

Cascone and his wife, Giovanna Cascone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2255. A bill for the relief of Celestina Martorana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 2256. A bill for the relief of Lucile M. Atkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 2257. A bill for the relief of Erodita Agard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2258. A bill for the relief of Gisele Berjonneau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2259. A bill for the relief of Wallace Chevez and his wife, Tensie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2260. A bill for the relief of Neville Pigott and his wife, Laurel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2261. A bill for the relief of Mary May Stout; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2262. A bill for the relief of Mollie King Williams and Clarence Fitzroy Williams (husband and wife); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WHO SPEAKS FOR ETHNIC AMERICANS?

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is remarkable that very little national attention has been given to the problems of our ethnic Americans. They have worked hard, followed the rules and helped to build this great country. Yet they have a growing sense that their problems are unnoticed and their voices are unheard. I call to the attention of my colleagues an article, "Who Speaks for Ethnic Americans?" from the September 29, 1970 issue of the New York Times and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHO SPEAKS FOR ETHNIC AMERICANS?

(By Barbara Mikulski)

The Ethnic American is forgotten and forgotten. He is infuriated at being used and abused by the media, government and business. Pejorative epithets such as "pigs" and "racists" or slick, patronizing labels like the "silent majority" or "hard hats" are graphic examples of the lack of respect, understanding and appreciation of him and his way of life.

The Ethnic Americans are 40 million working class Americans who live primarily in 58 major industrial cities like Baltimore and Chicago. Our roots are in Central and Southern Europe. We have been in this country for one, two or three generations. We have made a maximum contribution to the U.S.A., yet received minimal recognition.

The ethnics came to America from the turn of the century through the twenties, until we were restricted by prejudicial immigration quotas—65,000 Anglo-Saxons to 300 Greeks. We came looking for political freedom and economic opportunity. Many fled from countries where there had been political, religious and cultural oppression for 1,000 years.

It was this working class which built the Great Cities—constructed the skyscrapers, operated the railroads, worked on the docks, factories, steel mills and in the mines. Though our labor was in demand, we were not accepted. Our names, language, food and cultural customs were the subject of ridicule. We were discriminated against by banks, institutions of higher learning and other organizations controlled by the Yankee Patriots. There were no protective mechanisms for safety, wages and tenure. We called ourselves Americans. We were called "wop," "polak" and "hunky."

For our own protection, we formed our own institutions and organizations and clung together in our new neighborhoods. We created communities like "Little Italy" and "Polish Hill." The ethnic parish church and the fraternal organizations like the Polish Womens'

Alliance and the Sons of Italy became the focal points of our culture.

These neighborhoods were genuine "urban villages." Warmth, charm and zesty communal spirit were their characteristics. People knew each other. This was true not only of relatives and friends but of the grocer, politician and priest. The people were proud, industrious and ambitious. All they wanted was a chance to "make it" in America.

Here we are in the 1970's, earning between \$5,000-\$10,000 per year. We are "near poor" economically. No one listens to our problems. The President's staff responds to our problems by patronizingly patting us on the head and putting pictures of construction workers on postage stamps. The media stereotypes us as gangsters or dumb clods in dirty sweat-shirts. The status of manual labor has been denigrated to the point where men are often embarrassed to say they are plumbers or tugboat operators. This robs men of the pride in their work and themselves.

The Ethnic American is losing ground economically. He is the victim of both inflation and anti-inflation measures. Though wages have increased by 20 per cent since the mid sixties, the purchasing power has remained the same. He is hurt by layoffs due to cutbacks in production and construction. Tight money policies strangle him with high interest rates for installment buying and mortgages. He is the man who at 40 is told by the factory bosses that he is too old to be promoted. The old job is often threatened by automation. At the same time, his expenses are at their peak. He is paying on his home and car, probably trying to put at least one child through college.

In pursuing his dream of home ownership, he finds that it becomes a millstone rather than a milestone in his life. Since FHA loans are primarily restricted to "new" housing, he cannot buy a house in the old neighborhood. He has no slick stocking lawyers or fancy lobbyists getting him tax breaks.

He believes in the espoused norms of American manhood like "a son should take care of his mother" and "a father should give his children every opportunity." Yet he is torn between putting out \$60 a month for his mother's arthritis medication or paying for his daughter's college tuition.

When the ethnic worker looks for some modest help, he is told that his income is too high. He's "too rich" to get help when his dad goes into a nursing home. Colleges make practically no effort to provide scholarships to kids named Costiani, Slukowski or Klima.

The one place where he felt the master of his fate and had status was in his own neighborhood. Now even that security is being threatened. He wants new schools for his children and recreation facilities for the entire family—not just the token wading pool for pre-schoolers or the occasional dance for teen-agers. He wants his street fixed and his garbage collected. He finds that the only thing being planned for his area are housing projects, expressways and fertilizer factories. When he goes to City Hall to make his problems known, he is either put off, put down or put out.

Liberals scapegoat us as racists. Yet there was no racial prejudice in our hearts when we came. There were very few black people in Poland or Lithuania. The elitists who now

smuggly call us racists are the ones who taught us the meaning of the word: their bigotry extended to those of a different class or national origin.

Government is further polarizing people by the creation of myths that black needs are being met. Thus the ethnic worker is fooled into thinking that the blacks are getting everything.

Old prejudices and new fears are ignited. The two groups end up fighting each other for the same jobs and competing so that the new schools and recreation centers will be built in their respective communities. What results is angry confrontation for tokens, when there should be an alliance for a whole new Agenda for America. This Agenda would be created if black and white organized separately in their own communities for their own needs and came together to form an alliance based on mutual issues, interdependence and respect. This alliance would develop new strategies for community organization and political restructuring. From this, the new Agenda for America would be generated. It could include such items as "new towns in town," innovative concepts of work and creative structures for community control.

What is necessary is to get rid of the guilt of phony liberals, control by economic elitists and manipulation by selfish politicians. Then, let us get on with creating the democratic and pluralistic society that we say we are.

CONGRESS MUST FACE DEMANDS OF NATION

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the 92d Congress, with its leadership now chosen and having received the President's state of the Union message, is now hopefully ready to get down to business. Many are asking, however, whether the change in the majority leadership will result in any better performance record than that of the previous Congress when more than 35 legislative proposals by the President were left unfinished. The State Journal of Lansing, Mich., in an editorial on Thursday, January 21, 1971, entitled "Congress Must Face the Demands of the Nation" discusses some of the challenges facing the new session and the new majority leadership and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

CONGRESS MUST FACE DEMANDS OF NATION

The fight for leadership of the Democratic controlled House of Representatives is over and, as expected, the "old guard" forces won easily with Rep. Carl Albert of Oklahoma the new speaker and Rep. Hale Boggs of Louisiana elected as House majority leader.

There will be some groans about defeat of the younger and more reform-minded groups

in the House in their bid for the top posts. But the struggle is over and the question now is what the new Democratic leadership will do to spur some action on the many crucial legislative issues which were left on the shelf during the 91st Congress.

While Congress did finally push through some strong and needed legislation last year, including the 18-year-old vote, anti-crime measures and auto pollution deadlines, it failed completely to act on many of President Nixon's larger reform measures.

Among them were proposals on reform of the nation's welfare system, federal-state and city revenue sharing, overhaul of the draft and consolidation of the federal grant-in-aid system. Moreover, the House and Senate provided little by way of alternatives to the President's proposals.

There was a hopeful note after Tuesday's House election when Boggs indicated that the new leadership would not spin wheels just debating administration proposals but would come up with alternative programs designed to bring compromise solutions and legislative action.

Rep. Albert and Rep. Boggs are capable men and legislative veterans. It can be hoped that they will now move to meet President Nixon's recent pledge of cooperation with the 92nd Congress to "let us mutually commit ourselves to work, and work hard, for the record of achievement we can all share."

While Albert and Boggs may be able to provide a more aggressive program in the House, the U.S. Senate presents a more difficult problem. It is here that much of the strongest and most vocal criticism of the administration has centered during the past two years. Months of legislative time were lost in the Senate in prolonged debates over the President's Vietnamization and troop withdrawal programs for Indochina.

In the end, the challengers failed to change the policies which won majority approval in both Houses. Several of the senators involved in that fight are now considered to be among possible Democratic presidential contenders for 1972.

Fears have been expressed that this could encourage an all out battle among the contenders to gain the best political position to challenge the President in 1972. This could easily lead to more legislative stalling during the next two years.

The nation, we believe, cannot afford that kind of an impasse. More than at any time in the past 30 years, Congress is faced with finding new answers to the multiple social, economic and environmental problems facing the nation. The President will need all the assistance he can get on the legislative front.

Congressmen, particularly the Democrats, will hardly accept every administration proposal. But the loyal opposition must provide leadership of its own to hammer out alternatives and compromise on needed legislation for the good of the nation.

President Nixon has offered his cooperation. It's up to Congress to do the same.

A SON SPEAKS OF HIS FATHER

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT Mr. Speaker. I want to include in the RECORD the remarks of Lucius Mendel Rivers, Jr., which were made at the gravesite of his father.

His words need no explanation or clarification:

REMARKS OF LUCIUS MENDEL RIVERS, JR., AT THE GRAVESITE OF HIS FATHER, THE LATE HONORABLE L. MENDEL RIVERS, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, DECEMBER 30, 1970

Today, L. Mendel Rivers is laid to rest. It is fitting that he be laid here in St. Stephen, among the people with whom he grew up, for in a very real sense L. Mendel Rivers was one of the people. Everything he was came from you, and it can fairly be said he was the product of you, his people. I hope you never forget this, because he never did.

L. Mendel Rivers was the quintessence of three very human, very wonderful qualities. First, he was dynamism, movement, ceaseless activity, that drew people to him like a magnet. Secondly, he was love, so that once he had drawn people to him they always stayed there. He had a large heart that was full of love for his people. And thirdly, he was courage. He chose his positions, his ideas with great care. But once he had taken a stand, he never wavered, he never deviated, he never detoured. He simply didn't know how.

I would like now to read to you one of my father's favorite poems:

Let me live out my years in the heat of blood.

Let me die drunken with the dreamer's wine. Let me not see this soul-house built of mud

Go toppling to the dust—
A vacant shrine.

Let me die quickly
Like a candle-light snuffed out
Just at the heyday of its glow.
Give me high noon—and let it then be night.
Thus would I go.

And grant that when I face the grisly thing,
My song may trumpet

Down the gray Perhaps.

Let me be as a tune-sweet fiddle string,
That feels the Master Melody—

And snaps!

L. Mendel Rivers died mourned by millions of people, and surrounded by his family. No man could ask for more.

On behalf of my family, I thank you for coming here today.

THE TELEVISION SERIES "THE EIGHTH DAY"

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. ADAMS Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Puget Sound Coalition of Washington State and television station KING of Seattle for their leadership in developing public awareness of the threat to our environment through the production and programming of a television series entitled the "Eighth Day."

The Puget Sound Coalition was founded to create a constituency which will demand a better future by promoting a mass public dialog, utilizing the television medium. During the fall of 1970 there were eight programs, and each defined a problem area and suggested some possible alternative directions for the Puget Sound region. Each program was broadcast five times and watched by 5,000 people organized into 400 discussion groups, plus well over 100,000 members of the general public. The discussion groups were organized and monitored by a consortium of 11 area colleges which trained the discus-

sion leaders and provided discussion guides and reference materials. The participation of the colleges was made possible by a grant of \$87,250 under title I of the Higher Education Act. The grant, administered through the State Planning and Community Affairs Agency was in a major way facilitated by KING's cooperation, both by providing a communications outlet and by an in-kind contribution of over \$90,000.

The groups were formed in many different ways—neighborhood friends, church related groups, and classes—the largest single group—school classes, various civic organizations, and volunteers. The organizational work of the colleges was bolstered by a KING-produced promotional film and a number of spot announcements. KING also mailed information to 16,000 area teachers and carried newspaper advertising.

George Nelson Associates conducted an extensive evaluation of the project, under a grant provided by the Public Broadcasting Corp. This not only established the success of the venture, but provided a great deal of helpful data. For example, although the organized group members were relatively more aware and concerned about social and environmental problems than the average citizen, 88 percent of them had engaged in no civic efforts to improve the quality of life in the area.

The success of the project, the "Eighth Day," was so great that a new project, the "Ninth Day," a series of follow-up meetings, has been instituted. This project is entirely independent from KING. The participants in the "Ninth Day" are hammering out their course of action. They are indeed part of that constituency which will demand a better future.

STATE OF THE UNION

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest and great expectation last Friday evening in this Chamber as President Nixon outlined his six great goals for America. Nor was I disappointed. I came away from that meeting convinced that what we had heard represented one of the most sweeping and constructive proposals for reform of the Federal Government ever put forward by an American Chief Executive. While other Presidents have advanced bold and ambitious programs in their state of the Union messages, here was one with an important difference. Instead of seeking more power for the Federal Government, President Nixon has called for a New American Revolution—a peaceful revolution in which power was turned back to the people—in which Government at all levels was refreshed and renewed and made truly responsive.

Reporter James M. Naughton of the New York Times observed of the message that:

While other Presidents have gone before Congress seeking more power to do more

things, President Nixon has now done the opposite . . . In time to come, his words may be viewed as a turning point in the philosophy of American government.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe we have reached a point in our history when we desperately need such a new philosophy and restructuring of Government. President Nixon explained the need quite succinctly and frankly when he said:

Let's face it. Most Americans today are simply fed up with government at all levels. They will not—and should not—continue to tolerate the gap between promise and performance.

In the six goals set forth by the President we have an opportunity to close that gap, to restore the confidence of the people in their Government by making Government more responsive to their needs and more subject to their control. For President Nixon was really addressing himself to the overriding crisis of our times—a crisis of the spirit, a crisis of alienation and frustration, of helplessness and powerlessness.

In these six goals of health and welfare reform, restoration of the environment and a prosperous peacetime economy, and a restructuring of the Federal Government and its relationship to State and local governments, we have a program around which all Americans can rally and with which we can go forward together as a nation.

Mr. Speaker, anything as bold and sweeping as the President has proposed is bound to meet with some resistance and involve some controversy. The President has no delusions about this. But I would sincerely hope that this does not deteriorate into a partisan debate, for these are not Republican or Democratic goals—they are goals for America. We are united in our concern about the state of the economy, our environment and our health care system. And there is near unanimous agreement that the welfare system is in drastic need of overhaul.

Perhaps the most controversy will revolve around the Federal reorganization plan and revenue sharing. Some have even charged that these are merely political gimmicks. Such criticism is highly irresponsible. The reorganization plan is not only the result of extensive study by the Ash Commission under this administration; it is similar in many respects to the recommendations of the Heineman Commission of the Johnson administration. By the same token, revenue sharing can hardly be termed a partisan issue; one of its most ardent supporters was Dr. Walter Heller, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers in the Johnson administration. Revenue sharing is supported by the vast majority of Governors and mayors, regardless of political affiliation. And a Gallup poll published just last weekend reveals that 77 percent of the American people favor the concept and only 14 percent oppose it. A further breakdown shows that support cuts across party lines, with 77 percent support from Democrats interviewed, 81 percent from Republicans, and 73 percent from independents.

And so, Mr. Speaker, my appeal today is for us to approach these six great goals in a spirit of partnership rather

than partisanship. The President has made his appeal to the entire Nation, but it is up to us—to the Congress—to act. The Chicago Tribune, in its customarily pointed and realistic editorial style, observed that the most appealing and most fundamental part of the speech was the suggestion that Government power should be centralized, then said:

Of course, this would mean a corresponding reduction of the power of Congress, and this may help to explain the cool reception Mr. Nixon's speech received from the floor. It also emphasizes the importance and the difficulty of obtaining the cooperation from Congress which Mr. Nixon rightly says is necessary if the country is to meet the many problems which face it.

The Tribune editorial concluded:

The state of the Union is, indeed, troublesome. But in the decentralization of power, we believe Mr. Nixon has one goal which will make it easier to reach other goals. If Congress is willing, it is one that can be attained relatively easily.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to begin the process of turning power and resources back from Washington to the people in the States and localities from which that power originally came. May we rise to the challenge with the courage and unity required of us. The President himself made a similar plea when he said:

So let us pledge together to go forward together—by achieving these goals to give America the foundation today for a greatness tomorrow and all the years to come—and in so doing to make this the greatest Congress in the history of this great and good nation.

Mr. Speaker, I join in that hope that this 92d Congress will go down in history as one of the greatest, and I look forward to working closely with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for those goals which can unite us as a Congress and as a nation.

ERNEST W. MCFARLAND

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, a column written in the December 25, 1970, issue of the Arizona Republic by Bernie Wynn, the political editor, is of particular interest to the Members of the House and Senate who remember Ernest W. McFarland, of Arizona, as a Member of the U.S. Senate. Senator McFarland served his State and Nation well. He became one of the leaders of the Senate, serving in his last term as majority leader. He was responsible for the enactment of much of the legislation of the Truman administration. After his service in the Senate, Ernest McFarland served his State as Governor for two terms, and has served most recently as chief justice of the supreme court of the State. He is one of Arizona's most distinguished citizens, as the article by Mr. Wynn ably points out.

ERNEST W. MCFARLAND

(By Bernie Wynn)

Arizona leaders, regardless of political party, should get together and plan a statewide testimonial dinner for Arizona Supreme Court Justice Ernest W. McFarland, who is retiring from the bench.

Such an occasion would give the older citizens of Arizona an opportunity to thank the 75-year-old jurist for his many contributions to the state during the past 50 years.

Moreover, it would give the relatively new citizen here a chance to see a really unique public servant and one who has served with distinction in the state's executive, legislative and judicial branches.

In fact, McFarland is believed to be the only man in the United States to have been elected to top positions in each of the three branches of government.

Born in a log cabin in Oklahoma, McFarland came to Arizona in 1919 shortly after being mustered out of the U.S. Navy. He worked for a short time as a bookkeeper for the Valley National Bank and then went to Stanford University, where he received his juris doctorate in law and a master's degree in political science. (Before he was called to the Navy during World War I, McFarland had obtained his bachelor of arts degree from the University of Oklahoma and had taught briefly in a rural school.)

Returning from the university, McFarland hung out his shingle at Casa Grande, became assistant attorney general for a couple of years and was then elected Pinal County attorney for six years.

He next was elected judge of the Pinal County Superior Court for three consecutive terms and in 1940, with war clouds hovering over the land won election to the U.S. Senate.

McFarland was elected to a second Senate term in 1946 and became the Democratic majority leader in 1951-52 under Harry Truman and Vice President Alben Barkley.

"I must say I enjoyed my associations with my colleagues in the Senate more than anything else," McFarland recalled. "I had some very close friends from both sides of the aisle."

In 1952, Phoenix Councilman Barry Goldwater defeated McFarland. This might have ended his political career.

But Mac bounced back to be elected governor two years later and in 1958 was re-elected to a second term.

A friend of the judge recalled sitting up until 4 a.m. in a Washington hotel room while Gov. McFarland put together, paragraph by paragraph, a highly successful argument in defense of the Central Arizona Project before the U.S. Supreme Court. As senator, McFarland twice guided the CAP through the Senate, only to lose the important reclamation measure in the House.

Not content with all this, McFarland ran for the Arizona Supreme Court in 1964 and was elected to a six-year term which he finishes Jan. 4.

Strangely, he remembers with the greatest satisfaction not his hobnobbing with the mighty in the U.S. Senate and White House, nor his influence as the state's governor.

"The position that I really enjoyed the most was judge of the Pinal Superior Court," he recalled. "It represented an important step up in my profession."

Trim and vigorous, Justice McFarland could pass for 60. He isn't about to retire—"I don't like that word." He's going back to private law practice, either in Phoenix or in Pinal County.

The secret of his success?

"I always made a point to enjoy my work no matter what I was doing," he said. "Otherwise a man gets no enjoyment from life."

Asked this same question at the annual Christmas party of Pinal County lawyers, Mrs. McFarland confided:

"It's because he could never hold a grudge, no matter what."

CONVERSION RESEARCH AND
EDUCATION ACT OF 1971

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, during the second session of the 91st Congress, 54 of our colleagues joined with me to co-sponsor the Conversion Research and Education Act (H.R. 19037), a measure to involve our defense and space-oriented scientists, engineers, and technicians in efforts to meet our pressing environmental, transportation, housing, health, and other domestic research and development needs. Shocking unemployment among the highly skilled scientific, engineering, and technical professions makes necessary prompt action to prevent the total dissolution of the American scientific community—a community vital to the Nation's economic health and national defense. The substantial support given this measure in the 91st Congress by members of both parties, by business and labor, and by the scientific and technical community is convincing evidence that sufficient momentum can be built to enact this important measure into law.

On Thursday, January 21, 1971, I introduced the Conversion Research and Education Act of 1971. Joining me as chief cosponsor of the measure was the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS), chairman of the House Science, Research, and Development Subcommittee. The bill is similar to last year's legislation; however, there are two significant new provisions which authorize the National Science Foundation to provide grants to State and local governments to encourage the establishment of State and regional conversion planning commissions, and to make grants to community conversion corporations.

The impact of cuts in defense and space spending on research and development is reflected in the following statistics:

First. Approximately 83 percent of all federally funded research and development is carried out by the Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Over \$14 billion is being spent on R. & D. by these three agencies alone.

Second. More than 2 million scientists, engineers, and technicians are currently employed by Government and industry. Of those in industry, one in every four is engaged in defense related work. Of those in Government, one in every two is employed by DOD, NASA, or the AEC.

It is obvious, therefore, that we cannot talk about reordering our national priorities unless we provide for a smooth transition to a peacetime economy. I believe that this bill would create a solid foundation for economic conversion.

Because of the widespread interest in this measure, the gentleman from Geor-

gia (Mr. DAVIS) and I plan to reintroduce the Conversion Research and Education Act of 1971 on Tuesday, February 9, 1971. Also, we intend to obtain a special order on that day, and we invite our colleagues to participate.

For the information of the Members, an analysis of H.R. 19037, a list of co-sponsors, and a conversion fact sheet appear on pages 32239-32246 of the September 16, 1970, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A BLACK LOOKS AT AMERICA'S
OPPORTUNITIES

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, in today's political arena, shrill and divisive cries arise from both ends of the political spectrum. We are either badgered by such maxims as "Speak what's right, not what's wrong, about America" or are constantly assaulted by criticisms of our way of life.

It is not often that we find a middle ground that is articulated in a well-reasoned and modulated tone such as in the following address by Mr. Charles Lloyd, founder of Youth Inspirational Foundation of America. He simply states that this is the greatest country the world has known, with boundless opportunities and the maximum amount of freedom possible. Yet he acknowledges that there are difficult problems that must be overcome if we are to retain these treasured values, and rightfully urges us to expend our efforts on constructive programs to solve these problems. I commend this speech to your attention:

A BLACK LOOKS AT AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITIES

We live today in the greatest country on the face of the earth and in the history of the world. America is not perfect, and there are those of us who would compare her to some utopia that does not exist anywhere else in the world and never has. But compare America with any other country on the face of the earth and she will come out number one.

Let me tell you something about my background. When I was 6 years old, in Mississippi, I was called a "filthy nigger." Walking along the road to school, I have had white children on the school bus spit out the window on me. My father told me when I was 16 years old that, "You are wasting your time going to school. You can never be anything but a dishwasher."

I might have reacted in one of three ways. First, I might have been a dishwasher. Second, I might have been an attorney with an extremely negative viewpoint. Or, third, I could concentrate on all the good things in my life and that was my choice.

Let me tell you about the good, because I believe the good is the most important. I was inspired to become an attorney by a white man in Mississippi. I went to his office when I was 9 years of age and I realized that they lived better than we did! So why not follow that path?

CALIFORNIA

When I was 20 years of age, I took the police exam and went through the Los Angeles Police Academy at the same time working my way through law school. After graduation from USC's law school, I was employed by the City Attorney's office. I won 140 out of

145 jury trials in which 99% of the jurors were white and 95% of the lawyers were white. If the people had voted along racial lines, I would not have won a case. I cannot be a racist with such an experience.

I would like to say to the disadvantaged people of America that of course it is more difficult for some people in America to succeed than others. But it still does not relieve them of their responsibility for *doing the best they can*. A generation of Americans have been anaesthetized into believing that the world owes them something. The world does not owe anyone a thing. I am the first to say that there must be increased opportunities for the disadvantaged Americans—and disadvantaged Americans come in all colors. When the NBC and CBS specials were shown a year or two ago, we saw millions of whites starving to death in Appalachia and that is unequivocally wrong.

PARADOX OF GREATNESS

My youngest brother and I were born on the same day 16 years apart. He was in Cambodia and is in Vietnam now, yet the undisputed fact is that there are places in the United States where I, as a black, loyal, dedicated American, cannot buy a hamburger!

Now there are those in our society who would say that I am a militant. If taking extreme exception to any indignity makes me a militant, I say, as a great American said a long time ago, make the most of it. Conversely, if respecting myself, my fellow man, and loving America make me an Uncle Tom, then I say with equal vigor make the most of that too.

We must stop the name calling. The overwhelming majority of Americans are good, fine, law abiding, decent people. Yet, this same majority also is apathetic and indifferent. Apathy and indifference have permitted lynchings to occur in America. There still are places in America where I cannot live. There are places in America where I cannot work. There are places in America where I cannot eat. And yet, let me say to the disadvantaged, don't wallow in your misery. Look within to the inner man, that's where the answers are. Become *solution oriented* as opposed to *problem oriented*. I would say to the disadvantaged, let's look up and live. Hate, envy, name-calling all are destructive forces.

It is time for Americans of good will to come together. There is a silent black majority in America and this segment of the black community has not received the publicity. The H. Rap Browns and the Stokely Carmichaels of the world have been depicted as the "representatives" of the blacks. I say that they do not represent the blacks any more than I believe the Ku Klux Klan and the Minutemen represent you.

A POSITIVE PROGRAM

I was addressing a service club and a fellow said, why aren't you out speaking in the ghettos of America? My answer was simple. I would like to. I would like to go all over America. I have a message that I would give in Mississippi and that I would give at Harvard University. It is that the United States is the greatest country on the face of the earth and opportunity is greater here for all than in any other country. But, as great as America is, if the disadvantaged millions of Americans were enabled to contribute to her greatness, America would be even greater.

On April 19 of this year, I founded a non-profit organization called The Youth Inspiration Foundation of America. I am the first to concede that it is not a panacea for all ills. We operate mainly in two areas: motivation of and inspiration of disadvantaged youth. I believe that throughout history properly motivated people have done the impossible because they did not know that it could not be done.

When I watch television and see a black at Harvard or Columbia it gives me heartache to see a group of dissidents causing him to feel sorry for himself. If you had a

friend who was a hunchback, you would not spend all of your time making him feel sorry for himself. You would tell him: look, it is more difficult for you, but you can do it. And, that is what I want to say to the disadvantaged. *Today is the first day of the rest of your life.* America is not going to be destroyed. America is going to be preserved. There is nobody in the world who is more aware of the indignities and atrocities than a black from Mississippi. Yet, I can say that America is the greatest country on the face of the earth and in the history of the world.

My political philosophy is not one of "love it or leave it," it is one of love it and stay here and make it better. I believe that I am qualified by experience to take this message of hope to millions of disadvantaged Americans. Recently, negativism has been equated with intellectualism. This is asinine. Anyone can complain. We must ask the enemies of this country—those who would destroy it—what system would they offer in its place?

PARADISE LOST

There are conditions in Los Angeles as well as Mississippi that in good conscience ought to be changed.

I worked on the Los Angeles Police Department for 6 years and 3 months and for 6 of those years there was iron-clad segregation of the police department. That was why I was able to go to law school full time and work full time—I got the night shift! They had token integration at Central High School in Arkansas before the Los Angeles Police Department was integrated.

Many of you would say that you grew up here in Los Angeles but knew nothing about the problem. It isn't only past tense, it is still a problem, and it is an American problem. It is time for the people of good will, who are in the overwhelming majority, to stand up for what is right. Now, it is unfair to ask me to talk to 7 sleepy widows at an afternoon social about the positive aspects of American life, when those people who are talking about the destruction of this country are appearing on nationwide television.

The Youth Inspirational Foundation of America would like to implement its program of motivating the disadvantaged youth. Here is one example of motivation; Mr. S. Kenneth Davidson, the former owner of the Oakland Oaks basketball team, told me that a young white boy with whom I had spoken had cried, "If a black from Mississippi can do it, I know I can do it. I know I can do it." "I can" must become the watchword of the hour and not "I can't." No one can offer an easy solution for success. There are millions of Americans who, if they knew the price one has to pay for success, would not be willing to pay; they don't want it that badly.

A group of young Americans has been anaesthetized into believing that one day some politician is going to be elected and solve all the problems of the world. But it is my humble belief that individual responsibility, self-help, self-improvement, and self-betterment will ensure success; yet, no one can stay motivated forever. There must be increased opportunity for disadvantaged Americans. Those of us who are in the majority have to become concerned. If we do not become concerned the cherished freedoms that we enjoy now and the opportunities that we enjoy now will be with us no longer. Freedom is not free. We must pay the price.

POSITIVE EXPOSURE

The Youth Inspirational Foundation would like the same kind of exposure on nationwide television and radio and in newspapers that negative causes receive. With a counseling staff all over America the message would be the same: *that you are rightfully proud to be an American.*

It is so difficult to get the message across when you are talking about the positive aspects of American life. If I had indicated

that I was going to burn down the Biltmore Hotel or the county courthouse, the news media would be here in greater numbers than police officers. But, I have a message that is good and it should be carried to the four corners of the United States. It would give people hope, it would make them strong and vibrant, and let them know that they can "overcome." A good man said a long time ago, "Inasmuch as you have done it unto the least of these my brethren you have done it unto me." I believe that.

It is difficult to be black and there are very real problems in the United States in 1970. But I believe that the greatest country on the face of the earth can overcome these problems. And I believe that the transformation can take place within the framework of organized society and within the ambit of law and order.

OPPORTUNITY OR VIOLENCE

I am unalterably opposed to violence in any form. Violence must be put down with vigor. But increased opportunity must be forthcoming. I believe that dissent is healthy. Let us forget, one of the things that makes America great is the right to dissent. Love, goodwill, and concern must be the watchwords of the hour.

I stand here a black man with long sideburns. The next time you are riding down the street and you see a black man don't say to yourself, oh, there's a Black Panther. You cannot judge a person's heart by the color of his skin, the style of his hair, or his mode of dress.

America is the hope of the world. We should expend more effort and energy upon constructive programs.

SAN LEANDRO'S CITIZENS OF THE YEAR

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, each year the Morning News, a newspaper published in San Leandro, Calif., selects several outstanding citizens of that city for recognition of their contributions to the welfare of that community. This feature is part of the publication of the annual progress edition of the Morning News, which highlights activities during the past year of the local municipal administration and its commissions and boards, local business and labor organizations, civic clubs and fraternal organizations and many other groups, all of which make San Leandro a progressive and enjoyable place in which to live.

This is in the best tradition of public service by this hometown newspaper, which seeks not only to inform but also to involve its readers in community affairs. Mr. Abe Kofman, publisher, and his special editions editor, Mr. Robert "Bill" Bird, have put together an interesting and informative chronicle of San Leandro's accomplishments of which all of its citizens can be proud.

This year the Morning News has selected as its outstanding citizens of the year Mr. Joe Soares, Mr. Milt Murdock, Councilman Mario Polvorosa, and Judge William D. Spruance, Jr. Each of these men are to be congratulated on having been selected for this honor arising out

of their unselfish dedication to their community.

An article which appeared as part of the aforementioned progress edition of the Morning News on December 31, 1970, sets forth their many civic activities; and I am most pleased to insert it at this point in the RECORD:

SAN LEANDRO'S CITIZENS OF THE YEAR

(NOTE.—Each year, the Morning News Edition nominates worthy San Leandro residents as San Leandro's Citizens of the Year. This year, we are nominating four individuals who we believe have contributed greatly to the progress of the city of San Leandro not only in 1970 but for the past many years. These citizens are Joe Soares, Milt Murdock, William Spruance Jr. and Mario Polvorosa. The reasons why we chose these individuals are cited below.)

Nearly everyone knows how to get in touch with Joe Soares. If you can't find him at home: call San Leandro Boys Club.

Joe Soares, past, present and future has made his second home the residence of many homeless boys who have found company there and a proper place to grow up.

"I know a lot of kids who have pool tables, swimming pools and a lot of other pretty expensive things," Soares said. "But when I walk in that Boys Club and see the simple things we've done, I know I always want to be for the club.

"That is the place you go to make a man into a child who has no other place to go," he said. "He can grow up there; that alone makes me feel proud."

Owner and operator of S & R Pickup Service, Soares served as president of the boys club for two terms and said he "looks forward" to his coming term as president of its Dad's Club.

A leading money raiser for community needs' Soares is responsible for the yearly "steak feed" gathering by Oakland's Raiders which benefits the Boys Club. Soares personally sponsors the great supper each year and entertains party-goers in his own back yard.

Soares attended Lincoln School in San Leandro and worked for the city from 1945 to 1951 as a scavenger. He went into his present scavenger business in 1951 and moved the entire operation to improved and enlarged facilities at 2626 Nicholson in October of this year.

The new headquarters for his business is comprised of three large, private offices for Helen Gregory, office manager; Ernie Fazio, general manager; and Soares, as president.

A large fenced yard behind the offices and maintenance area ensures convenient and safe parking of equipment. The entire new facility is built on 5400 square feet of space.

Soares started his business at his own home on Alvarado with a single truck. His fleet now numbers nine modern, heavy-duty trucks that handle industrial and commercial wastes by the volume.

Married to his wife Yvonne since they both were 19 (43 years of marriage), Soares has two daughters, Beverly (Mrs. Richard Paulson); and Barbara (Mrs. Everett Gragg); and seven grandchildren.

"Maybe I was all for the Boys Club because I raised daughters," Soares said. "I don't really know. When you're 61, you're proud to have anything to do with that fine place."

Milt Murdock also carries a nomination for Citizen of the Year award, owing to his broad spectrum of action when it comes to San Leandro civic doings.

Also active in San Leandro Boys Club, Murdock is past president of the Lions Club, and is a member of the board of directors of Northern California Safety Society, receiving that agency's Society Safety Award.

Murdock is a member of American Safety Engineers, which has given him numerous technical advancements awards, and is vice

president of the board of directors of California Dispensers Association.

He is a member of the board of directors of Optical Employers Association, and belongs to the Governor's Safety Committee. A member of the Elks Club and the Rotary Club. Murdock is on the board of directors for both the Green Cross National Safety Council (10 years' service); and Northern California Society for the Prevention of Blindness (five years).

A recipient of a public service award for the State of California presented by Governor Ronald Reagan, he is past chairman for the United Crusade, Small Business Division, and is a member of the Athenian Nile Club.

Murdock received a public service award from Kaiser Industries and later received the U.S. Air Force Civilian Award. He served a tour of duty with the Air Force and its Reserve Forces for nine years and attended Oakland Junior College, University of California and Harvard School of Business.

Murdock and his wife, Betty, have two children, Kirk, 8, and Jan, 6, and enjoy golfing and swimming together.

Another member of the honored group of Citizens of the Year is attorney William D. Spruance Jr. partner in Spruance, Simonian and Pretzen. Spruance was elected judge of San Leandro Hayward Municipal Court and comes into his high judicial position from a thorough past grounding in law.

A member of California Bar Asso. since 1952, Spruance is a past member of the board of directors of Alameda County Bar Asso. He is affiliated with California Trial Lawyers and American Trial Lawyers Associations, as well as Fee Arbitration, Membership and Roster Committees, Alameda County Bar Asso.

Past secretary of San Leandro Junior Chamber of Commerce (1954 and 1955), he is a past president of that agency and served as its state director in 1956 and 1957.

Spruance is past president of San Leandro Beavers Swim Club and has been a member of San Leandro Boys Club since 1959. He also has served the Boys Club as a member of its executive committee since 1963 and was its first vice president in 1964. Past president of the club (for two years). Spruance was chairman of the "Holiday on Ice" benefit for the club in 1949 and 1970.

He was formerly membership chairman for Charwood district, Boy Scouts of America and is a past member of the board of directors for Southern Alameda County Trade Club.

Past member of the board of directors for Southern Alameda Trade Club, he was recipient of a Man and Boy Award in 1969 and was past master of San Leandro Masonic Lodge in 1963. Spruance is a member of East Oakland Rotary, Oakland Consistory Scottish Rite, Ashmes Temple, Scimitar Club, San Leandro Elks and Eagles, Southern Alameda Shrine, and San Leandro High Twelve Club.

He received an Eagles Civic Award in 1970 and now serves as a member of the board of directors of the Family Service Agency for Central Alameda County. He also is a member of the board of directors for Teen Center of San Leandro.

Serving a tour of duty with the U.S. Navy during World War II, he is married with three children and has lived in San Leandro for 15 years, having held a private law practice in the County for 18 years.

He enjoys golf as a favorite hobby.

Mario Polvorosa is the fourth member of the cadre of nominees for Citizen of the Year.

This man did not rest on his "laurels" from previous years. His many achievements and accomplishments throughout 1970 assured this gentleman his place in this year's "Progress Edition" as one of our nominees. We therefore consider him a "must" in the selections.

His civic activities run into great numbers:

Has a Life Member Gold Card in the AMVETS World War II.

Has a Life Membership in the San Leandro Memorial Hospital.

Chairman of Cerebral Palsy drive for San Leandro Elks 1970.

Is member of the Cerebral Palsy Association "I Am One in A Hundred."

Is a member in good standing of the Eastshore Neighbors, Inc.

He raised money to get Braille typewriter for retarded blind girl.

Had automobile safety legislative Bill signed by Governor into law.

Was instrumental in obtaining \$10,000 in cash to build a swimming pool at the San Leandro Boys' Club in memory of Captain Steve Lagomarsino and, recently raised \$5,025 for the Boys' Club.

1967 all-time high recruitment of 39 Chamber of Commerce members and in 1968 an all time high of 44 members. "Top Man of the Year" in 1967 and 1968.

As past director of the San Leandro Girls' Club brought in \$870 in cash for the Club.

Was past president of U.P.E.C., also past director of Council No. 1 of U.P.E.C. He was asked to circulate campaign documents for Judges Robert Fairwell, Robert Byers and William Spruance.

For the past four or five years he has been co-chairman with the Honorable Judge Gerald Connett, of the Cerebral Palsy drives.

In 1969 was San Leandro City Chairman of March of Dimes. The increase in funds collected was the largest in Alameda County. He is chairman of March of Dimes this year.

Just recently was awarded the National Commander Special Achievement Certificate, American Veterans of World War II AMVETS for outstanding service to the organization and to the community which it serves.

Member of San Leandro Fraternal Order of Eagles.

Charter member of Elks, San Leandro Lodge No. 2241.

Member of the American Legion—San Leandro Post 117—27 years.

Member of the Iberico Club (Spanish).

Recipient of Volunteer of the Year award 1970 for his distinguished voluntary leadership as Chairman of the March of Dimes in San Leandro.

Recipient of San Leandro Boys' Club's Past President award in 1967 for his fund raising.

Recipient of the outstanding service award of the San Leandro Girls' Club in 1967.

Recipient of San Leandro Chamber of Commerce "El Supremo" award in 1968 for excellence in membership work.

Recipient of Pacific High School award in appreciation of athletic programs.

Recipient of San Leandro Fraternal Order of Eagles State Highway Safety award for his outstanding contribution toward keeping highways safe, 1970.

Recipient of "Citation of Humanitarian Service" from the Cerebral Palsy Center.

Recipient of Recognition Citation 1961 for dedicated service to the youth of our community from San Leandro Boys' Club.

Recipient of 1967-1968 United Cerebral Palsy Association of Alameda County citation.

Recipient of a Resolution from the California Senate for his devotion to the people of his community and state and wishing him the greatest success in his future efforts on their behalf by Senator Lewis F. Sherman.

Recipient of Citizen of the Day Award, Station KABL, 1969 and 1970, in recognition of outstanding contributions to the welfare of our community.

Has made the Congressional Record twice. Extension of remarks of Honorable George P. Miller of California in the House of California in the House of Representatives. While he was recovering from surgery in the hospital, a friend in the same hospital needed

60 pints of blood. Polyvrosa called a friend on the U.S.S. Hancock docked in Alameda and in a few days got the 60 pints plus another 90 pints which were given to Erwin Memorial Blood Bank.

The second time he made the Congressional Record was for recruitment of Chamber of Commerce members in 1967 (39 members) and 1968 (44 members). Remarked George P. Miller: "Mr. Speaker—City Councilman Mario Polvorosa of San Leandro, California, is the type of friendly, energetic person who dignifies public service through his willingness to continuously help."

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS—JANUARY 25, 1971

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

THE NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Congress has not kept pace with the demands upon it, and unless major changes are made in its procedures, its claim as a co-equal branch of government may become meaningless.

Unfortunately, the greatest obstacle to the reform of Congress is Congress itself. Reform involves many things—procedural changes, control of lobbyists, a code of ethics, strict control of campaign financing, strengthened leadership and modern business practices. But no reform is more important than the reform of the seniority system.

It automatically gives to members with the longest continuous service powerful committee chairmanships and it rewards political survival and ignores merit. A Congressman moves up the ladder of leadership simply by being re-elected. Diligence, interest or expertise are not qualities which count.

The seniority system has a number of obvious drawbacks, among them the advanced age of men in positions of enormous responsibility; men become leaders who are often insensitive to public opinion; and able, younger members, whose abilities are not utilized, feel frustration.

The system of seniority, ironically, has no legal or constitutional basis. It is neither a law nor a rule of the Congress. It is a custom which has become absolute in the last two decades—a custom which no other national institution or state or national legislature follows with such blind obedience.

As a consequence of this custom, three House committee chairmen are more than 80 years old and 10 more are more than 70—the age at which Congress has said Federal judges should resign. We are following the practice of placing persons of advanced age into positions where ability and stamina are foremost requirements.

The seniority system concentrates power in a few states. Nine of the chairmen of the 21 permanent committees of the House are from the South, and in the Senate, 10 of the 16 committee chairmen are from the South.

The modification of the seniority system is not just a question of removing from positions of power a few older legislators. More importantly, it is an effort to permit political parties to put into leadership positions men who will be responsive to the Party and to the public.

The Democrats have controlled Congress for most of the last 40 years. But under the seniority system, the Democrats have found it difficult to account for their performance in the Congress. Why? Because they do not control the choice of committee chairmen, the system of seniority does. Many commit-

tee chairmen are Democrats in name only, and, insulated in their positions of power, they can safely ignore Party leaders, Party platforms and public opinion.

This week, however, there appeared the first cracks in the seniority wall. Both the Democrats and Republicans, in their pre-session caucuses, adopted reforms aimed at making committee chairmen more responsible to Members of their party and to the House.

The major Democratic proposal states that 10 or more Members may obtain a caucus vote on the nomination of any prospective committee chairman or committee member. Any individual or committee list which is rejected must be returned to the Democratic Committee on Committees for a new selection.

Republicans elected to vote by secret ballot on the senior member (or when in power in the Congress, the committee chairman) of each committee when that Party's Committee on Committees submits its nominations. Anyone failing to get a majority vote in the caucus is then recommitted to the Committee on Committees for another choice.

These are important steps. It is apparent that major reform will come only with pressure from outside of the Congress—from public interest in Congressional reform.

NEED FOR NUCLEAR-POWERED CARRIER TASK FORCES

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from one of America's most respected military leaders and thinkers, Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, which I want to share with my colleagues.

Admiral Rickover, in his communication, reviews the history of several of our nuclear warships. He also advances some thoughts on the present state of the cold war and on our national defense posture. I find his comments perceptive and worthy of wide dissemination here in Congress.

The admiral contends that as the number of our advance bases decreases and the size of the fleet shrinks, the need for ships independent of the logistic umbilical cord for propulsion fuel will continue to increase. His warning, in light of this trend, that to structure our defenses on Vietnam-type wars and let our capability to hold our own in a larger nonnuclear war go by default is to invite disaster, must be considered. According to Admiral Rickover, the aircraft carrier will be the principal offensive striking arm of the Navy in a nonnuclear war for the foreseeable future and that it is essential that the ships we build are the most powerful and effective weapons possible. Nuclear-powered carrier task forces are recommended by him to meet our security interests in this field.

The letter is well worth reading and I now include it in the RECORD for my colleagues' information:

AT SEA, NORTH ATLANTIC,
January 20, 1971.

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WILSON: We are returning from the post-refueling sea trials of the USS *Enterprise* (CVAN65), our first nuclear-

powered aircraft carrier. The ship completed all tests, including full power operation, powered by her new design reactor cores which have enough fuel to last more than ten years. The *Enterprise* was overhauled and refueled by her builder, the Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company of Newport News, Virginia.

The *Enterprise* was commissioned November 25, 1961. She operated three years before her first refueling, including a 30,000 mile cruise around the world without logistic support with the nuclear cruiser *Long Beach* and the nuclear frigate *Bainbridge* in 1964. Following her first refueling the *Enterprise* operated four years on her second set of reactor cores, including four deployments to Vietnam before entering the shipyard for her second refueling and overhaul. The *Enterprise* has steamed more than 500,000 miles to date.

During the last year the *Enterprise* has been completely overhauled and reactor cores of an entirely new design have been installed in her eight reactor plants. These new cores contain energy equivalent to the amount of oil which could be carried on a train of tank cars stretching from Washington to Boston. This will provide her enough fuel to carry out all operations for the next 10-13 years, thus making her truly independent of fuel logistics support.

The new nuclear-powered aircraft carriers, *Nimitz* (CVAN68) and *Dwight D. Eisenhower* (CVAN69), now under construction at Newport News, will each have two reactors which will produce about as much power as the eight reactors in the *Enterprise*. The initial reactor cores to be installed in the *Nimitz* class carriers will provide for 13 years of ship operations without refueling.

We now have three nuclear powered guided-missile ships in operation, the cruiser *Long Beach*, the frigate *Bainbridge* and the frigate *Truxtun*. Two more are under construction: the frigates *California* and *South Carolina*. Funds have also been appropriated for the first two ships of a new class of nuclear frigates called the DLGN38 class and advance procurement funds have been appropriated for three more. The Navy plans to build more nuclear frigates in later years.

Nuclear power in surface warships gives them the ability to operate continuously at high speed which affords them protection not available to nonnuclear ships. This can mean the difference between winning and losing battles. As the number of our advance bases decreases and the size of the Fleet shrinks the need for ships independent of the logistic umbilical cord for propulsion fuel will continue to increase.

Next to providing the major deterrent to all-out nuclear war, I believe that the most important mission of our Navy is to insure that our first line naval striking forces can carry out their mission against the threats the Soviets are presently developing. A significant portion of our surface warships must be nuclear-powered or we may end up without a credible deterrent to communist encroachments which do not warrant escalation to a nuclear war. As the Soviets achieve parity in nuclear weapons strength, a credible deterrent against lower levels of aggression becomes vital. As recent developments have shown, we can no longer rely on the threat of nuclear war to stop communist aggression unless the issue is so vital to us that we are willing to risk destroying ourselves to resolve it.

To structure our defenses on Vietnam-type wars and let our capability to hold our own in a larger nonnuclear war go by default is to invite disaster. It is widely understood that American nuclear superiority over the past 25 years has deterred nuclear war; it is not as widely understood that our naval superiority over this period has deterred lesser wars. If we do not maintain the capability to operate our first line naval striking forces in all areas our national interests dictate, we

will have given up the ability to carry out sustained military operations away from our shores, not only by the Navy but by the other services as well.

For the foreseeable future the aircraft carrier will be the principal offensive striking arm of the Navy in a nonnuclear war. No other weapon system under development can replace the long-range, sustained, concentrated firepower of the carrier air wing. Torpedo-firing nuclear submarines, cruise missile-firing nuclear submarines, nuclear frigates with anti-air and antisubmarine capabilities, are all needed to supplement and augment the capabilities of the nuclear carrier.

Our carriers are vulnerable to attack by Soviet cruise missiles—as are all surface ships. However, the first line of defense our surface ships have against such missiles and their launchers is carrier based aircraft. Without carriers and their aircraft, other surface warships, replenishment ships, and amphibious forces, would all be much more vulnerable. The nuclear carrier task force with its capability of unlimited operation at high speed is the most powerful, least vulnerable surface ship force in the history of naval warfare.

Nuclear-powered carrier task forces can steam at high speeds without concern for fuel conservation or slowing to refuel. When necessary, nuclear ships can steam at high speeds to areas of low threat for replenishment of combat consumables such as weapons and aircraft fuel. These options are not available to conventionally powered ships.

Oil-fired warships must be refueled every few days; their operations will be restricted if the tankers they need are sunk or diverted by the presence of enemy ships. The U.S. lost over 130 tankers in the World War II Atlantic Campaign, mostly due to German submarines an order of magnitude slower and less capable than the submarines the Soviets have today. The Germans started World War II with 57 submarines. The Soviets today have some 350 submarines; at least 85 being nuclear-powered.

Some have objected to nuclear warships on the basis of higher initial investment cost. These ships are often compared in cost with cheaper conventional ships of much lesser military capability, the argument being that we should build more of the cheaper conventional ships rather than fewer of the nuclear ships. Yet study after study has shown that when all costs are considered nuclear warships cost little more than conventional warships having the same weapons systems—and the nuclear warships are far superior militarily.

Further, the cost of war itself far exceeds any cost needed to be prepared to prevent a war. The best warships we can build, hence the cheapest, are those which are never used in combat because they have served to prevent war.

With the heavy military and nonmilitary demands on the budget the United States must only spend where it is necessary and where the value received is clear. But the real value of having a Navy capable of countering the Soviet threat cannot be measured in dollars alone; our survival may depend on it.

The Soviets recognize the importance of becoming the world's strongest sea power. We have now chosen not to challenge them with numbers of ships. It is, therefore, essential that the ships we do build are the most powerful and effective weapons we know how to build. This means nuclear propulsion for major warships. The penalty for any other approach is the steady erosion of our conventional military forces; a consequent reduction in our influence and in our "options" in world affairs; and the reliance for our security on a nuclear weapons force which, if used, could mark the supreme failure of mankind.

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITIES OF PRIVATE BUSINESS IN THE 1970'S

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of reading an extremely stimulating and helpful address by David Rockefeller, chairman of the Chase Manhattan Corp., made at the annual dinner meeting of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce. It is indicative of the age of conscience and concern in which we live. It is also indicative of the tremendous input being made, and to be made, by the business sector of America into the solution of current national problems. I strongly recommend it being widely read and for this reason include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITIES OF PRIVATE BUSINESS IN THE 1970'S

I have looked forward to this occasion with particular pleasure because, frankly, I have long admired the forthright manner in which the Pittsburgh business community has dealt with urban and environmental problems.

As even the occasional visitor knows, you were among the first to recognize and respond to the many complex and interrelated issues of ecology and urban renewal. You did so with imaginative approaches that, in many cases, have since been adopted by other major cities.

During the 1950's and '60's, urbanologists and early environmentalists were still unable to get a serious hearing in many parts of the country. Yet here in Pittsburgh, you already had a functioning alliance of concerned business and civic leaders headed by Dick Mellon whose memory should be revered by all. Under this kind of capable leadership, you moved forward with a broad base of community support to reverse the tide of urban deterioration and environmental pollution.

In view of your record of accomplishment, you have better reasons than most to resent the current wave of attacks charging business with an utter lack of social concern. It is no exaggeration to say that American business today is facing its most severe public disfavor since the Depression era of the 1930's.

We are told in the most forceful terms by a wide range of critics that we are doing both too much and too little, that we are at once profligate and miserly, evangelistic and hypocritical. Indeed, there seems to be a fixed belief, in some quarters at least, that businessmen are constitutionally incapable of performing a selfless act. When one occurs, the critics are sure it must have been done for the wrong motives. And if no questionable motives can be assigned, then it is assumed to have been an accident!

We cannot escape evidence of this public disfavor even in the toy departments where we do our Christmas shopping. Where once the game of "Monopoly" dominated the scene, we now find a proliferation of new ones with such topical names as "Smog: The Game of Environmental Awareness," and "Extinction: The Game of Ecology."

Ours is the dubious honor of having gone from "Monopoly" to "Extinction" in one generation!

The net effect of this shifting public sentiment toward businessmen was summarized amusingly in a recent article in Finance Magazine. It ticked off the typical headaches of today's average executive in these words:

"Two citizens' groups have brought suit (against his company) . . . the press keeps making outrageous claims . . . consumers are trying to organize a boycott . . . a Federal agency is making a study . . . some fellow in Washington, acting independently with some law students, is about to slip a report to a Congressman . . . a nearby college has 150 scraggly potsmokers who are talking about bombing his office . . . and his children call him an imperialist pig!"

In such a climate of confrontation, it should come as no surprise that socially concerned businessmen are caught in a devastating cross-fire of criticism from both ends of the ideological spectrum.

At one pole, Professor Charles Reich has pronounced America's businessmen guilty of the social "crime" of creating an anti-human "Corporate State." In his current best-seller, "The Greening of America," Professor Reich views this supposed monolithic machine as a destroyer of individual dignity and holds it responsible for a catalogue of social ills ranging from depersonalization to pollution. In his view, business—as an oppressor of the human spirit—cannot make a positive social contribution.

Professor Reich's goals are admirable. Surely no one will contest a creed that places individual dignity and self-realization at the center of our social and economic efforts. But his analysis fails, I believe, when it attempts to make business the scapegoat for the inevitable dislocations produced by rapid progress. His view of business as a rigid, machine-like structure bears little resemblance to today's flexible, responsive, consumer-conscious corporation.

Material prosperity and automation have immeasurably improved the lives of millions and greatly shortened the work week, freeing people for the aesthetic, intellectual and recreational pursuits that Reich himself espouses. Business now is making substantial inroads against the by-products of technological advance through anti-pollution efforts, urban programs and a host of other activities.

Further, business has moved away from authority toward participative management and individual initiative in many of its operations.

In short, business concern for the individual and the community has moved us toward Professor Reich's most worthy goals. To use one of his own terms, his revolution has been "co-opted" by American business.

Attacking from an opposite point of view, Professor Milton Friedman contends that business has only one responsibility—to maximize profits for its shareholders. Beyond this, he insists, corporate social efforts are only "hypocritical window-dressing" and "unadulterated socialism." This is surely too narrow a perspective.

Even Professor Friedman recognizes that the donations made by businesses to various community service organizations on an annual appeal basis are appropriate under customary and conventional ethical standards of good citizenship. But what he fails to appreciate, in my view, are the many innovative social contributions of business which are perfectly consistent with the profit incentive. The construction of "turnkey" public housing, for example, in which private industry works with government to create much-needed housing for low-income families, has proven both profitable and socially beneficial.

Profits are, indeed, the lifeblood of business. But our own consciences as well as rising public expectations make it increasingly clear that modern managers must come up with more new and imaginative approaches like "turnkey" housing, to reconcile their expanding responsibility to society with the investment interest of their shareholders.

Responding to critics is tempting and I think businessmen should give in to the impulse more often—not to apologize but to set the record straight. I would hope, however, that we would not spend so much time and energy in answering critics that we have none left for reexamining our own performance to spot new areas for improvement.

This is a time of profound reassessment throughout our society, a time for reordering values and priorities at all levels.

Business must participate fully in this reassessment by redefining its own relationship to society.

The last time we went through such a national reappraisal—in the 1930's—business tended to stand aside and leave the initiative to government. In retrospect, I think all of us would acknowledge that this was a mistake. The result was a serious erosion of our economic freedom. This time, unless business rolls up its sleeves and gets into the fray, there is likely to be not only a further erosion of economic freedom but of individual freedom as well.

The amount of freedom business retains will depend decisively on the quality of management's response to changing public expectations and on the degree of its involvement in public responsibilities.

Certainly, I recognize the temptation to cut back on programs for social progress during a period of diminished profits, especially when we are being roundly criticized for these very commitments from certain enclaves of tradition. But I would argue that it is precisely at this time, when social expectations and needs are greatest, that we must weigh our options calmly and employ our most farsighted business judgment.

Far from cutting back, it seems to me highly desirable that we step up our social involvement, at this critical juncture, in at least three distinct areas.

The first, of course, is within our own companies. Many businessmen have been doing a good deal, individually, to make their corporations more socially responsive to the changing environment. But, for the most part, they have done this as a kind of "addon" to their regular business—programming a response to each challenge as it appears. For example, they have stepped up financial contributions to deserving urban projects, developed more playgrounds in the ghettos, and provided more counseling services for the disadvantaged. In other words, they have responded with good intentions but usually with the self-limiting presumption that social improvement programs must be carried on the loss side of the company's ledger. They presumed that business and social responsibilities would not mix. I believe it is now time to question that presumption.

The immediate task, as I view it, is to learn how to discharge our social responsibilities as an integral part of our overall corporate planning and performance. We should think not so much in terms of how to hold down the cost of these programs, but rather how to make them more efficient and more effective so that they contribute to long-range profitability. Briefly stated, the essential job is to reconcile what happens in the marketplace with what has already happened in society. This may mean liberalizing our hiring practices to include more from the minorities or broadening our services to extend into disadvantaged neighborhoods.

This may also mean taking a longer range view of profits. It may mean lowering our profit sights in a particular year, in the interest of helping to shape an environment in which business can continue to prosper ten or twenty years into the future. In a sense, this is a kind of capital investment in community well-being which will produce future dividends in the form of a more viable business and living environment.

The latest surveys by the Opinion Research Corporation reveal that a solid majority of the American people now considers corporate responsibility for maintaining a pollution-free environment equal in importance with supplying customer needs at reasonable prices. So, besides being a matter of good conscience and good citizenship, it is also a matter of good business judgment to structure ourselves, within a sound application of free-market principles, to respond to the will of the majority of our potential customers. To narrow our individual corporate objectives solely to the pursuit of profits would place us almost at once in direct conflict with the many publics on whom those profits depend.

A second area in which businessmen can and should be involved in a socially responsible way is at the industry and even the multi-industry level.

The "pilot projects" of individual companies have been very much worthwhile, and have taught us valuable lessons about what can and can't be done with limited resources. But the need now, as I see it, is for more massive collaboration by groups of several corporations in diverse fields to tackle those truly major problems that surpass the resources of a single company.

One of the most promising avenues for expansion would be to select, from among the many trial-and-error experiences of separate companies, those ongoing projects which show the greatest potential for multi-industry application.

For instance, in my own industry, I think the "Key Cities Program" of the American Bankers Association, which is committing one billion dollars by 1975 in minority business financing across the country, is an important program. It will focus initially on 50 critical urban areas. In these, coordinating committees of local bank executives will see to it that this financing is responsive to unique local needs and problems. Supporting this funding program will be teams of visiting specialists who will bring their proven experience to bear through a series of Urban Development Seminars. The "Key Cities Program" is particularly attractive for multi-industry involvement because it offers wide-ranging opportunities for almost every kind of industry to supply its own particular technical, managerial and product support in local areas under local supervision.

The various manpower development programs of the National Alliance of Businessmen have proven themselves capable of far wider applicability, given the inter-industry base that has already been established. The lessons learned in these programs could be applied more extensively to the development of training capacities for moving workers up from entry-level competence toward managerial positions.

Although still in development stages, the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships and HUD's "Operation Breakthrough" are both promising prototypes for a total business-sector initiative. With its recent development grant from HUD, Westinghouse is already exploring the feasibility of modular and prefabricated housing on a broad scale.

In the underlying and, in many ways, most critical problem of educational deficiencies, the various "partnership projects" between corporations and schools have nationwide and industry-wide potential.

In the past several weeks, two major educational studies have been released—one by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the other by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Both studies concluded that the present educational system in this country is too rigidly degree-oriented and lacks the flexibility needed to guide young people with a wide range of talents and ambitions into suitable professions and occupations. They proposed that big cities create new models of secondary

schools adapted to their own community needs rather than remain firmly anchored in the past and the present.

The validity of this proposal is supported by recent statistics revealing that almost one-quarter of all high school students drop out before graduation. And roughly half of those who enter college quit before taking the bachelor's degree.

Until now, the business sector has tackled this enormous problem largely on a company-by-company basis, setting up separate programs for the industrial and basic skills training of "drop-outs." These individual programs are often costly and inefficient, and the new educational techniques learned by one company are not transmitted quickly to others.

How much better it would be if we had a nationwide system of industry-supported vocational schools of sufficient scope to exert a real impact. Ideally, these institutions would not close off the possibility of subsequent academic training, but would provide a viable alternative route toward higher learning. Those, who for personal or family reasons, felt the need for early employment could have the opportunity and the flexibility to complete their high school education in these industry-sponsored vocational schools and then continue on to college if and when they desired.

By breaking down the rigid correlation between age and formal schooling, an approach such as this might go a long way toward making education a lifelong process with men and women entering college from the ranks of labor, commerce and industry—perhaps under employee to trade union scholarship programs. Nowhere is it written that education in America must be a hectic scramble by everyone, regardless of incentives and qualifications, to accumulate the maximum number of degrees in the minimum amount of time.

The major industries could establish a loosely-tied national chain—steel, transportation, utilities, communication and banking—building the buildings, defraying salaries and other operating costs and offering employment options to the graduates.

The schools that I propose would not be in competition with other public schools. They would be supplemental and would be fully certified and accredited by local educational authorities—differing not in educational standards but in educational emphasis and in the fact that they were financed in part by the private sector.

To work out the details of such a project in full cooperation with the present secondary school system and to ascertain what tax incentives might apply, this proposal would clearly require the concurrence of educators, leaders of business and labor and various governmental authorities. But I have outlined the proposal here in order to illustrate the dimensions of future commitment that I believe business must undertake at the multi-industry level.

The third major area in which this sense of commitment must be manifested is in the national debate over policies, programs and priorities.

Businessmen have been generally reluctant to enter into public debate on issues other than those of direct company concern. They will talk volubly about why they need higher tariffs or lower taxes. But they tend to become reticent when the discussion turns to the need for an improved welfare program, broad-gauged trade legislation, or more realistic safety standards. The supposed risks of alienating other businessmen or consumers are often regarded as unacceptably high. As a result, we too often end up with uninformed, catch-all legislation.

By restricting the range of topics to those directly related to their livelihood, businessmen have seldom achieved wide public recognition. It is precisely by avoiding social

debate, that they have given currency to the notion that they are concerned solely with profits and have little of substance to contribute to the developing dialogue of democracy.

The great need here, as I see it, is to coordinate the business community's efforts, talents and influence in a way that will give it genuine impact not only at local and state levels, but at the national level as well.

Some coordination in the social realm already exists in activities of the National Alliance of Businessmen, the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships, the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Conference Board, the Committee for Economic Development and others.

But what is needed additionally, in my view, is an all-out determination to mobilize the opinions and resources of the business community behind workable large-scale approaches to urban problems. With a guiding consensus of our own, we would then be in a better position to enlist the support of the Administration and Congress to do the job that must be done. The influence and ideas of businessmen are needed now as never before to speak out more forcefully and more frequently on social and urban legislation.

Because of this very urgency and because of your own enviable past record in setting examples for the larger business community, I am taking the liberty now of urging upon you—the business leadership of Pittsburgh—this additional task. I know of no body of businessmen anywhere that is better equipped, by experience and achievement, to show us how the country's business sector can bring its influence to bear on forward-looking social legislation in city hall, state house and in Washington.

I do not mean to suggest that such a leadership role can or should be played in isolation. Its effective implementation will require the same kind of close cooperation with the academic and intellectual communities that you have achieved in the past. And it will require the same cordial working alliance with labor to impact effectively on Government at all levels.

But I believe that the first driving thrust could well come from the concerned and committed business sector of Pittsburgh. I would add only that the time is short and present problems across the nation are rapidly outrunning their solutions.

For those across the country who boggle at the immense urban tasks still before them, there would be great encouragement in the realization that "the spirit of Pittsburgh" was on the move once again.

In a larger sense, there is reassurance for the nation's businessmen, too, in recalling that since the days of Karl Marx, critics have been predicting the downfall of the American industrial system and the demise of the corporation. Yet through the years that system has proven remarkably durable and resilient. It has been highly resourceful in adapting to change involving employees, customers and society in general.

I personally am confident that it can and will demonstrate equal adaptability in the decade of the Seventies. I think it is more than capable of rising to the challenges posed by Professors Reich and Friedman by coming up with fresh solutions to many problems within the context of the free-market system.

Tradition holds that the first draft of the Declaration of Independence dedicated this new nation to "life, liberty and the pursuit of property." It was only at the urging of those who insisted on greater concern for the quality of life in America, that Thomas Jefferson struck out "property" and placed "the pursuit of happiness" in a position of high prominence.

Now, nearly two centuries later, we are witnessing a strong resurgence of this na-

tional goal. Those of us in business are being asked to contribute more to the quality of life than mere quantities of goods and services. I believe that "the spirit of Pittsburgh" could well supply us with the precedent and vision necessary to achieve this goal.

**PERU'S TREMBLING LAND IS
STILLED**

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, during the tragic earthquake disaster in Peru last May, a courageous Los Angeles vascular surgeon, Dr. Albert Fields, joined a group of physicians to offer emergency medical aid to thousands of victims of the tragedy.

Dr. Fields stands as an example of medical practice truly responsive to the immediate needs of the world community. His voluntary effort will be long remembered by the hundreds of disaster victims whom he and other volunteer physicians aided.

I insert the following article from Medical World News, July 31, 1970:

PERU'S TREMBLING LAND IS STILLED

While the ground trembled and tons of mud and water were pouring over Peruvian villages last May, vascular surgeon Albert Fields was relaxing—at home in Los Angeles. Learning about the disaster via television, he reacted with feelings of uneasiness and helplessness. But he could not erase the tragedy from his mind, and a week later he climbed aboard a Lima-bound jet to offer his services. "I just decided it was something I had to do," the 54-year-old doctor said.

Before he left Los Angeles, Dr. Fields helped round up 50 tons of medical supplies to be flown to Peru. On arrival, he went to a hospital outside Lima, where he treated chest and abdominal injuries, flesh wounds, and compound fractures. During his harrowing three-week stay, he performed approximately 300 operations and assists and still found time to lecture at various Peruvian hospitals on traumatic and vascular surgery techniques.

The earthquake, the worst in Peru's history, killed some 50,000 people, and the devastation was almost unbelievable. The western coastal city of Chimbote was nearly obliterated, and a 50-mile-wide strip of land stretching 300 miles to the north and south of Chimbote was torn up.

Ironically, neither Dr. Fields nor any of the dozens of other doctors from America and other countries who rushed to join Peruvian doctors in treating the injured were able to save many lives. By the time help arrived in isolated areas, most of the critically injured had died. And the doctors in Peru are still powerless to combat what is essentially a public health problem. Pneumonia and upper respiratory infections caused by exposure are now commonplace, simply because the survivors of the quake have no shelter. Their rude adobe shacks were almost all flattened. Gastroenteritis is also prevalent; this is attributed partly to contaminated water supplies. And among city slum dwellers, tuberculosis and parasitic diseases are permanent fellow travelers.

"The country is almost completely lacking in rehabilitation facilities," Dr. Fields reports. "Those in the isolated areas have nothing in the way of medical facilities, no nurses, no first aid stations, no running

water, no heat—nothing. Probably three fourths of all the doctors and medical facilities in Peru are in Lima, and the remainder are in the larger cities. Peru has well-trained men in many of the medical specialties, but most of the country's hospitals are sadly lacking in equipment."

Immediately after the quake, overreaction set in. Fear of epidemics spread, and a mass inoculation program was considered. Peruvian health teams began mass inoculations for typhoid. But after a close look at sanitary conditions, doctors decided that a typhoid immunization drive was unnecessary. There was also concern about rubella, which is endemic in Peru during this time of year. By tracing several reports of the disease without pinpointing any cases, however, doctors in the field determined that vaccination would be unnecessary.

When medical teams arrived in the isolated areas, they found that it was better to treat the injured there than to evacuate them to coastal hospitals or the U.S.S. *Guam*, anchored offshore. Although there were rumors and speculation that thousands of critical injuries had occurred in the area affected by the quake, only a few hundred people were found with severe and life-threatening injuries. "In earthquakes of this type, people caught in buildings that are collapsing or caved in or in earthslides usually do not survive, so you have a strange phenomenon—either the living or the dead, with the number of injured being comparatively small," explains Stephen R. Tripp, disaster relief coordinator for the Agency for International Development.

The government has announced plans to eventually construct 2,400 shelters in the disaster area to accommodate large numbers of the people made homeless by the quake. But as it stands now, most of the dispossessed people are out in the open, or in tents, or in temporary shelters they have built, says Dr. Fields. What will happen to them in September when the winter rains begin remains an urgent question.

**TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RANDOLPH
ON HUMANITARIANISM IS WELL
DESERVED AND HELPFUL TO A
CAUSE**

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday in my hometown of Charleston, W. Va., I was privileged to attend a City of Hope fund-raising dinner, honoring our senior Senator from West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH. This long-deserved tribute acknowledging Senator RANDOLPH's many years of dedicated service on behalf of humanitarian causes culminated in the presentation of the City of Hope's Golden Torch of Hope Award. Guest speaker for the occasion was Elliot L. Richardson, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I was particularly pleased to note that, along with Governor and Mrs. Arch A. Moore, four distinguished former governors of the Mountain State were in attendance. They are: Homer A. Holt, Okey L. Patterson, Cecil H. Underwood, and Hulett Smith.

For those who may not be familiar with the City of Hope organization, the national medical center for research and treatment of catastrophic diseases was

founded in 1913. At present, more than 700 scientists and staff are working at the Los Angeles center to find cures for such diseases as cancer and leukemia. The treatment of patients is free and offered on a non-sectarian basis.

Senator RANDOLPH, who has long been identified with legislation aimed at helping the sick, the handicapped, and the disadvantaged, joined in the effort to raise funds for this worthy project. As evidence that, on rare occasions, prophets are honored in their own country, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made at the City of Hope dinner by Secretary Richardson and Governor Moore, together with the moving acceptance speech by Senator RANDOLPH:

**PEOPLE MUST BE HELPED OUT OF DEPENDENCY,
NOT FURTHER INTO IT, SECRETARY RICHARDSON
SAYS**

Under the circumstances, it's understandable that one might feel a bit difficult about trying to frame some appropriate remarks for this occasion.

I sincerely welcome the privilege of being here this evening to pay tribute to a distinguished citizen of West Virginia and one of the Nation's outstanding legislators and humanitarians—your guest of honor, Senator Jennings Randolph.

It has been my good fortune to know and to work with Senator Randolph for part of his long career in the United States Congress, and I count myself among the many people throughout the country who recognize him as a skillful lawmaker and a devoted servant of the public interest.

But any hesitancy on my part is erased by the Senator's gracious charm and by the knowledge that the dual purpose of this banquet is significant beyond my ability to add or detract.

In selecting Jennings Randolph to receive the Torch of Hope, the City of Hope is according recognition to a principle symbolized alike by the institution and the man. For both the City of Hope in its commitment to serving the victims of disease, and Senator Randolph in his four decades of service to the handicapped, are guided by an overwhelming desire not merely to serve mankind, but to enable human beings to gain the self-respect that comes with self-reliance.

I know enough of medical care to know that the will to recover is as potent as any medicine, and that the patient with the poorest prognosis is the patient who has given up hope. The City of Hope, in its extensive programs of research and care for the desperately ill, is grounded not just on the philosophy, but on the inescapable fact that the desire to recover, to conquer adversity no matter how grave, is among the best of all therapies.

Senator Randolph, as his career amply proves, is guided by the same philosophy and the same clear view of humanitarianism. When others were content to give the handicapped little more than alms, Jennings Randolph fought for programs to help the handicapped help themselves.

The legislation he sponsored to provide meaningful employment for the blind is more than an avenue to support, it is a path toward self-respect and independence that has dignified the lives of thousands of sightless Americans throughout the country.

Much the same principle needs to be applied to a great many of the issues and problems that face this Nation. It is not enough simply to minister to those in need in ways that perpetuate hopeless dependency. We see the futility of such a plan in the intolerable burden of our present welfare system with its skyrocketing costs and seemingly unending

increase in numbers of recipients. Nowhere else could it be more clearly necessary to apply the principle that Senator Randolph understands so well: that people must be helped out of dependency, not further into it; that humanitarianism—to say nothing of plain common sense—demands that we give every man the chance to achieve the independence that comes from self-reliance.

I need hardly tell you that the President has no more urgent domestic goal than reform of the outmoded, unworkable, degrading, and frightfully wasteful welfare system. Together with a plan for revenue sharing that will help the cities and States meet the staggering costs of welfare, education, and the myriad other demands on their hard-pressed fiscal resources, the President has made it known that he will ask the 92nd Congress to do what the 91st failed to do—reform the welfare system by adopting the Family Assistance Plan.

Where most present welfare programs discourage the poor from working, Family Assistance would both reward the working poor and help them to find and keep jobs. Where most present welfare programs tend to break up family units by the imposition of what has been called the "man in the house" rule, Family Assistance would have the opposite effect. It would help to keep families together and to earn the money they need to stay together.

I think it is fair to say that we have a good deal of catching up to do in this country. Unkept promises, unfulfilled commitments, and unmet responsibilities combine to give us an agenda for social action that is both long and demanding. Let me just take one additional item from that agenda, because it is so pertinent to this occasion and to the great work in which the City of Hope is involved.

I am referring, of course, to the crisis in health and what can and should be done to ease or eliminate it.

Of course, one way to deal with this crisis is to deny it exists. I am not being facetious. It is perfectly possible to look at the state of the Nation's health and conclude that the word "crisis" is inappropriate. By comparison with other countries of the world, we in America enjoy a relatively high standard of health care. Some other countries have slightly longer average life expectancies, lower infant death rates, and higher ratios of physicians to total population. But the differences among such statistical comparisons often are measured in small fractions of numbers, and the United States is unquestionably among the first rank of nations in terms of these objective measurements of health status and health care achievements.

Why then the word "crisis"? Why has the subject of health care become so paramount an issue for national debate? Why have so many proposals, including not less than 200 bills in the last Congress, been put forward to deal with "the crisis in health"?

The answer—at least part of the answer—lies in the fact that the kind of gross statistics that I just mentioned tell a very misleading story, for they obscure the glaring discrepancies in our systems for providing health care to the people of this country. The simple truth is that the best medical care in this country is without equal anywhere in the world, but for a great many people, chiefly but not exclusively the poor, the best is not available. And for millions of Americans living in big city slums and rural poverty areas, health care of any kind is virtually non-existent.

The infant death rate in one impoverished area of Chicago is seven times greater than the rate in a neighboring, affluent suburb and nearly three times as high as the national average.

But it would be incorrect to suggest that the crisis in health care is simply another symptom of the plague of poverty. The soaring cost of health care touches all of us, middle and upper income families as well as the

poor. Hospital charges are rising at the rate of 15 percent a year; the aggregate cost of all health care is increasing twice as fast as the cost of living; the devastating cost of care in cases of catastrophic illness or injury can quickly reduce a family from a position of economic security to one of insurmountable debt.

Obviously, we cannot permit these conditions to continue. A Nation that can allocate, as we do, more than 7 percent of its gross national product for health can see to it that decent health care is available to all its citizens, poor and non-poor. The challenge we face is one of developing our vast health resources, expanding them as necessary, and most important of all, making the best possible use of what we have and what we will have in the future.

The initiatives the President will recommend will seek to assure adequate health care for every citizen through a system that will effectively combine public and private resources, not in a monolithic scheme controlled by the Federal Government, but in a collaborative system that makes the best use of Federal leverage, State and local resources, the private insurance industry, and those people and institutions that provide health care.

It seems to me that there is a strong analogy between the philosophy of this Administration with regard to problems of health and welfare and the philosophy that Senator Randolph has followed in his career of service to the handicapped. When a man is down, help him up. Give him the means to help himself with pride and dignity.

Too many American people and American institutions are down. They need the support that the most favored nation on earth can provide. But they also need the chance to become productive parts of society. What we have to do is what Senator Randolph has so admirably done for the handicapped. We have to make it possible for all the people of this country and all the social institutions that serve them to achieve their fullest potential.

The City of Hope has chosen well in selecting Jennings Randolph to receive its Torch of Hope. I am confident that this distinguished health center will realize its goal of expanded service to the cause of medicine and medical care. I understand that they used to call the City of Hope "the tents in the desert." Those tents may have long since folded, but they have certainly not silently stolen away. They have become a distinguished medical institution because of the dedication of those who work there and the generosity of those who have helped pay the enormous cost of transforming "tents" into a complex of laboratory and clinical facilities that are among the finest in the world.

The great American novelist, Thomas Wolfe, eloquently described the Promise of America. He wrote: "To every man his chance; to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining, golden opportunity. To every man, the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever his vision and manhood can combine to make him. This, seeker, is the Promise of America."

This nation, because of men like Jennings Randolph and institutions like the City of Hope, will continue to move ever closer to the fulfillment of its promise.

GOVERNOR MOORE PRAISES RANDOLPH'S LONG AND DEEP COMMITMENT TO CAUSE OF HUMANITARIANISM

Good Evening.

Senator Randolph, to my distinguished former predecessors in this most humble office of Governor of the State of West Virginia, Mr. Secretary, and General Jessel, in viewing the program tonight I notice that those that were going to share in the speaking portion, in acknowledgement of the great

honor given to our distinguished Senator, were not West Virginians—and, so I presumed upon perhaps the only prerogative that a Governor occasionally might have and asked that if I might say something for West Virginia and for those that are its leaders that are here tonight and its citizens and those that are particular friends of our honoree.

Senator Randolph, West Virginia is indeed proud of you as you have gone from this great Mountain State and made that which is so often referred to, but very rarely reached, the total commitment of oneself to his people. And this distinguished honor here tonight that has come your way is not only for you but is for the citizens of our State. We are intensely proud of your service to us in the United States Senate as we have been intensely proud over the years for your commitment in other public realm. So, as Governor of West Virginia, and for and on behalf of its people, those Jennings that have not said so at the polls, in one way or another, I would say here tonight we are deeply appreciative of your public service, your great humanitarianism, your commitment to us. And thank you for a job, not well done, but magnificently so in many, many respects.

Thank you very much.

MANY PEOPLE CONTRIBUTE TO SEARCH FOR RELIEVING HUMAN SUFFERING AND PROVIDE HOPE FOR THE SICK

(Remarks by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH)

Please understand that I am grateful and honored to receive this award.

When citizens of good purpose choose to call public attention to work that has been carried forward as the result of earnest convictions and the desire to be of service, then that person is expected to appropriately respond.

If I have contributed to the improvement of the health and welfare of the American people, then this knowledge is the source of satisfaction.

At a time like this, I remember the many activities with which I have been associated relating to the well-being of people.

I remember that date nearly 35 years ago when the Randolph-Sheppard Act became law and established a program under which the blind were to become self-supporting citizens.

In more recent years, I remember our successful efforts in the Congress to establish Medicare so that the medical needs of our older citizens could be met.

These were valid decisions by government, and there have been others over the years that have held my intense interest and continuing concern. They are very, very important because government must share its deep involvement in improving the health of the people.

Tonight I recall just a few of the individuals and groups who have devoted themselves to the cause of the sick and handicapped and those who have been the beneficiaries.

I think of the people of the large and small cities in West Virginia who, in recent years, have raised millions of dollars in their communities to build new hospitals; people in Grafton, Weston, Spencer, Princeton, Charleston, Phillippi, Fairmont, Point Pleasant, Clarksburg Martinsburg, and Charles Town.

I think of Dr. G. O. McClellan whose dedication makes him available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, to provide medical care for the people of rural Lincoln County.

I think of an observance I recently attended in Parkersburg to honor the Moose Lodge on the tenth anniversary of its hearing detection and improvement program, which has now aided more than 2,000,000 children and adults.

I think of Dr. Daniel Hale and his associates in the Southern West Virginia Re-

gional Health Council who are creating a unique organization to improve health services in an area where they have been much needed.

I think of the thousands of blind people who operate vending facilities in public and private buildings, in particular Erma Jeffries who has helpfully served her customers in the Huntington post office for many years.

I think also of the civic organizations such as the Lions Clubs, whose members devote much time and energy to sight conservation.

I think of Dr. J. E. Blaydes, a Bluefield surgeon who has performed thousands of eye operations, often without compensation for his skill.

I think of Dr. Spencer Dryden, whose heart, as well as his hands, restored my sight caused by a detached retina.

I think of Rose Martin, of my home town of Elkins, who directs the organization of hundreds of practical nurses in education and service.

And I think, of course, of the City of Hope. There could be no more appropriate word for this institution than "hope." For while you care for the sick and conduct research into the causes of human suffering, these activities provide hope, a precious commodity of inestimable value in alleviating the anxiety and anguish that accompanies illness.

I convey to the City of Hope my own personal commendation for the great humanitarian work in which it is engaged, work which demonstrates the capacity of the American people to face difficult problems with resolution and to attack them with determination. It is an endeavor that deserves the support and encouragement of every person who is concerned for the welfare of his fellow man.

Henry David Thoreau wrote these words about HOPE:

"If you have built castles in the air, your work need not be lost, that is where they should be. Move foundations under them."

Truly, the City of Hope is one such foundation!

STATES CAN DEMAND FEDERAL TAX-SHARING

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the financial crisis confronting many State and local governments has prompted a movement to call a national constitutional convention to achieve by constitutional amendment what the 91st Congress failed to do—namely approve a plan of revenue sharing.

The Jackson Citizen Patriot of Jackson, Mich., devoted a lengthy editorial on Friday, January 15, 1971, to an illuminating and probing study pointing out some of the problems and possibilities of such a movement by recalling what happened in Michigan in 1946 when a State constitutional amendment was adopted by referendum which provided for the diversion of sales tax income to local governments and schools after the Michigan legislature failed to act on this proposal. In view of President Nixon's renewed and enlarged request for revenue sharing I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and particularly the leadership of the Congress:

IN OUR OPINION—STATES CAN DEMAND FEDERAL TAX-SHARING

The most significant current development in the effort by state governors and legislatures to advance the cause of sharing of federal tax revenues by the states comes from New Jersey.

The event there is not large of itself. It is nothing more than a resolution by the New Jersey Legislature calling for a national constitutional convention for the purpose of writing an amendment which would cut the states in on the federal tax pie. Viewed in the context of the history of representative government in America it assumes a great deal of importance.

Sponsors of the Jersey resolution expect from 10 to 20 other state law-making bodies to follow up the idea in the near future. When two-thirds of the states join the request Congress will be forced to convene the convention which will be limited to writing a tax-sharing amendment. When two-thirds of the states ratify the amendment the fact of revenue sharing will be accomplished without the say-so of the Congress or the President.

The development is intriguing because, in certain respects, it parallels the move in Michigan which resulted in the adoption of the constitutional amendment which diverts a fixed portion of the state sales tax to school districts, townships and cities.

The year was 1946, a period in which local governments, particularly cities and schools, were hard up for money and the state of Michigan was relatively wealthy.

The plight of the cities and schools had been the subject of numerous studies and tax reform measures which would bail them out were proposed to the legislature.

In 1944 Harry F. Kelley, then governor and who retired at the beginning of this year as a State Supreme Court justice, appointed a "blue-ribbon committee" to look into the plight of the local governments and recommend a course of action. The result was a proposal for sweeping tax reform, some of it to be accomplished through a constitutional amendment.

The Legislature ignored the recommendations and tossed the cities a bone in the form of a \$16 million grant from the liquor and intangibles taxes.

(As the French say, "The more things change the more they stay the same." The above-mentioned action took place in the 1940s, not the late 1960s and early '70s.)

Leaders in the cities and the school district fell back on a political axiom, "Those who fail to govern lose the right to govern."

Taking advantage of unrest among the people, they drafted the amendment which would divert a portion of the sales tax income to cities and schools. They cut the townships in on the swag, thus assuring their amendment the broadest possible base of popular support.

Put to a vote in November of 1946, the sales tax diversion amendment passed 864,630 to 684,698.

Thus did the people remove from the hands of the legislature, which had proved so unresponsive to their pressing needs, the right of control over what was then the state's most productive source of revenue. By not listening to the voices from back home, the legislature goaded the people into desperate, last resort measures and the invoking of the unusual powers which are their's under the constitution. It often happens when the lawmakers go directly against the wishes of the majority as they often do.

Now the unrest has moved up one layer in the structure of government. While the states are under pressure from their local governments to "do something" about financial woes, the states have troubles of their own.

When governors get together the prime topic of conversation is "federal tax sharing." Whether this solution to the tax problems of the states is proper or not matters little. That, in the view of governors, is where the money is.

If the legislatures of two-thirds or more of the states choose to use their powers under the Federal Constitution they can force revenue-sharing on the Congress and the President.

They will be emulating, to a large degree, the steps the people of Michigan took in 1946 (and which they may take again at some time in the reasonably near future.)

The Congress could find itself, as the Michigan Legislature did after 1946, losing direct control over the most lucrative tax-raising system ever invented.

Moreover, the Congress won't have the right to draft the formula for revenue-sharing. That will be done by a constitutional convention which will be under the influence of state officials.

The Congress then would be faced, as the Michigan Legislature is today, with getting up funds to operate the central government with no say as to how a fixed portion of the tax revenue will be spent.

An element of danger lies in the course which apparently is being seriously considered by state leaders. They may be inclined to forget that the principal thing the federal government has to share is a \$300 billion-plus deficit. (By contrast, in 1946 the state of Michigan had a multi-million-dollar treasury surplus.)

Be that as it may, human nature and the rules of politics and the Republic make possible, if not probable, a successful effort by the states to force federal revenue sharing if Congress does not respond to their demands within a reasonable time.

LET US START GRADING AMERICA ON THE CURVE

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times we hear many prophets of "gloom and doom." Dr. Frank R. Barnett, president of the National Strategy Information Center, Inc., of New York, in an article based on his recent commencement address at the University of South Carolina at Columbia, projects a much more objective and positive analysis of the condition of our Nation. In "Let Us Start Grading America on the Curve," printed in the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin of December 1970, Dr. Barnett states that by comparison with other nations the United States must be given very high marks. He says:

If America is graded against utopian criteria, like all imperfect institutions, she may deserve nothing better than C-minus. But if Americans are graded more compassionately "on the curve"—if our Nation is compared, not with the imaginary Camelot of the poet's vision, but with the real kingdoms, empires, and people's penitentiaries of this earth—then America's grade is perhaps not less than B-plus. And one might challenge comparative historians to find any A's at all.

His remarks should encourage us all to be proud of our Nation and strive to keep it as the bulwark of freedom in the world.

This article is very timely and informative, and I, therefore, insert it in the RECORD:

LET US START GRADING AMERICA ON THE CURVE

(By Dr. Frank R. Barnett)

The ideal commencement address should provide inspiration for parents, encouragement for trustees, and aspirin for the faculty. It should also be short enough to be tolerated by the graduating class. Finally, it should warn us to beware the hardening of absolutes, a disease that can only be contained by a steady diet of reason and civility.

In more tranquil days, this was the season to reaffirm ideals everyone took for granted. Alumni were confident that undergraduates had come to join the Establishment, not to bury it. Parents took comfort from knowing their sons and daughters had set foot on an escalator that could lead to a platform of opportunity reserved for less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the earth's population. A graduation ceremony, therefore, was normally a festival of self-congratulation.

Today is no time for platitudes in praise of the status quo. We could occupy the entire weekend with an inventory of the fears and grievances that darken our scene.

Some pessimists predict anarchy; others foresee a police state. Some cop-outs, shouting that God is dead, or absent without leave, urge us to seek salvation in chemistry. It almost seems that bad news is our most consistent product.

A modest dosage of self-doubt is a healthy antidote for arrogance; but to inject self-hatred into the national bloodstream is scarcely the means to cure our own society or help others. Spare us from the whimperings of political Portnoys who find nothing of value.

If America is graded against utopian criteria, like all imperfect institutions, she may deserve nothing better than C-minus. But if Americans are graded more compassionately "on the curve"—if our Nation is compared, not with the imaginary Camelot of the poet's vision, but with the real kingdoms, empires, and people's penitentiaries of this earth—then America's grade is perhaps not less than B-plus. And one might challenge comparative historians to find any A's at all.

Suppose all passports and immigration quotas were abolished throughout the world; in what direction would a torrent of humanity move in search of wider options and a better life?

Those who assert that this is the worst of times cannot have heard of the past. Until History's last quarter-hour, most men's fortune was limited to crippling manual labor and the wreckage of old age at 40.

Even in England, at the peak of its 19th century affluence and culture, Matthew Arnold could compose lines which sound as if they might have been written yesterday in a campus dormitory. Matthew Arnold concludes that:

"... the world, which seems
To lie before us like a land of dreams,
So various, so beautiful, so new,
Hath really neither joy, nor love, nor light,
Nor certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain;
And we are here as on a darkling plain,
Swept with confused alarms of struggle and flight,
Where ignorant armies clash by night."

I do not suggest that we resist badly needed reform in America by using the miseries of other continents and other times as an excuse for inaction. But let us not be panicked into the wrong action by amateur Interns who portray America's contusions as terminal illness. Those who want to "shut down" society until love and peace govern all human relationships are lamenting the human condition, not the American system. If they complain they have inherited a world

they never made, they have only announced their membership in the family of man, since none of us since Adam and Eve have been able to preselect our environment. Only the day before yesterday, your parents inherited a depression and two World Wars they had no hand in starting.

LOOK AT THE RECORD

No one would argue that the scars from those calamities have been removed from society; and some of the repair jobs might have been better done. But in predicting America's capacity to survive turmoil, it is relevant to remember that in 1941 a nation torn by strikes, haunted by unemployment, preyed upon by mobsters and labor racketeers, agitated by Communists and the Ku Klux Klan—such a nation closed ranks to keep Germany and Japan from swallowing the earth, rebuilt Europe, designed the United Nations, and planted earth's banner on the moon. That same nation (calling itself "capitalist") outmoded the socialist platform of Norman Thomas with a total welfare package that now costs \$67 billion a year, made foreign aid a major industry, and provided scores of outlets for practical idealism—at home and abroad—through social inventions that range from Head Start to the Peace Corps.

DEFINING SUCCESS

The critic may object I have come to sell stale sentiment, or to assure the class of 1970 they have been guaranteed sweetness and light by the strenuous effort of their elders. To the contrary! Nobody can promise you anything but turmoil, tension, and plenty of pressures to test your ingenuity and resolve. Unless failure were probable in human affairs, achievement would be insipid and routine. Whether you define "success" in personal or public service terms, success is always balanced on the rim of disaster. That is especially true when freedom must still compete in the modern world with the primitive ideologies of dictators.

Twenty-six years ago, my generation inherited the duty to spend June 6, 1944, on the beachheads of Hitler's Europe. We learned the hard way that, when democracies pursue business-as-usual, dictators intoxicate themselves on ego-trips that carry the world over the edge of global war.

Of course, history never reruns an old scenario with the same players. Perhaps the lessons learned from the failure to appease Hitler and Stalin no longer apply. But let us ask the students of Prague if they think the armored divisions of Brezhnev are an improvement over the mailed-fist diplomacy of Stalin. Let us ask the Soviet scientist thrust by the secret police into a ward for the mentally disturbed if he thinks the will of the Russian tyrant to smother dissent has diminished.

SHORT MEMORIES

And perhaps we should ask ourselves if we think that the Soviet Union—quite prepared to stab a small Communist ally in the back—would treat a capitalist opponent with more courtesy if and when Soviet science could assure the success of a surprise assault on America. One fears that 6 months is about as long as the world can remember the atrocities and duplicity of dictatorships.

The cast of characters may change in Moscow; but the Brezhnev doctrine is written in the script of Lenin. And Brezhnev is armed with military capabilities not available to Stalin. Russia has "caught up" with the United States in some categories of strategic weapons and, by 1972, may even be ahead. Her navy prowls the Mediterranean; and from bases in North Africa she outflanks NATO from the south. Through Arab proxies she is encircling Israel and the oil of the Middle East, the fuel tank for Japan and Western Europe. With submarines and helicopter carriers Russia will soon be able to provide mili-

tary support for her propaganda spearheads—even in our own hemisphere.

In such a world, it is doubtful that America should turn all her power and wealth inward and try to live behind a moat, abandoning allies willing to stand by our side in the world arena. The democracies of the West still possess enormous vitality. If they keep their shields together, Russia can be deterred from making Hitler's mistake in assuming that aggression pays off.

Apart from Russia, there is one other major threat to our society. This internal threat stems from poisoned slogans that could polarize our Nation into either (1) the "law and order faction" or (2) the "civil rights and welfare faction." Let us resolve our pluralism shall not perish from false categories. Liberals, conservatives, and radicals need the same shield of justice. Law and compassion can walk hand in hand. Opportunity is the necessary companion of order. We must never divide the Nation into hawks and doves on the issue of "safeguards for the innocent" which have taken centuries to evolve.

A vast section of history is a desert swept by the raw winds of power. In that desert, "due process" is a small oasis, beyond whose fragile outworks shouts from the barbarian steppe still echo: "Let the stranger be killed!" "Strangle all the male children!" "Up against the wall with the village chiefs!" Those who denounce our judicial system as cumbersome should consider the options.

Would they return justice to trial-by-combat? Due process, however frustrating it may seem to the angry, must be preserved. The alternative is military government or the sort of "curbstone courts-martial" practiced by the Hitler Youth and the Red Guards of Mao Tse-tung.

The most strident attack on due process comes from radicals who boast they will use the political tapes of Lenin and Mao to program our civilization to self-destruct. Because the puritan ethic yields at times to the publicity ethic, articulate factions of the New Left sometimes seem to be enlisting thousands of disciples in their Mardi Gras of violence.

Does this mean the revolution is at hand? Actually, the extremists are disorganized warlords, each in search of a following. Almost without exception, these producers of guerrilla theater have been rejected by the Negro middle class and residents of the ghetto. On the college campus, where Weatherman and other anarchists try to exploit genuine grievances for their own ends, they are being unmasked by the great body of students who see through their charade.

Alumni and the general public can assist faculty and students in isolating New Left extremists by keeping their own cool in crisis situations. Let us welcome dissent as we reject "social demolition." Let us work for change as we oppose institutional homicide. It is imperative to distinguish between passionate reformers and ideological criminals.

Similarly, we must not confuse a handful of political revolutionaries with the hundreds of thousands of "cultural" rebels to be found everywhere in our society. Bare feet at Woodstock, and the cult of hair for hair's sake, may offend our sense of hygiene; but Woodstock was not the campsite of Che Guevara. Differences in taste and style do not make a spiritual chasm. Birthdates need not divide mankind any more than those other artificial barriers of race and religion.

You know that better than I do. Here in Columbia, in the recent past, a major university was tempered in the fire of controversy, cooled by the wisdom of administration, faculty and students working together in "double overtime," and is now certain to merit the reputation of a great university in the closing decades of this century. No one will pretend that Columbia was its usual sea of tranquility in May 1970; no human

beliefs are ever proof against misinformation and mistakes in the translation.

Elsewhere last spring, universities were paralyzed by those who want Halls of Knowledge to become the fourth branch of government or staging areas for social combat.

Here, in Columbia, there was no surrender of academic freedom to internal or external pressures. Here, the community of scholarship was kept intact by dialog and self-renewal. Here, in the age of the antihero, there emerged, all along the generation wave band, a new breed of hero who neither seeks nor needs "high visibility." This sort of hero commits himself—in the role of social architect—to undramatic chores which often require more skill and sheer stamina than deeds celebrated in the headlines.

I am not a stranger to the culture and boundless courtesy of the people of this State. Under any circumstances, the degree you confer on me today would be cherished and proudly exhibited as my foremost claim to distinction. After the trial by stress in May, in which your class and your university reinsured the "primacy of reason," I shall regard this honor as an obligation binding me to a continuing apprenticeship in your roundtable of maturity, your League of Fellowship and moral courage.

South Carolina has a message both for our Nation and the outside world which otherwise might misjudge our in-house disputations. That message is that when Americans shout at each other, they are shouting across the width of Main Street. If they must cross Main Street to speak to each other in more civil tones, they are still separated from communist and fascist totalitarians by the width of the Gobi Desert and the Black Sea. Though we may argue with each other on secondary issues, let the world know that those who trace their legacy to Gallilee and Magna Carta are not going to abdicate the future to the heirs of Genghis Khan and Stalin.

FORGOTTEN PEOPLE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the elderly are the forgotten people of our society: their problems too frequently obscured by more glamorous issues, their voices too often buried beneath the rhetoric of revolution and the uproar of partisan politics. Too proud to beg, too decent to revolt, the elderly stand and wait for someone to hear them out and someone to voice their needs to the American Nation.

We can give them that voice, we can be that voice, if we decide finally to give our elder citizens the representation they most certainly deserve in the Congress of the United States. I urge, Mr. Speaker, that we no longer ignore the people who—10, 20, 30 years ago—made this Nation what it is today; that we approve resoundingly this resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging in the House of Representatives.

The crisis of the elderly grows with each new set of statistics. Our most recent figures show that the aged have less than half the income of those under 65; that only among the aged did the number of people living in poverty actually increase in the past 2 years; that, with

the huge rise in unemployment of workers over 45, more and more older people are retiring involuntarily and accepting reduced social security benefits; that medical costs have risen 20 percent in the last 2 years, while medicare continues to cover but half of all these costs; that inflation has pushed property taxes to unreasonable heights, while the aged still live on fixed incomes.

Even beyond the statistics, evidence of nursing home abuses and pension plan failures continues to mount—with no sign of stopping. The crisis of the elderly quite literally extends to all areas of American life.

We can alleviate the problems of the aged by improving several existing programs and enacting a number of new ones. I have chosen nine areas which, I feel, deserve our fullest effort.

First. A House-passed bill to provide automatic increases in social security with each rise in the cost of living was tied up in debate and never enacted into law. This matter should receive priority attention in the 92d Congress.

Second. The family assistance plan would have raised many older people over the poverty level, yet the Congress, again, allowed it to wither away in needless controversy. This, too, is a matter of the first importance.

Third. Even now there are millions of elderly citizens who are not aware of benefits they could claim under old-age assistance. We must be sure to publicize the availability of this program and of the family assistance plan, when and if it is enacted.

Fourth. Various national health insurance measures will be introduced in the upcoming session, each of which will offer major benefits to the aged. These must be given the closest attention by the Congress.

Fifth. Even if no such insurance plan is passed, at the very least, we must make substantial changes in the medicare program. The monthly premium paid by the elderly for medicare part B—now double its original amount—may possibly be eliminated and that part paid for by Federal revenues. In addition, we must consider placing the cost of drugs under medicare coverage. Too many of the elderly spend half of their annual income on medication.

Sixth. We should undertake a major reform of nursing homes. Serious consideration should be given to the concept of a Federal subsidy for families taking the elderly into their homes. Much of the money we use now to finance nursing homes could be diverted to individual families, who most certainly would provide more love and better care to their parents than any institution ever could.

Seventh. The Congress should enact legislation to assist and train older workers. So much is spent now on the young, but what about the elderly unemployed? We should also examine a proposal to create public service jobs in the community for the older worker.

Eighth. I believe we should move for changes allowing workers to obtain benefits on their pension plans before they turn 65, and that a Federal agency

designed solely to regulate the pension business be established as soon as possible.

Ninth. We should seriously consider a law to provide Federal aid to States granting property tax relief for aged homeowners.

Each of these nine areas is part of the same problem; the problem of aging. They demand in the future a comprehensive and unified approach, not the piecemeal attacks of the past.

Many will argue that there are already committees to discuss the suggestions I have just made. That is true. And yet, that is precisely the problem—there are too many committees dealing with minute segments of the crisis of the aged and no single committee looking at the entire problem.

The record clearly shows the failure of these committees with regard to the aged. Something must be done—and done now.

The proposed select committee will not have extensive powers. It will not even have the authority to consider legislation. But it will have the advantage of a unified view of the crisis of the elderly, and it will finally give them a voice in the decisions so important to their own lives.

Growing old, Mr. Speaker, is not a partisan issue; nor is it an ideological question. It is a matter which concerns us all, Democrat or Republican, liberal or conservative, old or young. It is a matter which demands our continuing attention in the Congress of the United States.

I am proud to cosponsor this resolution creating the Select Committee on Aging, and I urge its immediate adoption. The elderly can be forgotten no longer.

"LADY MACBETH" AGAIN ON DISPLAY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the annual Texas State Society reception for the Texas congressional delegation featured an added, noncongressional attraction. It was the resurrection from a Smithsonian basement of Elizabeth Ney's famous statue of Lady Macbeth, portrayed during her distress-filled sleepwalk.

By courtesy of Dr. Joshua Taylor, Director, the reception was held in the National Collection of Fine Arts in the room where Lady Macbeth is now being displayed. The new Senator LLOYD BENTSEN and new Texas Congressman BILL ARCHER were guests of honor—and once again several hundred Texans residing in the District of Columbia area came out to say "howdy" to their representatives and to other well-known Texans, including Mr. and Mrs. Chuck Robb.

The Lady Macbeth statue was completed in Austin, Tex., in 1905, the fulfillment of a lifelong effort by Elizabeth Ney. Miss Ney—one of the world's first

lady sculptors—was born in Germany, rose to heights of popularity and acclaim there, and moved to Texas in 1872.

In 1920, the statue was moved to the National Gallery of Art on loan. When he saw the work, William Henry Holmes, then Curator, remarked that:

It displayed genius of the highest order. The distress, the agony, the despair, and the remorse are depicted in a completeness and subtlety that cannot be surpassed. The statue has the effect of making the other marbles assembled about it appear as the work of amateurs.

The group gathered yesterday, including Dr. Taylor, certainly seemed to agree with Mr. Holmes' assessment.

Several months ago, my wife handed me some articles on the Elizabeth Ney statue—and that began the long unraveling of a history as complicated and controversial as the life of the artist herself.

Judge James McClelland of Austin has spent a lifetime of dedicated work trying to get the statue placed on exhibit either at the Elizabeth Ney Museum in Austin or in the Smithsonian Institution.

Former Congressman Homer Thornberry joined the cause while he was in office—and then the task fell to me. I am delighted to see this moving work of art placed again on display for the people of this country to enjoy.

It is still not known if the statue can be moved from the gallery because of the legal confusion in the designation of heirs.

At least until such time as an heir can be named, however, I call on the national collection to keep this statue on exhibit.

Elizabeth Ney is also the artist responsible for the statues of Sam Houston and Stephen F. Austin in statuary hall and also so familiar to visitors to the Texas State Capitol.

Her long life was—to put it mildly—both fascinating and controversial. Born in Westphalia in 1833, daughter of Napoleon's famous general Johann Adam Ney, by the time she was 20 she had braved criticism and ridicule to win a place as a student of the great master Christian Daniel Rauch in Berlin. This in an age and a locality where women sculptors were unheard of. Two years later she moved out on her own, where her extraordinary gifts, her unusual beauty, and her indomitable will carried her to heights of popularity.

During this period, she completed portraits of the philosopher Schopenhauer, the naturalist Von Humboldt, King George V of Hanover, chemist Von Liebig, Jacob Grimm, Joschim, and Garibaldi, and was personally selected by Bismarck as the one living sculptor most able to "fittingly portray the builder of Germany for future generations."

But her popularity was soon to be lost in confrontations with that same heady independence which brought her fame. Although legally married to Dr. Edmund Montgomery and although their devotion to each other was obvious, she refused to acknowledge the institution of marriage. In the 19th century, social ostracism was inevitable.

Her search for a place where her ideas could be "free" brought her to Georgia, where she hoped to fund a utopian com-

munity. When that fell through, she went on to the young State of Texas, which remained her home until her death in 1907.

Also present at the display yesterday was Mrs. J. W. Rutland, who was the inspiration and guiding force behind the Elizabeth Ney Museum in Austin since its inception in 1926 and who remained its active director until 3 years ago.

I honor Mrs. Rutland, Judge McClelland, Judge Thornberry, and all the many others whose efforts to give this great work of art its due recognition received a pat on the back yesterday, I hope that now the statue will remain on display for many others to enjoy.

UNITED STATES STEEL-PUBLIC CO-OPERATE ON WATER POLLUTION

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, urban areas are having difficulty compelling water and air-polluting industries to take immediate steps to eliminate this menace to the public health and comfort. Considering the great progress made in science, space, et cetera in recent years, the elimination of air and water pollution should be a simple accomplishment, if all parties involved will work together to make it succeed.

The following editorial from the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune reveals a major step toward solving this destructive menace to the health of millions throughout the Nation:

A MODEL POLLUTION FIGHT

Settlement of that Illinois water pollution suit against U.S. Steel's South (Chicago) works might well set an example—and a helpful one—on the handling of similar situations which appear likely to arise in the near future.

Under an agreement solidified by court order the affair has apparently been settled by the steel company pledging itself to meet a series of deadlines which are designed to have the steel plant end all of its dumping of poisonous wastes into the Calumet River and into Lake Michigan by late 1975.

There are a variety of details, but those apply to the particular case. What is important is the way that the case was worked out, a development which has led Illinois Atty. Gen. William Scott to say it should serve "as a model for future legal battles by this office and others against major polluters throughout the country." We agree.

The case did not develop as, it well could have, into an acrimonious public courtroom battle. Instead representatives of both sides to the dispute, plus the obviously concerned Chicago Sanitary District, were ordered into the judge's chambers for six weeks of closed door negotiations. Out of that came the agreed settlement which was firmed up by the court decree.

If the case is accepted as a model it might even in time do away with the preliminary step of filing the law suit.

For example, the present Gary anti-pollution ordinance was developed through cooperation on the part of city officials and steel company representatives. The recent amendment to have that ordinance include coke oven emissions in its control provisions

is designed to work the same way. The only trouble with that is at times certain industries have dragged their feet with contentions of impracticability which sometimes meant only high costs. It is when that sort of thing develops that a public body feels forced to go into court as was the situation in the Illinois case.

Now if major industries sense that courts are generally shifting to the side of mandatory cleanup of pollution they may see the light sufficiently to work harder on advance agreements, thus possibly obviating the additional bother and expense of court proceedings.

RESULTS OF LAWS AFFECTING WELFARE RECIPIENTS

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the present laws affecting welfare recipients have resulted in human tragedy and financial waste. A recent article by Nick Kotz in the January 17, 1971, issue of the Washington Post points out that some families are being housed in hotels that are filthy and unsafe. The cost to the public runs as high as \$1,500 per month per family.

This should be a matter of national attention and concern. I commend this article to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

LUXURY RENT FOR FILTH, DEATH; UNSAFE HOTELS HOUSE N.Y. WELFARE CLIENTS

(By Nick Kotz)

NEW YORK.—For five years, a continuing government-imposed life style has packed welfare recipients here into filthy, unsafe hotels and is supporting them at Park Avenue luxury prices. The death count since early December stands at four children dead.

City officials admit that safety violations were involved in the death of one child crushed in an elevator shaft and another who fell into a stairwell lacking proper protective railing. Two children died in a fire at a hotel previously cited for building safety violations. Prostitution, narcotics and burglaries flourish under the noses of hotel managers who often bar poverty workers from the premises.

Packed five, six and seven to a room, welfare families continue to live in the hotels that were scenes of recent deaths—the Earle in Greenwich Village, the Broadway Central in lower Manhattan, the Sanford Motor Hotel near Laguardia Airport in Queens—and in about 95 others.

The city acknowledges that many of the hotels violate health and safety standards, but contends that in the midst of a housing crisis it has no other place to put the 5,000 welfare poor now living there.

Yet the government foots the bills, which run four to five times as much as adequate housing would cost, if it were available and if welfare families were permitted to occupy it. City-imposed limits on welfare rent bars welfare recipients from most decent available housing.

Hotel rents average \$650 monthly per welfare family and run as high as \$1,500 monthly with the federal government paying half the cost and the New York City and state governments splitting the balance.

Families are averaging 4½-month stays in the hotels and some have lived in them for several years.

"There is a sad and ugly stench of greed," said New York City welfare official Robert Jorgen. "The hotel operators are stopping all services and making a quick killing. The families are helpless, traumatized and being further exploited."

"I can't talk on a normal basis," said Lula Robinson, a black woman who has lived with her husband, daughter, and six grandchildren in two small rooms of the Hamilton Hotel on West 73rd Street for which they paid \$660 monthly rent. "We have been murdered. Satan has triumphed."

HAMILTON CLOSED

The city closed the Hamilton Hotel last week because of health, fire, and building hazards, and 35 welfare families living in it have been moved to another dilapidated building, abandoned as a nurse's residence. Despite a three-week effort—intensified by a six-day "live-in" at welfare department headquarters by families from the Hamilton demanding apartments—the city has found apartments for few.

"These 5,000 human beings have been consigned to concentration camps," says Dorothy Pitman Hughes, the black antipoverty worker leading the protest. "This is just as bad as Myl and the persecuted Russian Jews that get all that front-page publicity."

"The city has exposed just how deeply it cares about human beings."

City officials are quick to condemn the conditions. "These hotels have become notorious sore spots in our city," says Mayor John Lindsay. "The rental costs are exorbitant and exploitive, the physical conditions and health standards within many are deplorable and illegal . . . Children cannot go to school."

But Mayor Lindsay and others in New York disagree strongly about the root causes that lead the city to place homeless welfare families into such a wretched existence.

Agreement about the cause of this scandal stops after acknowledgement that there is a city-wide housing crisis, which puts a particular squeeze on New York's 1.2 million welfare poor. The statistics include 800,000 badly substandard dwelling units are still used as homes and 130,000 families waiting for public housing vacancies. Every year, 50,000 housing units are abandoned as unrentable but thousands still go on living in the ruins. Every year, 10,000 families are left homeless by urban renewal and other new construction.

Lindsay says the city is forced to pack the welfare families into the hotels because "obsolete federal and state regulations" prevent the city from providing lower-cost housing. Changed laws and far from more federal housing funds are needed to bring reform, says Lindsay.

Other city officials disagree. They point out that to maintain a racial and economic mixture the city's own housing authority has limited the number of welfare recipients permitted into public housing—particularly those in the Aid to Dependent Children program. Of the 583,000 persons living in public housing, about 133,000 are receiving welfare benefits.

The city's regulations put a ceiling on rents paid by welfare recipients, and the limits effectively preclude welfare recipients from getting better housing. But critics note the irony that the rates don't stop the city from paying high prices to put the homeless welfare recipients into hotels, including at least 23 officially rated, "unapproved" by the city.

The New York Urban Coalition criticizes the city for refusing to finance its plan to rehabilitate abandoned housing for the wel-

fare poor. The critics note that the city's relocation administration has, until last week, shunned responsibility to help relocate homeless welfare poor, 90 per cent of whom are black or Puerto Rican.

TENANTS REFUSED

"It gets down to people," said a city welfare official. "The relocation inspectors are mostly white. They make \$7,200 a year and they're not going to break their necks finding housing for some black or Puerto Rican when they themselves can't even afford to live in Massapequa," a low-income Long Island suburb.

Relocation officials respond that landlords refuse to accept welfare tenants because they destroy property and fail to pay the rent.

Julie Sugarman, director of the city's Human Resources Administration, said "the most significant lesson to him from the Hamilton Hotel protest" is the shortage of large-size habitable apartments and the high level of hostility of landlords to rent to welfare tenants.

The darkest view of the city's failure and the economic-political causes was expressed by Frances Fox Piven, a professor at the Columbia University School of Social Work.

"Slum housing is no longer a self-sustaining system, given the cost of financing, heat and maintenance," she said. "In order to make a profit, the landlords milk the building, neglect services, then walk away."

"The city's solution has been to slowly raise the rents permitted for welfare families just to keep the slum housing going. They want to paper together the existing system. The city is working for and with the slumlords. The city doesn't feel capable of a large-scale solution."

RECENT INCIDENTS

The state of New York's welfare hotel housing and the city's obvious inability to cope with the problem are illustrated by a chronological account of events the last 13 months, events whose pace has recently quickened:

Dec. 18, 1969—Eleven members of the Georgia Tate family died in a Brooklyn attic fire. City welfare and building inspection officials knew earlier that their residence in what was built in 1889 as a one-family home violated health and fire safety regulations, but they said they couldn't find other housing for the Tates. Seventeen members of the Tate family were packed like sardines in the second floor and attic of the small home.

April 2, 1970—A Brooklyn grand jury indicted the Tate's landlord, a 78-year-old woman, on 11 counts of manslaughter and criminally negligent homicide.

Incredibly, the six surviving Tates at this time were being moved by welfare officials, for the third time since the fire, into substandard welfare hotels.

Nov. 23, 1970—The New York Times in an extensive story described the hazards of welfare hotel living.

Nov. 24, 1970—Mayor Lindsay responded to the Times story, agreeing with the picture of hotel horrors, and announced certain reforms—particularly, weekly inspections of the hotels and provision of more social services to the welfare occupants.

Dec. 7, 1970—Gerald Willmote, 4, plunged to his death down an open stairwell in the Broadway Central Hotel. After an inspection, welfare and building department officials said in reports that protective railings was missing and broken steps were hazardous. "Even a sure-footed adult would have trouble not falling," the inspecting welfare official said.

CRITICAL INSPECTION

Dec. 12, 1970—Rep. Edward Koch (D-N.Y.) toured the Broadway Central on a critical inspection. Accompanying city officials did not tell him or the press about the earlier death.

Gerald Willmote's five surviving brothers and sisters still lived there in one room. A fire door labeled "this door may save your life in case of fire" was nailed shut.

Dec. 16, 1970—Larry Anderson, 4, and his sister Laurie, 2, died in a fire which began in the basement of the Sanford Motor Hotel. The 11-member Anderson family had been charged \$850 monthly for their three rooms. The hotel had been placed on the welfare department's "non-referral" list 11 months earlier because of repeated and uncorrected building code safety violations, but the welfare families had not been moved out.

Dec. 23, 1970—A city health and building inspection team cited the Hamilton Hotel for raw sewage on the cellar floor, mouse and rat infestation, overcrowding, inadequate heating and cooking facilities, holes in the walls and peeling paint containing dangerous percentages of lead. Forty-seven welfare families lived in the building. City Councilman Theodore Weiss had been complaining to the city about these conditions for five months.

Dec. 23, 1970—Welfare administrator Sugarman announced that families would be moved from the Hamilton to better housing and said plans were under way to ease the hotel situation by seeking higher rent maximums for welfare tenants of apartments. He said the increased hotel inspections ordered in November were now in effect.

Dec. 29, 1970—The city ordered the Hamilton Hotel to close by Jan. 12.

New Year's Eve—A 14-year-old girl fell nine stories down an open elevator shaft in the Whitehall Hotel, 250 W. 100th St. She landed on a huge pile of garbage and miraculously lived, welfare reports show.

Jan. 2, 1971—Juanita Sheppard 7, got out of her bed at midnight in the Earle Hotel and was crushed to death after falling into a freight elevator shaft. City officials said the freight elevator door lacked the required safety latch. The hotel owner said the freight elevator was locked.

Jan. 5, 1971—Rep. Koch inspected the Earl Hotel. He found the dead Sheppard girl's mother, stepfather and five brothers and sisters still living in two rooms with three beds, one hot plate, a half refrigerator, and \$222.60 weekly rent. "A hotel is not a place for children", hotel owner Moses Rosenberg told reporters. "I keep asking the city to take these children out of here. I tell them to send me older people on welfare if they have no room. But not children."

"LIVE-IN" AT HAMILTON

Jan. 5, 1971—About 50 men, women and children from the Hamilton Hotel began a "live-in" in Sugarman's offices to protect the city's failure to find them new housing.

Jan. 7, 1971—City police came to Director Sugarman's office to evict the "live-in" families. The women and children barricaded themselves behind office doors. Sugarman forestalled the eviction, telling the mayor's office: "We still haven't found housing for 40 families; We have condemned their present living quarters (the Hamilton) and we can't send them back there."

Jan. 8, 1971—The mayor's office instituted a plan not to let the "live-in" children return to the offices from a day care center to which they had been lured. The plan was to evict the parents and take the families back to the Hamilton, Rep.-elect Charles B. Rangel (D-N.Y.) stopped the plan at the last minute with a call to Deputy Mayor Richard Aurelio. The city still had not found housing for the 40 families.

Jan. 9, 1971—The welfare "live-in" group was taken to visit what the relocation department called "Newly renovated apartments." A shivering black woman returned to report that holes in an apartment wall were so large you could see the building across the street.

"A precious few apartments were decent," said a welfare official, "but most weren't fit for any human to live in."

Jan. 11, 1971—The city put finishing touches on plans to evict the welfare families and bus them to a former nurses' home on East 20th Street. Buses were parked outside the building to move the families during the evening. At 5 p.m., a minor fire in the bank on the building's first floor forced emptying of the building. City officials said the fire was accidental. The families huddled in a city office across the street while the fire was extinguished.

Black leaders met at 11 p.m. with city officials and reported back to the families: They must go to the nurses' home, go to the Hamilton, or be arrested. "I wouldn't put a pig in that nursing home," a black woman replied. "You have sold us down the river. We've gone too far to turn back now. I'd rather die."

Sugarman succeeded in getting the group to go to the nurses' home after promising that 12 good apartments would be available the next day and telling them: "You did a lot of good in getting the city to pay attention to this problem. The machinery pushed into being by your action will not be turned off."

HAMILTON SEALED UP

Jan. 12, 1971—While the mayor issued a press release announcing that new public housing starts greatly increased during 1970, Sugarman admitted to the families evicted from the Hamilton that the 12 apartments he promised them were the same accommodations they viewed the previous Saturday and found unliveable.

The Hamilton Hotel was sealed by the city, after all families were emptied into buses and sent to the nurses' quarters or other hotels. Steven Silverberg, co-owner of the hotel, said his basic mistake was not charging higher rents so he could keep up the building and make a profit. He received \$38,500 monthly for his welfare tenants' rent.

"This used to be a nice residential hotel," said Silverberg, "but 40 of my tenants moved out when the second welfare family moved in. These people have sabotaged and ruined the building."

Jan. 13, 1971—Sugarman announced he still had been able to find decent apartments for only 9 of the 47 families now at the nurses' home.

Jan. 14, 1971—New day's effort by the mayor's emergency-ordered action group succeeded in finding only three more liveable apartments. Thirty five families were still stranded in the former nurses' quarters, but order now prevailed there. The building was manned with 24-hour coverage by high-ranking city officials, including the commissioner of the narcotics addiction program, who busied himself ordering diapers and sheets. City crews got the water and heat operating and covered the flaking lead-based paint with a thin coat of new paint. The building was manned by child care, social services, custodial, youth services, safety patrol, homemakers, day care and medical personnel. While black youths roamed their new neighborhood in packs, the younger children watched a movie on zebras provided by the youth service workers.

Jan. 15, 1971—The work week ended with the city unable to add a single new apartment for the homeless families.

Jan. 16, 1971—New York City congressmen met with city officials to demand action. Solutions discussed included admitting more welfare families to public housing, rehabilitating abandoned housing, using Model Cities money and seeking permission to use welfare money to buy housing for the welfare poor. Rep-elect Bella Abzug (D-N.Y.) said massive emergency federal aid is needed. The city officials promised action.

FINDING TRAVEL BARGAINS

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe the attached article "Finding Travel Bargains" by Peter Weaver, should be of interest to all of us.

Those who want super service can get it on the scheduled airlines, but surely the student, and others traveling on a limited budget, should be able to take advantage of the most economical means of transportation that is available, consistent with sound operating practices. Supplemental airlines provide such favorable rates, as outlined in Mr. Weaver's article, with an enviable safety record.

Those of us who have consistently supported legislation affecting airlines believe that the CAB should reexamine the fare structure of all types of air transportation and assure the American people of the best rates.

The article follows:

FINDING TRAVEL BARGAINS

(By Peter Weaver)

Next April 1, international airlines aim to cut out some of their best vacation bargains.

If you want to grab one of these bargains before they're shut off—start planning now. There are other bargains that can match those being discarded by the airlines but you have to know where to find them. Here's a guide:

BIT Flights: Airlines flying to Europe will soon close out their Bulk Inclusive Tour (BIT) flights. You can still get one of these up to March 31 by inquiring through a travel agent or an airline that flies to Europe.

For example, \$284 gets you a two-week "Theater Package" which includes air fare from New York, hotel with breakfast, tickets to London's best plays and musicals. To figure prices from cities other than New York, use round-trip "Discover America" fares. Examples: Flying from the Chicago area you would add approximately \$100, making the total trip \$384; from the West Coast, add \$200. Use this method to compute all European fares outside of New York.

There are also BIT "Car Tours" where you fly to, say, Paris, Brussels or Amsterdam for \$285. This includes air fare, one night in a de luxe hotel, use of a car for two weeks (unlimited mileage) and 13 nights in a guest house. The "guest house" is a gimmick to get around international air agreements which insist that all BIT flights include ground accommodations. They're often hard to reach and few travelers use them. It's more convenient to just throw away guest house coupons.

After April 1, the only airline bargains left will be Group Inclusive Tours (GIT). In comparison with the tour packages mentioned above, GIT prices will cost from \$75 to \$105 more than BIT flights.

Supplementals: There are supplemental airlines that do not fly specific routes on a scheduled basis. They do not belong to the International Air Transport Assn. (IATA) which fixes prices for most scheduled, international airlines. The supplementals are, however, certified by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Because they're not IATA members, supplementals can cut air fares to as low as one-half those charged by scheduled airlines. Here are some examples: Round-trip jet fare on a supplemental from New York to Mexico

averages \$120 (compared with \$240 scheduled airline excursion fare); San Francisco-Tokyo is \$300 (compared with \$614 excursion fare).

Also, supplementals can provide shorter, packaged vacations for those who can't spend the two or three weeks required in airline BIT or GIT tours. From the East Coast, you can get a supplemental 8-day tour to Malaga, Spain, for \$190. This includes air fare, hotel and some meals. You can get a 4-day trip to Nassau, Bahamas, for \$99, including hotel and some meals.

Supplementals fly from air terminals all over the United States. To find names and addresses for supplemental airlines that might be flying to a country you want to visit, write to National Air Carrier Assn., 1730 M St., NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. Ask to be put on the supplementals' mailing lists.

Another non-IATA member is Icelandic Airlines which, unlike the supplementals, flies a regularly scheduled jet route from New York to Luxembourg via Iceland. Icelandic's GIT fare to Europe is \$195, round-trip—cheapest on the Atlantic.

Icelandic has a two-week Swiss Alps Ski Tour for \$285 which includes airfare from New York to Luxembourg, 12 nights with breakfast and dinner at a good, legitimate Swiss guest house (three to six in a room, dormitory style).

Icelandic also owns International Air Bahama Airline which flies to Luxembourg from Nassau for \$195 round-trip. Add \$34 if you connect from Miami. You can get an intriguing packet of Icelandic's tour brochures (including \$16.50 one-day, one-night tours of Iceland and Luxembourg at de luxe hotels, with meals). Ask your travel agent or write Icelandic Airlines, 610-B Fifth Ave., New York, N.Y. 10020.

SOUTH PUNISHED BY NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, bias against the South has become commonplace here in Washington, D.C. It is even justified by some as being in the best interests of democracy.

The latest anti-South discrimination has been the proposal by the Rules Commission of the National Democratic Party to punish the South for what it calls lack of party loyalty in national presidential elections.

The proposal would deny equal representation to Southern States at the Democratic National Convention.

This punishment would deny the South 129 delegates to which they would normally be entitled. Although the Southern States contain 23.6 percent of the Nation's population, the national Democrats would allow the South only 19.3 percent of the convention delegates.

By this action, not only has the national party commission violated the basic concepts of democracy, it has further flaunted its own egalitarian doctrine of one man, one vote, and the laws of the Supreme Court of the United States on equal apportionment of voting rights.

This is strange behavior for the Democratic Party leaders who apparently fail to understand that political parties do

not punish people—rather people punish parties. Perhaps this is the new politics—when Democrats become undemocratic in order to gain more political power by diminishing the South's representation.

I include a local news clipping in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 23, 1971]

DEMOCRATS OK 1972 CONVENTION DELEGATE RULES

(By Robert Walters)

The Democratic party's Rules Commission, almost evenly divided during four hours of debate, has rejected a series of proposals designed to increase the voting strength of delegations from Southern states at the party's 1972 presidential nominating convention.

Instead, the 27-member reform group, headed by (Blank) yesterday adopted an apportionment formula based on two equally weighted factors—each state's current population and its support of Democratic candidates in the last three presidential elections.

The commission also voted to limit the 1972 convention to approximately 3,000 delegates and to end the practice of awarding state delegations "bonus votes" which provide automatic delegate status to the 110 members of the Democratic National Committee.

"BONUS VOTES" ENDED

Also terminated was the allocation of "bonus votes" to states where the Democratic candidates received a plurality in the most recent presidential election. All of yesterday's decisions still require the approval of the Democratic National Committee, which meets here Feb. 19.

Virtually all of the commission's meeting centered on a pair of conflicting approaches to resolving the problem of equitably apportioning state delegations at the forthcoming national convention.

Sen. Thomas F. Eagleton, D-Mo., advocated a formula based solely on population, as determined by the 1970 census. Supporting him were almost all of the commission members from Southern and border states.

Donald O. Peterson, chairman of the Wisconsin delegation at the 1968 Democratic convention, led the forces seeking adoption of a formula which would place considerable emphasis on each state's past support of the party's presidential nominees.

LESS LOYAL TO TICKET

Because the South has been substantially less loyal to the party's national ticket in elections during the past decade, the Peterson approach would have the effect of allocating fewer delegates to its states than to states in other regions of the country.

The first in a series of extremely close votes on the issue came when the commission divided, 9-8, in favor of Eagleton's population-only apportionment formula. But , who had initially abstained, joined those opposing the plan and promptly announced that it "falls on a tie vote."

Eagleton then modified his plan and offered a new formula, based on three weighted factors. Population would compose half of the formula, with a quarter determined by each state's total votes in the electoral college and the remaining quarter based on the state's voter turnout for Democratic candidates in the 1960, 1964 and 1968 presidential elections.

MEMBER SWITCHES

One commission member, Carl A. Auerbach, a Minnesota law professor, switched from a pro- to anti-Eagleton position, and the Senator's second formula was defeated by a 9-8 vote, with abstaining.

Peterson initially offered a formula based half on each state's support for the Democratic presidential nominee in 1968, a quarter on population and a quarter on relative strength in the Electoral College. That pro-

posal never came to a vote because Peterson modified it late in the meeting to pick up needed additional support.

Finally agreed upon by the commission, on an 11-6 vote, was a formula devised by Peterson and slightly modified by Mrs. Liv Bjorlie, Democratic national committeewoman from North Dakota.

It calls for apportionment of the state delegations based half on current population and half on each state's voter turnout for the Democratic presidential nominee in 1960, 1964 and 1968.

In each of those years, voters in the Southern states were less enthusiastic about the Democratic ticket than the nation as a whole. Thus, the commission's formula gives the South 19.3 percent of all 1972 convention delegates, even though the region has 23.6 percent of the country's population.

Specifically, that means the South will be represented by 129 fewer delegates than under a population-only formula. The state most substantially affected, Texas, will have 140 delegates, 31 fewer than under Eagleton's initial proposal.

CAMBODIA

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the Sacramento Union, one of California's most distinguished daily newspapers, has for the past 5 years carried the dispatches from Southeast Asia of Jim Bishop, a correspondent of unusual discernment. On January 12, 1971, less than a week after his return from Cambodia, the Union printed a Bishop article on Cambodia which seems to me to be of more than passing interest and deserving of careful study by Members of Congress.

The article follows:

CAMBODIA

(By Jim Bishop)

What are Cambodia's chances of survival? Doubtful.

The North Vietnamese, VC, and Khmer Rouge are already in control of about one third of Cambodia.

The Cambodians are getting increasingly squeezed back into the cities and larger villages. And increasingly, these cities and villages are being cut off from each other and surrounded by Red forces.

The seven highways into Phnom Penh are closed by the Red's. The river route up the Mekong is a slow and precarious one.

Cambodia's allies? Not one American soldier will fight on Cambodian soil. Cambodians generally lump their major ground and air ally, South Viet Nam, with North Viet Nam. To a Cambodian, a Vietnamese is a Vietnamese, be he north or south. The presence of South Vietnamese troops on Cambodian soil is unpopular and unwanted to the average Cambodian. To the west, an increasingly jittery Thailand is causing concern to Cambodia. Border incidents along the Thai-Laos and Thai-Cambodia borders could bring another invasion of Cambodia.

Phnom Penh is a city under siege. The American Embassy has been bombed. Theatres, although still open, have been grenaded. Guards have been sniped off walls at night. Half of a big military installation was destroyed just outside the Phnom Penh Airport. Small bands of VC have had firefights in Phnom Penh suburbs.

Angkor Wat is surrounded. Kompong Thom is cut off. The seaport of Komy Som is isolated.

Economically Cambodia has already been bled bone-dry. Four of the nation's five rubber estates are already shut down. The Khmer nation is not attracting its once booming tourist business. This year's rice harvest is down from a year ago. In rice-bowl Battambang Province alone, the harvest is 100,000 tons lower this year. And to add even more problems, Reds have burned scores of rice trucks on Highway 7 and other roads and warned drivers not to attempt to bring rice into the major centers. Consequently truckers have raised their rates, charging "danger money", as much as six times more than a year ago.

Military and press sources in Saigon and Phnom Penh call the Cambodian army "poorly equipped, poorly trained, poorly led, and poorly armed".

On the other hand, everyone agrees the existing morale and unity of the Cambodian Army is far higher than had been expected. Now that the dry season has begun which gives the NVN and VC new mobility and striking power, Cambodian morale and unity will be taxed to its utmost.

Some rice is getting into Phnom Penh. A small tanker came through Red gunfire up the Mekong River a week ago to deliver seven day's supply of civilian gasoline to Phnom Penh. American sources say 180,000 weapons have been delivered to the Cambodian Army. The percentage of new weapons is a small one.

Cambodian sources say volunteers have increased their army to about 175,000. Many of these are women and teen age boys. The original standing army of Cambodia was about 35,000, most of whom were used in the Sihanouk regime for road repair work or Palace guard duty.

Can the Communist forces take Phnom Penh now?

Probably.

But why should they? American headlines report rape in much larger type than they do slow starvation. Why should the NVN and VC force, a costly confrontation which might pull world opinion and American military might back in against them, when their goals can be accomplished—as they will be in South Vietnam—over a longer and quieter period.

The grass-green Cambodian troops are hoping for a "classic battle" of head-on forces. The Reds have avoided such strategy whenever possible since Dien Bien Phu.

Hit and run. Starve and strangle. Strike by night. Disappear by day. This will be the Communist program in Cambodia.

And even if American aid, already passed by Congress, is made available immediately, can it get up the Red-controlled highways in time?

If not, then does Cambodia revert to a perpetual battleground, its resources and people lost to themselves and to the Free World? A battlefield where Vietnamese fight each other and the Cambodians, where Red Chinese and Thai battle, where Khmer Rouge and Laotian loot and pillage. And Communism has taken another giant step towards domination over all of Southeast Asia.

Starving, strangling and most of all, saddening, that's Cambodia 1971.

RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE IN THE SOUTHWEST

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, we are on the eve of the decision from the Depart-

ment of Transportation concerning the future of traveling America. Soon, we will have the decision from DOT naming the end-points of the basic railroad passenger service to operate under the direction of the National Railroad Passenger Corp.

That decision, Mr. Speaker, is crucial to the people of the Southwest especially. We are concerned because the initial recommendations offered by DOT leave our part of the Nation without service. We feel like the victims of the last great train robbery.

Last week, DOT Secretary John Volpe and FRR Administrator Carl Lyon met with me to discuss service in the Southwest, Texas in particular. At the outset, let me say that I am in sympathy with the difficulties facing these two capable men. They are charged with the tough responsibility of putting together the framework of a national system which will serve two masters: the public and the accountants. In the excitement to insure rail service for the Nation, many people forget that the Congress has charged the DOT to come up with a railroad passenger system which at least has a fighting chance to become economically sound. That in itself is 180 degrees from the financially bankrupt passenger lines now running. I will be among the first to agree that the new system must be run for profit.

And, I will be among the first to argue that we can prove our economic case in the Southwest—if we can get adequate, decent, and efficient service, we can make the railroad passenger service pay for itself. I am convinced.

Mr. Speaker, I left the meeting with Mr. Volpe and Mr. Lyon encouraged that they would give our requests their full and personal consideration. This, I am certain, they will do.

However, since the clay is still soft and a final decision has not been made, I must point again to the desperate needs of my State and our neighbor States in the Southwest. We must have the strong support of the railroad service to keep our other systems from being choked to death by the slow strangulation that has robbed the eastern seaboard of mobility—too many people trying to get too many places by too few available methods.

In Texas, we have a remarkable highway system. Also, our airport development is well on its way. But they cannot be expected to continue to stand alone against the onslaught of an ever traveling public.

For as long as people will listen, Mr. Speaker, I will continue to ask for the barest semblance of rail transportation. Mine is not an unreasonable request.

I ask two routes, and I make no attempt to name points along the line. Rather, I ask for service in general direction only.

We need to include the Southern Pacific run which is currently in operation from New Orleans to Los Angeles. This line alone would offer transportation to the great Southwest which has been left

waiting at the church. This East-West service is good enough now that passenger trains are running three times a week. Plus this route, or something like it, has been recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Texas Railroad Commission, NARP, the Governor of Texas, and various other groups.

The second, but equally important, part of my recommendations would include train service from Laredo northward.

Mr. Speaker, passenger trains enjoy immense popularity in Mexico, our neighbor to the south. To deny them service into this country would be a diplomatic insult. For generations, we have endeavored to make the good neighbor policy work. Let us put some money where our mouth is.

Too, at the top of our hemisphere, Canadians have demonstrated they have no aversions to riding the passenger train. What we need, Mr. Speaker, is service from Monterey to Montreal with stops in between to provide service for the stepchild of the transportation industry—the railroad passenger.

Hard statistics are scarce because the last passenger run, the historic Golden Eagle, was discontinued earlier. However, I can support my arguments with impressive figures that are directly related to movement of mail—that can be translated into dollars and profits.

Few have stopped to realize the tremendous volume of mail that flows back and forth at Laredo. The United States sends more than 11 million pieces of mail every year across the border by surface transportation. This, despite the fact that most first class mail is airlifted to Mexico City. Mexico sends an impressive 7 million pieces of mail across into the United States from their side of the border.

That is over 200,000 sacks of mail each year. Mr. Speaker, we can stack only 750 mail sacks into a 40 foot box car, so you can see that we fill lots of trains.

Also, on the international side. Every day 240 sacks of international mail in a closed pouch comes out of Mexico into the United States for distribution to other nations.

Mr. Speaker, I can and will continue with these and many other statistics. However, at this junction, I ask permission to pause and illustrate the depth of the feeling in Texas that we need railroad passenger service.

On Thursday, January 7th, the Houston Chronicle ran a strongly worded editorial which dramatically points to our despair. It tells our story in a minimum of words and I include a reprint of the article in the RECORD at this point:

RAIL PROPOSAL NOT GOOD ENOUGH

Designation of a final nationwide railroad passenger service system is to be completed in late January and unless changes are made, Texas will wind up with only one north-south route in the network.

It seems to us utterly ridiculous that the government-sponsored National Railroad Passenger Corp. network would be set without east-west routes across the southern half of the nation, including Texas, Louisiana and Arizona. Another area ignored by the

first proposal of Transportation Secretary John Volpe was a link with Mexico.

There is some chance that the proposed system will be modified when the final plan is presented next month since the powerful Interstate Commerce Commission has called for major alterations in the proposed system. The ICC has urged that the Southern Pacific Sunset Route connecting New Orleans and West Coast points be included in the Railpax network, and it also recommended connection with a Mexican border corridor. The last link with Mexico, the Missouri Pacific St. Louis to Laredo was abandoned earlier this year.

As pointed out by ICC spokesmen, the proposed network as it now stands leaves millions of citizens without any rail passenger service including such Texas cities as Beaumont, San Antonio and El Paso as well as Phoenix and Tucson in Arizona. Houston would have only one north-south route to Chicago, which means that a passenger would have to go through Chicago to get to the West Coast.

In its report to Volpe, the ICC said that selection of routes is a function of the Railpax Corp. but points designation is the secretary's decision to make. It said a more specific designation of intermediate points to be served would provide a clearer guide for route selection.

Like the ICC, we feel that the basic plan for Railpax is good, but as presented thus far, it should be modified to provide medium and long-haul service to all areas with population sufficient to provide potential profits for the system. An east-west route from Florida to the West Coast via Texas and Arizona certainly has the population potential to support it.

PENALTIES FOR NEGLIGENCE

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1971

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the two recent oil-spill tragedies in Connecticut and California underscore the need for new legislation holding negligent shipowners liable for environmental damage caused by oil-spills. Under existing law negligent boatowners are liable only for the cleaning-up costs. Since the 87th Congress I have introduced legislation to amend the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 to provide penalties against shipowners in instances of negligence which substantially endanger desirable aquatic, or other plant or animal life of the navigable waters of the United States, and I intend to reintroduce the bill again in this Congress.

The Connecticut shoreline is presently being threatened by 386,000 gallons of oil from a damaged tanker. Although the oil has not hit the beaches yet, the oil is already taking its toll in wildlife, and the damage to fish and plantlife has yet to be assessed. I firmly believe that the shipowner should compensate the State of Connecticut and private landowners for all of the damage caused by its negligence, and I intend to push vigorously for enactment of my bill in this session of Congress.