their own voters for State, county, and municipal offices and the nature of their own machinery for filling local public offices."

The Court further stated:

It is obvious that the whole Constitution reserves to the States the power to set voter qualifications in State and local elections except to the limited extent that the people through constitutional amendments have specifically narrowed the powers of the States.

Regardless of the sound legal reasoning employed by the Court, some serious and practical difficulties are raised by this decision.

First, there is the whole thrust of the consciousness of a generation. Eighteen-year-olds today are better educated, more aware of their world, more positive in their thinking, and more solicitous of other human beings than any previous generation. I believe that the majority of them have the soundness of judgment to analyze critical State and local issues and to take meaningful intelligent positions on them.

Second, to limit the suffrage of 18-year-olds to only Federal elections is nonsensical. Eighteen-year-olds have as much at stake in the elections of Governors and mayors as they do in electing Congressmen and Senators.

Third, this split in suffrage will play havoc with State and local registration systems. Officially will be required to keep two sets of listings—a separate one for voters eligible for national elections and a list of eligible voters for State and local elections.

Local government officials are already overburdened with Federal redtape. In addition, registration bookkeeping will be costly and extremely impractical to administer.

For these reasons, I, and 34 of my colleagues, are introducing a House joint

resolution proposing a constitutional amendment that will provide for the full enfranchisement of the 18-year-old voter. This amendment will prohibit the States from abridging the rights of citizens of the United States who are 18 years of age or older from voting in State and local elections.

I believe that this amendment is needed. I believe that it deserves prompt consideration by both Houses of Congress, and I believe that our State legislatures should ratify it with as much speed as possible.

The following Members are cosponsors of the resolution:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Joseph Addabbo, New York.
Glenn Anderson, California.
Thomas Ashley, Ohio.
Nick Begich, Alaska.
John Brademas, Indiana.
Jonathan Bingham, New York.
William Broomfield, Michigan.
James Burke, Massachusetts.
Charles Carney, Ohio.
Shirley Chisholm, New York.
James Cleveland, New Hampshire.
Robert Drinan, Massachusetts.
William Ford, Michigan.
Edwin Forsythe, New Jersey.
Don Fraser, Minnesota.
Seymour Halpern, New York.
Lee Hamilton, Indiana.
Walter Jones, North Carolina.
Joseph Karth, Minnesota.
Robert Leggett, California.
Abner Mikva, Illinois.
William Moorhead, Pennsylvania.
John Moss, California.
Andrew Jacobs, Indiana.
Paul McCloskey, California.
Thomas Rees, California.
Benjamin Rosenthal, New York.
Fred Rooney, Pennsylvania.
J. Edward Roush, Indiana.
B. F. Sisk, California.
Charles Thone, Nebraska.
Morris Udall, Arizona.
Lionel Van Deerlin, California.
Gus Yatron, Pennsylvania.

PENNY POSTCARD

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, during the 91st Congress I first introduced legislation which would reestablish the penny postcard.

There were some who were amazed that I would make such a proposal in this time of increasing high cost. Some might scoff that the Post Office will never break even at that rate.

However, from others—literally worldwide—there was instant and gratifying praise. At last someone had thought of the common man, they said.

It is my way, Mr. Speaker, to provide at least one way—at least one avenue of communication—for the poor pensioner and the poorest of the poor of our land.

With the rate of first-class mail as high as it is, with the telephone and telegraph rates out of sight for countless numbers, there is nothing left for

the common man without the 1-cent postcard.

Consequently, I have introduced legislation today on this first day of the 92d Congress which amends the Postal Reorganization Act to provide for 1-cent postal cards and postcards.

MAYOR OF NEWARK TESTIFIES BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the privilege along with Congressman JOSEPH MINISH of introducing the mayor of Newark, the Honorable Kenneth Gibson, to Chairman PROXMIRE and the members of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mayor Gibson was the leadoff witness before the committee as it begins to explore the question of changing national economic conditions and their effect upon the major urban centers of our Nation. Mayor Gibson's testimony was not only eloquent and convincing, but also shocking in its factual description of the degree of deterioration and the lack of financial resources to meet physical deterioration and impending fiscal crises.

During this first 7 months of Mayor Gibson's tenure, he has resolutely and courageously faced critical problems that have been building up for years. He speaks for all Newark when he outlines not only the reasons for urban decay, but the hope and the optimism that are necessary to overcome our dire circumstances.

I speak not only as a Representative of the city of Newark, along with my colleague JOE MINISH, but also as a lifetime resident of Newark. I have seen many changes in the city and I know how strongly the people of Newark feel. I know on a firsthand basis the pride they feel about their homes and their neighborhoods, even in the face of seemingly insurmountable problems. The city of Newark must not die. If it does, it will serve as the deathknell to similar urban centers throughout our Nation.

The problems of Newark, as Mayor Gibson so effectively points out, represent in a large measure the problems of all American cities. When we speak of the necessity for acting quickly and when we speak of the urgency of Newark's problems, we are also speaking of the urgency of urban problems everywhere in America.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues in the House will hear the message that Mayor Gibson delivered to the Joint Economic Committee and that the 92d Congress will be responsive to the needs of Newark and the cities of America.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE KENNETH A. GIBSON

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

I wish to thank you for inviting me here today to testify on the changing economic conditions in our nation and its impact on our city, Newark, New Jersey. You have asked me to address myself to four questions, the first of which deals with the financial problems faced by my city. To briefly summarize the detailed statement which I have filed with you, Newark is faced with a budget crisis that threatens to bankrupt the city. Upon taking office in July of 1970, I found an estimated deficit for 1971 of over 70 million dollars, or over 40% of the budget (\$160 million). The budget crisis was brought on by a 10% decrease in city revenues and an increase of \$50 million in expenditures. The additional \$50 million, largely the result of mandated appropriations for essential municipal services, raised the city's total expenses for 1971 to \$210 million. To fill this gap through increased property taxes, we would have had to raise the present rate, already one of the highest in the nation, by 50 percent (from \$8.44 to \$13.00 per \$100 assessed valuation). After months of study and consultation, we finally opted for a series of taxes on Newark's businesses and consumers, in the form of occupancy, payroll, and sales taxes. We are aware that these are highly discriminatory and regressive taxes, and that they will further inhibit the economic growth potential of our city, but we had no alternative.

Our deficit may run even larger than estimated. The teachers' union has presented demands which we estimate would more than double the already skyrocketing school budget of 90 million dollars. Police and firemen are also demanding more in contract negotiations. We must also pay about 30% of county expenses, and the county has budget requests for 1971 which amount to a one-third increase over 1970. We must deal with these problems despite a depression level unemployment rate of over 11%, brought on in part by current fiscal policies, and a business community which has curtailed capital expansion due to an uncertain economic future facing the city.

If we meet our deficit needs, we will only be providing for the most basic of city services—schools, public safety, health, welfare, and sanitation. Even if we succeed in filling the budget gap we will still be left with the problems of arresting physical deterioration and strengthening our people's faith in the ability of our institutions to respond in hours of greatest need. Our \$210 million city budget doesn't begin to solve the problems of the 40% of our labor force which is unemployed or underemployed, or the 30% on welfare. Neither does it rebuild the 30% of Newark's housing stock which is sub-standard or the 50% of Newark's schools which were built over 60 years ago.

These are the facts. It is said that facts don't lie. But all too often facts don't compel one to action. Yet action is what is needed. When all the witnesses before this distinguished committee have concluded their testimony, you will not have heard anything that you have not heard many times before. All of the major areas of concern have been endlessly studied. I have before me copies of our Model Cities proposals, copies of our Community Renewal Program, copies of the Report of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders, copies of the Governor's Commission on Civil Disorders, and literally hundreds of other studies and official commission reports which fully document Newark's problems and suggest immediate and long-range solutions. Information and knowledge of conditions and problems are not what is needed. The information has been available for years, yet the decline of America's urban centers has continued at a relentless pace. What is needed now is the will to do something about it.

In 1968, for instance, Congress set a 10-year goal of 26 million new and rehabilitated dwelling units. Two years later, we find ourselves already 650,000 units short (or 15%), and talk is spreading of holding back \$200 million in previously committed Urban Renewal funds. Efficient and balanced urban mass transportation which would stimulate desirable economic and social trends was another lofty goal, and yet of \$7.7 billion which the Administration requested for federal aid to transportation in 1971, only 2% (0.15 billion) was devoted to urban mass transit.

The list of goals and the score-card on performance is a shocking indictment of this nation's failure to respond to the urgency of the crisis. What is lacking is the resolution of the House, the Senate, the President, the state legislatures, the governors, local officials and private industry to act before it is too late.

I am not anxious to make this the first of many annual appearances before Congressional committees to ask for money handouts or to appeal for a recognition of the crisis of urban America. It grieves me to lay bare before the nation and the world the ills of our city; the city for whose health and welfare I am responsible. The only reason I come here today is to petition you again, as so many others have done in the past, to recognize the obligation of the Federal Government to meet the needs of the people of this country, the majority of whom now live in urban areas. If this testimony helps to convey the needed sense of urgency concerning the crisis of our city, in fact all cities, then this trip has been worthwhile—provided that sense of urgency is quickly followed by appropriate action.

The areas of action are clear. They include revenue sharing, federal assumption of welfare in the form of an adequate family maintenance program, expediting the construction of housing, providing increased aid for education, passage of a bold manpower bill, and other well-known programs.

Lost in the national debate on welfare reform and revenue sharing is this needed sense of urgency—of aggressive and affirmative national commitment. Lost in the rhetoric of debate is the simple truth that cities across the nation are fighting just to stay alive—to pay the police, the firemen, the teachers, and the basic service employees. America's priorities must reflect a commitment to urban America. They must reflect the simple truth that human resources are America's greatest asset, and that our greatest hope lies in the healthy development of all our people.

The scope of urban problems has been well documented. I have before me countless reports which analyze the problems of our urban centers—crime, infant mortality, substandard housing, unemployment, welfare, miseducation. These thousands of pages of expert study and evaluation of the deterioration of our cities indicate a national recognition of the crisis. One need not be an expert, however, to realize that all the studies in the world will not give one child the proper education, one unemployed man a decent job, or one welfare family safe housing and a hope for the future. Without the commitment of massive public and private resources dedicated to the physical and human revitalization of our cities, millions of Americans will continue to live in despair and poverty.

America's greatness has been its ability not only to recognize problems and accept challenges, but to commit the American will and the vast American resources to achieve a common goal. When America made a commitment to be the first nation to land a man on the moon, we devoted \$25 billion to reaching the objective. To begin to realistically confront the urban challenge, we as a nation must be prepared to expend the tens of bil-

ions of dollars necessary to do the job. The urgency of the problems demand action now; the magnitude of the problems demand vast reallocation of resources.

I caution you, distinguished Congressmen and Senators. Do not misunderstand the implications of urban decay and collapse. As I have said many times before, "Wherever America's cities are going, Newark will get there first."

We are not talking only of saving the Newark of America; we are talking of saving America itself.

PREPARED TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE KENNETH A. GIBSON, MAYOR OF NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, BEFORE THE HEARINGS OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE OF THE 92D CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

NEWARK, N.J.: A STATISTICAL PROFILE

1. The largest city in the nation's most urban state
2. Population: 400,000 (approximately)
3. Population distribution: 60% black, 11% Spanish-speaking, 29% white (largely ethnic)
4. 80,000 school children: 85% black and Spanish-speaking
5. Land: 24 square miles (Newark Airport occupies nearly 8 sq. miles). 60% of land area is tax-exempt
6. Unemployment: 11.1% (January 1971)
7. Public Assistance Recipients: 114,000 (January 1971) 30% of Newark's population
8. Highest crime rate in the nation
9. Highest per capita incidence of venereal disease and infant mortality in the nation.
10. Annual budget: \$161,000,000. (1970)
11. Real estate tax rate: \$8.44 per \$100 of assessed valuation (among the highest in the nation).
12. Anticipated deficit: \$70 million (1971), 43% of the operating budget.

These are just a few of the important statistics which comprise Newark's two-dimensional profile. These are a few of the facts which suggest that the commercial, industrial, social and cultural hub of the State of New Jersey may also be the most decayed and financially crippled city in the nation.

To fully comprehend the reasons for Newark's present state of decay, one must first examine Newark's past. Newark was a central point of development in one of the oldest and most highly urbanized areas in the country. The City began as a sub-region of the New York metro-trade region. In the nineteenth century it rose as a manufacturing center, specializing within the region in certain industries. In the first half of the twentieth century it became a white collar office center again specializing in certain activities, primarily the insurance business, government and non-profit industries.

Newark is a sub-regional center with a weak "pull" on its hinterland. Newark suburbs are close to the center of the city and they are highly developed. The City, however, never established a sufficient concentration of skilled labor or a monopoly on professional and business services, retail sales, or employment in any sector to give it dominance in the sub-region or allow it to exert any strong centralizing influence. Consequently, we now find that people and industry show no reluctance to move out of the city. In 1968 the outlying areas led Newark in rate of industrial growth not only in the manufacturing sector (a typical urban growth phenomenon), but also in all other sectors except transportation. Whereas New York City and other large cities have established sufficient regional dominance to survive decentralizing trends, Newark apparently has not. This situation tends to make national economic downturns especially hard-felt in

terms of the city's competitive economic position and absolute economic standing.

Throughout the post-war period, Newark, like most other large cities in the Northeast, has functioned as a processing and service center for the economically deprived. While population has remained relatively constant, the affluent and middle classes have moved out of Newark in large numbers. They have been replaced by migrants with lower level employment skills who require additional social services which strain the city's financial resources. Those who acquire skills and become absorbed into the economy of the area often move out of the city, only to be replaced by others, less skilled, who quickly begin, once again, the struggle for economic status and self-sufficiency. The process of continual turn-over in the semi-skilled and unskilled, highly transient population results in constant transfer of properties and further compounds the problems of urban deterioration.

The City of Newark has been able to provide fewer and fewer employment opportunities for its residents. The manufacturing industry, long the source of training for the unskilled and semi-skilled, has declined almost 25% in the past twenty years and is now at a point where it can no longer provide an adequate pool of employment. The only appreciable increase in employment has been in the service sector, but even in this area Newark's growth rate is only one-half that of the other cities in the region. It is important to note that whatever the increase in this sector, it has had little effect on the total employment picture in Newark since little effort has been made to train the unskilled and semi-skilled for employment in this field.

National economic policies, particularly credit stringency and the high cost of borrowing, have seriously impaired the city's ability to reverse or even stabilize this declining trend. Newark has now reached a critical point in terms of maintaining its position as an industrial and commercial center. Non-residential construction starts in the city during 1970 were 30% lower than they were in 1969, as compared to a national decrease of only 4%. To further illustrate this decline, according to a recent Chamber of Commerce study, 41% of the businesses in Newark found it necessary to curtail expansion of capital facilities during 1970. Finally, and perhaps most significant of all, of the businesses included in the Chamber's study, only 38% showed an increase in profit during the past year. The national economic downturn, which comes at a time when many of the city's businesses are at a marginal profit level, when capital expansion is at a dangerously low rate, and when the city's employment growth rate is considerably lower than that of the surrounding area, seriously threatens the possibility of any future economic recovery.

The employment picture in Newark is equally dismal. Traditionally, city residents have found the greatest employment opportunities in the manufacturing industry. Yet manufacturing has steadily declined in Newark. The service field, on the other hand, has grown over the past two decades. The new positions in this sector, however, require a degree of skill found mostly among the suburbanites. Consequently, although employment within the city has remained relatively constant, an ever increasing percentage of those employed in Newark are commuters. Current statistics reveal that 15,000 people, or over 11% of the resident labor force, are presently unemployed. Another 35,000 people are employed either full-time or part-time at a rate of under \$3000 per annum. Still another 17,000 are being underutilized. Hard statistics reflects a human tragedy: One out

of every two people in Newark interested in jobs cannot find adequate employment. It is difficult to conceive of a more drastic situation that what has just been described, yet it should be pointed out that youths aged 16-22 make up 30% of those without adequate employment. Further, unemployment for youths of that age is at an alarming 34%. The future of Newark and every other city is in their hands!

Newark's financial difficulties extend beyond the private sector into the public sector. The present budget crisis, which threatens to bankrupt the city, was brought on by a 10% decrease in city revenues coupled with an increase of \$50 million in expenditures, bringing the total deficit to \$70 million. The additional \$50 million in expenditures, largely mandated appropriations for essential municipal services, raised the city's total expenses for 1970 to \$211 million. Tragically, even this sum will not begin to slow the physical decay of the city, or measurably improve the quality of life of the city's residents.

Upon taking office, I was faced with three alternatives to solve our financial dilemma. The first alternative was to raise Newark's property tax by 50%. I rejected this possibility for many reasons, primarily because Newark's property tax is presently among the highest in the nation, and considered confiscatory by experts. Property owners are already abandoning property in such large numbers that the city can only collect 88% of what it levies (compared to 97% for New York City). When the city takes over property and attempts to sell it for taxes, no one wants to buy it. (A recent sale of 400 properties had buyers for less than a dozen.) As a result, the city is forced to collect rents on abandoned properties to cover taxes, and is fast becoming the biggest landlord in the city.

The second alternative was to enact an earnings tax which would have required suburbanites who work in Newark to share in its financial burdens. I considered this alternative the most equitable because Newark provides employment for more non-residents, giving the city one of the highest commuting rates in the country. This influx results in an overtaxing of the city's physical facilities—roads, police, hospitals, and fire departments—which is extremely difficult to finance with our meager tax base. Unfortunately, this proposal was summarily rejected by the suburban-dominated New Jersey legislature.

The third alternative was a self-help program whereby the city of Newark would impose a series of taxes on payroll, occupancy, and sales. We realized that these temporary measures were regressive and discriminatory and would further inhibit the economic growth potential of the city, but they were preferable to the destruction of Newark through increases in the confiscatory property taxes or municipal bankruptcy. If we were to adopt these measures, we would still face a \$35 million deficit. And this deficit, to repeat, merely reflects mandated increases in services and decline in revenues, and does not reflect any new or innovative programs or any significant improvement in the living conditions within our city.

Our deficit for 1971 may be even larger than estimated. The teachers union has presented demands which we have estimated would more than double the already skyrocketing school budget of \$90 million. Police and firemen are also demanding more in contract negotiations. (Contracts with municipal unions were recently required by state law.) Furthermore, we must pay about 30% of county expenses and the county has budget requests for 1971 of \$120 million, a one-third increase over 1970. More impor-

tantly and to place this discussion in its proper framework, let me point out that even if we succeed in filling this budget gap, we will still be left with the problems of arresting the physical deterioration of our city and strengthening our people's faith in the ability of our institutions to provide essential services. That we have thus far failed to fulfill our obligation to the citizenry of Newark is evident in every aspect of urban life.

For instance, in education, which I have personally declared my number one priority item, we are saddled with an ancient physical plant and an inadequate per pupil municipal expenditure. In an area where it is generally agreed the need for compensatory and innovative programs for the inner-city resident is most badly needed, Newark has not been able to match suburban areas in per pupil average expenditures; we spend less than \$650 in educating each pupil, as compared to an average expenditure of over \$800 in suburban Jersey districts. Our physical structures were allowed to deteriorate for many years—between 1930 and 1955, for instance, only three new elementary schools were constructed. Of Newark's eighty-four schools, almost half were built over sixty years ago. And while there is no direct correlation between drop-out rates and new school buildings, it seems clear to me that a city with one of the highest high school drop-out rates in the country (24%) must be able to utilize enormous resources for physical rehabilitation and innovative programs if the classroom is to become once again a meaningful and productive learning environment for all our inner-city children.

In housing, Newark's needs appear even more staggering. Nearly eighty per cent of our dwelling units are at least forty years old (and the great majority of these are wooden frame dwellings). As of 1967, thirty per cent of the city's housing supply, or about 41,000 units, were clearly substandard; that is, they could not be rehabilitated and had to be totally replaced. And while the process of physical deterioration continues largely unabated, and while the demand for shelter increases sharply, substantial resources have not yet been harnessed to make an impact on the problem. A dramatic illustration is that residential construction in Newark declined from \$3,982,000 in 1969 to only \$165,000 in 1970.

The unemployment crises which has plagued Newark has had a marked effect on welfare programs. Presently over 114,000 of Newark's 400,000 residents, fully 30% of its population, is receiving some form of public assistance. Both the percentage and the absolute numbers are increasing. Welfare costs in the city have risen from \$42 million in 1966 to \$87 million in 1970.

The list of problems, the areas which are in desperate need of new money, runs the full spectrum of city services and basic urban institutions. In recreation, Newark has less acreage per 1,000 population than any other "old" city within the New York region. The streets and sidewalks of Newark are in desperate need of renovation. 54% of Newark's sewers are 75 to 100 years old. Effective law enforcement may be impaired without considerable expansion of the city's 1400-man department, and the Fire Department is handicapped by deficient maintenance and the lack of a fire training center. Finally, in the all-important fight against pollution, Newark has been forced into the role of spectator.

What began in Newark 25 years ago as an almost imperceptible decline of its educational facilities and other essential services has resulted in a physical, social and financial atrophy unmatched in the post depres-

sion era. The resources with which to provide safe, efficient new schools, to assure every citizen an adequate, sound dwelling unit, and to support all our people at adequate maintenance levels, are simply not to be found within the confines of the City of Newark.

The cry from Newark is becoming the all too familiar appeal for national solutions to urban problems. The cry can only be answered by the Congress, the Senate, the President, the State Legislatures, the Governors, local officials, and private industry—and the answer must be a bold, affirmative commitment to act before it is too late.

I caution you: do not misunderstand the implications of urban decay and collapse. As I have said many times before, "Wherever America's cities are going, Newark will get there first." We are not only talking about saving the Newarks of America, we are talking of saving America itself.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To remedy the ills which afflict Newark and the other urban centers of our country, I propose the following:

A. Employment

1. The present system of unemployment compensation should be modified so as to provide higher benefits and a longer period of eligibility during inflationary and high unemployment periods and/or in areas of high unemployment.

2. The Comprehensive Manpower Training Act of 1970 should be enacted so as to provide the needed employment and training for many disadvantaged city dwellers.

B. Welfare reform

1. The Federal Government should assume the full cost of all public assistance programs, thus insuring equal treatment throughout the country.

2. The present proposed minimum support levels should be dramatically raised so as to recognize the increased cost of providing a decent and adequate standard of living.

3. Welfare reform should be coupled with a universally-available network of day care centers.

C. Housing

1. Congress should declare "Housing Disaster Areas" for various sections of the country, specifically in urban areas. This would include massive infusion of monies for land acquisition and assembly, housing development, mortgage subsidies, employment training, etc.

2. All future federally funded housing should be available for sale, not rental. This would eliminate absentee landlord problems and instill a sense of "pride in ownership" which is now totally lacking.

3. All federal housing programs should strive to recreate the neighborhood concept, once indigenous to the nation's urban centers.

D. Revenue sharing

1. The Congress should enact immediately a revenue sharing program. This should not replace existing categorical programs but should be "new" money with a committee of Congressmen and Senators appointed to oversee the expenditure of funds.

E. Health

1. A national health insurance plan should be enacted as soon as possible.

F. Private industry

1. Congress should enact legislation whereby businesses are encouraged, through tax incentives, to locate in the urban centers. This will allow the cities to restore their tax bases and encourage industry to take a more energetic role in the revitalization of our cities.

TABLE I.—EMPLOYMENT OF NEWARK RESIDENTS (A 5-YEAR COMPARISON)

	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971 (projected)
City of Newark:					
Adequately employed.....	76,071	73,621	71,171	67,270	63,420
Underemployed.....	16,700	16,900	17,100	17,350	17,700
Low income employed.....	34,000	34,250	34,500	35,000	36,000
Unemployed.....	15,000	14,500	14,000	15,000	16,000
Not in the labor force but 16 years of age or older.....	106,862	106,862	106,862	106,862	106,865
Under 16 years of age.....	139,435	139,935	140,435	140,935	141,435
Total population.....	388,068	386,068	384,068	382,417	381,417
Unemployment rate.....	10.6	10.4	10.2	11.1	12.0

TABLE II.—NEWARK'S REAL ESTATE TAXES (A 5-YEAR COMPARISON)

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Land.....	\$313,000,000	\$289,000,000	\$285,000,000	\$283,000,000	\$277,000,000
Improvements on land.....	954,000,000	958,000,000	941,000,000	936,000,000	890,000,000
Taxable base.....	1,267,000,000	1,247,000,000	1,226,000,000	1,219,000,000	1,167,000,000
Rate.....	5.97	7.76	7.90	8.30	8.44
Tax imposed.....	74,000,000	97,000,000	97,000,000	101,000,000	98,000,000
Tax collected.....	65,000,000	84,000,000	85,000,000	87,000,000	86,000,000

TABLE III.—PUBLIC ASSISTANCE IN NEWARK (A 5-YEAR COMPARISON)

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Dollars expended in Newark.....	\$42,400,000	\$52,100,000	\$60,000,000	\$78,400,000	\$87,000,000
Number of people receiving benefits.....	47,000	58,000	67,000	89,000	114,000
Cost to Newark.....	\$5,800,000	\$7,900,000	\$9,100,000	\$7,400,000	\$7,000,000

EFFORT MADE TO END DRAFT

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the growing public interest in the concept of an all-volunteer army is nowhere better exemplified than in the efforts of a young ROTC cadet, Paul P. Christopher, who comes from Wakefield, Mass. He plans a career in the armed services. In 1967, concerned with the effects that the anti-war protests were having on the morale of our fighting men in Vietnam, he organized a rally in Wakefield for the purpose of demonstrating America's appreciation of their service, their courage, and their sacrifice.

He is now organizing a letter-writing campaign designed to end the draft and to replace it with an all-volunteer army.

Paul is an outstanding young man, immensely concerned with the quality of life in America and the future of this Nation. He is atune to the problems and anxieties of youth, and has been working hard to provide a channel by which they can express their views and make their influence felt in the policymaking process.

As one who sees in Paul's efforts the kind of constructive, responsible, and thoughtful action by which our youth can develop the leadership capabilities they will need for the future, and as one who concurs with the need for an all-volunteer army, I am delighted to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the following article which appeared in the Boston Record on January 2 of this year:

YOUTH STARTS ANTIDRAFT DRIVE

(By Dave O'Brian)

A 22-year-old junior at Norwich University in Vermont has started a letter-writing cam-

paigned designed to end the draft and replace it with an all-volunteer army.

Paul P. Christopher of Wakefield, who is attending school on a full ROTC scholarship and plans a career in the armed services, has formed a campus group called the ROTC Action Committee.

Composed of Christopher and two other Norwich juniors, the group is sending anti-draft literature to senior ROTC cadets and class presidents at all 347 schools across the country that have ROTC units.

Christopher is asking that all 109,900 ROTC cadets in the country write their congressmen demanding an all-volunteer army.

Organizing crusades is nothing new to Paul Christopher. In October of 1967 he organized a Wakefield rally in support of servicemen in Vietnam which was attended by 50,000 persons. At the time, he was a high school student.

Now a business administration major, Christopher wants to be a career officer and admits he would be better off financially in a volunteer army with higher benefits.

But he has other motives. "The draft is antiquated," he said. "It is both unfair and unnecessary."

Also, Christopher believes that a volunteer army would "upgrade the quality of the armed services" and "improve the prestige of the soldier."

The letter-writing campaign began only a week and a half ago, but already, Christopher says, he has received 30 letters in response and all are favorable.

The other members of the group are John W. Walsh of Burlington and Joseph Donnelly of Troy, N.Y., both juniors.

MRS. KNIGHT'S YULE MESSAGE

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, through the years, as many of us know from experience, Frances Knight has done a marvelous job as head of the U.S. State Department's passport section. In fact,

it is difficult to know how anyone could have improved on her job.

In many instances, the press has been critical of bureaucracy in the Washington style. Frances Knight has been one who has received almost universal acclaim from the press for her efficiency, integrity, and perseverance—sometimes under the most difficult circumstances.

A few days ago, the Champaign-Urbana News Gazette did write an editorial regarding Frances Knight, and I append it herewith. I am sure that my colleagues will be happy to know that again, from the press, she has received an accolade to which she is entitled:

MRS. KNIGHT'S YULE MESSAGE

Frances G. Knight, head of the United States State Department's passport section, is a rarity among bureaucrats. She is outspoken, fearless in her determination to improve her section—which incidentally is one of the few offices in government which pay for themselves—and doesn't mind criticizing anyone who stands in her way.

Last Christmas Mrs. Knight sent out a letter, which was widely circulated, in which she warned that passports would take two weeks to process unless her section was granted additional funds. This Christmas she sent out another explaining delays were now as much as a month, and would get worse.

That's typical bureaucratic progress, but untypical honesty.

HON. WILLIAM MURPHY

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, January 2, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege to join my colleagues in paying tribute to my good friend Congressman WILLIAM MURPHY of Illinois who is retiring after 12 years of dedicated service in the House. It has been an honor to benefit not only from his views and knowledge but from his friendship as well.

BILL's reputation as a hard worker is well deserved. His service on the Foreign Affairs Committee and particularly his Chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs reflects his concern with the betterment of U.S. relations overseas. Yet his wisdom and concern with issues of national importance have by no means affected his devotion to his constituents. BILL is an outstanding example of the Congressman who effectively serves both the national interest and the interests of his local constituency. His service on the Chicago City Council and in other important posts in that great city have provided him with an insight on urban politics and problems that is greatly needed among public servants today. Chicago and his constituents have been most fortunate to be represented by such a man. They, as well as the House, will surely miss BILL.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate BILL MURPHY on his exemplary career in public service and particularly upon his years as a Member of the House of Representatives. I warmly wish him the best of success in the years ahead.