

a resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Rules and Administration for a study of matters relating to privileges and elections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution, which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES 28

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1971, through February 29, 1972, for the purposes stated and within the limitations imposed by the following sections, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Rules and Administration, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1971, through February 29, 1972, to expend not to exceed

\$113,000 to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;
- (2) corrupt practices;
- (3) contested elections;
- (4) credentials and qualifications;
- (5) Federal elections, generally; and
- (6) presidential succession.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 29, 1972.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

The Senate continued with the consideration of the motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 9) amending rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate with respect to limitation of debate.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, what is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOK). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ala-

bama (Mr. ALLEN) to postpone until the next legislative day the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 9, a resolution to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate with respect to the limitation of debate.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECESS UNTIL 12 NOON ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1971

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 1, 1971, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HALTING BROADCAST ABUSES

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the poor quality of radio and TV broadcasting is almost universally acknowledged. TV programing, in particular, has appropriately been called a "vast wasteland." This situation is due largely to the absence of effective monitoring by the FCC of the 7,500 broadcast stations in this country, which often leads to flagrant and continuing violations of stations' public responsibilities.

A highly imaginative petition to correct these abuses was filed with the FCC on January 8 by students of consumer spokesman, John F. Banzhaf III of the George Washington University Law Center. Adopting the acronym STATIC—Student Taskforce Against Telecommunication Information Concealment—the students' petition, if adopted, would require stations to broadcast spot announcements informing the listening public of station programing requirements and procedures governing renewal of broadcast licenses.

Armed with this knowledge the public could critically monitor the stations and make both the FCC and the individual stations aware of violations. In my view such action could lead to increased efforts by the stations to serve the public interest, and ultimately to significant improvements in radio and TV broadcasting.

The petition follows:

HALTING BROADCAST ABUSE—BEFORE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

In re: Public Rights in the Broadcasting Media.

PETITION FOR RULEMAKING

JANUARY 8, 1971.

Pursuant to 5 USC Section 553, the statutory authority, and 47 CFR Section 1, 40(a), the Commission authority, STATIC, Student Taskforce Against Telecommunication Information Concealment, a group of students from George Washington University Law School, as members of the general public, respectfully requests that the Commission adopt as part of their Rules and Regulations requirements for licensees designed to give the public effective notice of their rights vis a vis the licensees as established by statute, administrative policies and decisions, and judiciary review decisions.

II. SUMMARY OF THE PROBLEM

The Federal Communications Act of 1934 was passed in part in recognition that the electronic mass media should serve the public. The Act empowered the Federal Communications Commission to regulate the use of the frequency spectrum. The rights of the public to complete coverage of controversial subjects and to inoffensive and factual transmission of news were included in the statutory language.¹ Correlatively, the licensee, as a condition of being granted the license to broadcast, has the duty to serve the public interest by respecting these rights.

The duties the licensee owes the public have been further delineated since 1934 through administrative policy statements and judicial review. The licensee's programming, it is now recognized, must be balanced and fair, and

"THAT THE LICENSEE RESPONSIBILITY IS TO BE EXERCISED IN THE INTEREST OF, AND AS A TRUSTEE FOR THE PUBLIC AT LARGE."²

Furthermore, the public has standing at Commission hearings. Nonetheless, the public is not made aware of their rights, and they are unable to fully protect their interests. The duties of the licensee must include informing the public of its rights through the media. Otherwise, the statutory rights of the public serve merely to protect the licensees from competition. They will not insure that the interests of the public be served.

The Commission does not have the resources to effectively monitor and identify the licensees who violate the public trust. In the thirty-six years of existence, the Commission has expanded the personnel in its broadcast bureau three-fold, while the number of licensed stations has increased ten-fold. The Commission requires the licensee to ascertain the community needs and program accordingly. In this way the licensees satisfy their statutory requirement of public service. The Commission cannot independently evaluate each community's needs, and should not depend solely on the licensees evaluation of its own performance.

Therefore, as a mode of illuminating the public interest the Commission should invite the licensee to open direct avenues of communication with the public.

III. PROPOSED SOLUTION

In order to actualize the statutory intent and purpose it is necessary that the licensees be required to inform the public of its rights and of the duties owed by the licensees. In order to effectively administer the Act, and present Commission policy, the Commission should adopt our petition for rulemaking which would require the licensees to give effective notice to the public of its rights.

IV. THE RATIONALE OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM

The original Federal Radion Commission (1927) and the succeeding Federal Communi-

Footnotes at end of article.

cations Commission (1934) were created in response to two problems involving the allocation of the frequency spectrum: the prevention of technical interference and the choice of who is to operate upon the limited number of frequencies.³ The allocating mechanism adopted by Congress was licensing.

The problem of preventing technical interference was easily solved. The FCC limited the number of licenses to transmit and regulated their power and frequency transmission.

The second problem was more intractable. The Commission is instructed to grant or renew a license "if in public interest, convenience, or necessity."⁴ This language was taken from public utility legislation and lacked any definite criteria for the Commission.

The relationship between the broadcast industry and the public is special and unique. The FCC could not issue licenses on a first come basis and depend upon competition to protect the public interest. The major theorem of the competitive model is that the interaction of buyers and sellers insures the interest of each one is maximized. However, in commercial broadcasting, the licensees are the sellers and the advertisers are the buyers. Therefore, the public interest is not directly considered if the broadcasting industry is unregulated.

Moreover, the technically limited frequency spectrum created an oligopolistic industry structure which necessitates regulation.

However, regulating the profits of the licensee as if he were a common carrier or public utility was quickly rejected. It was felt that this type of regulation would in no way protect the public interest.

On the other hand if the public was merely a third party beneficiary of a contract between the owner of the broadcast station and its advertisers who pay to broadcast, the public would not have any rights cognizable in a judiciary forum. This is not the case.

Thus, the vague language of the statute considering the "public interest" must involve a special kind of regulation. One side argued for precise legislative standards for licenses while the other side advocated permitting administrative discretion.⁵ The statutory language permits administrative discretion.

The FCC enabling legislation, subsequent FCC policy statements and decisions, and judicial review decisions have better defined the rule of the public and formalized the relation among the parties of interest.

V. THE RIGHTS OF THE PUBLIC

Numerous conflicting policies and actions can be rationalized under the rubric of public interest. Nonetheless, some definite meaning to "serving the public interest" has been acquired, since the Federal Communications Act of 1934, through administrative policy decisions and judicial review.

The statutory language explicitly defined three aspects of what would serve or insure the public interest: the airways were to be fully utilized;⁶ controversial subjects were to be covered completely;⁷ offensive and unlawful transmission of news was prohibited.⁸

The function of the FCC is not only to issue and renew licenses, but as importantly to insure that the public interest is considered by the licensee. To those who argued that we should "regard the Commission as a kind of traffic officer, policing the wave lengths to prevent stations from interfering with each other, Mr. Justice Frankfurter answered:

"But the Act does not restrict the Commission merely to supervision of traffic. It puts upon the Commission the burden of determining the composition of that traffic. The facilities of radio are not large enough to accommodate all who wish to use them. Meth-

ods must be devised for choosing from among the many who apply. And since Congress itself could not do this, it committed the task to the Commission.

"The Commission was, however, not left at large in performing this duty. The touchstone provided by Congress was the 'public interest, convenience or necessity.'

"... The facilities of radio are limited and therefore precious; they cannot be left to wasteful use without detriment to the public interest. . . . The Commission's licensing function cannot be discharged, therefore, merely by finding that there are no technological objections to the granting of a license. If the criterion of 'public interest' were limited to such matters, how could the Commission choose between two applicants for the same facilities, each of who is financially and technically qualified to operate a station? Since the very inception of federal regulation of radio, comparative consideration as to the services to be rendered have governed the application of the standard of 'public interest, convenience or necessity.'"

In subsequent proceedings the Commission further defined the statutory language. Full utilization of the airways means in part that the public is to be protected from overcommercialization.⁹ The licensee's programming must be balanced; thus, the Commission identified fourteen areas in which the licensee must provide programming. These areas include programming of religion, education, politics, sports, entertainment, news, agriculture, weather and public affairs, editorializing, service to children and minority groups, opportunities for local expressions, and development and use of local talents.¹⁰

Recognizing the importance in a democracy of public response to controversial issues, the Commission formulated the Fairness Doctrine.¹¹

The licensee's programming must be relevant to the community. In *Simmons v. F.C.C.*, 169 F. 2d 670 /1948/, the D.C. Court of Appeals upheld an F.C.C. ruling that a licensee who makes no effort to structure its programs to the particular needs of the community does not satisfy the public service responsibility of a broadcast licensee. A licensee must not only be cognizant of the community needs, but his programming must reflect the various interests of the community.¹²

In the *Office of Communication of United Church of Christ v. FCC*, 359 F. 2d 994, it was recognized that the public does have standing before the FCC to enforce its rights. Thus the court recognized the public as an active participant in broadcasting. In order to make this participation more effective the public must be informed of its rights.

Considering that the airways are public property which the licensee is merely given permission to use at nominal cost, the duties the licensee owes the public are not oppressive. They do not even endanger the licensee's monopoly profits.

VI. IN RESPECT OF THE RIGHTS OF THE PUBLIC

The rights of the public are essential in the mass communication media industrial structure, and yet the licensees appear to pay more lip service to the public's needs and interest. To realize how true this statement is, students of the mass communication media consider it axiomatic that the present performance of licensees with respect to public service can be improved.¹³

Thus, under the present system, the rights of the public are well documented and recognized, and yet there is no effective mechanism to insure that these rights are honored.

Unsurprisingly, the public has not acted vigorously to protect its own rights. In fact, most of the public is unaware of its rights.

"Most people believe that radio and television are like the weather. Bad weather exists. But it is no one's fault. Accordingly,

nothing can be done about it. The same is widely believed to be true of radio and television."¹⁴

The public may also be apathetic to the duties the licensee owes them. Even if the people are apathetic, an opinion that no one has taken the trouble to verify, their apathy is no excuse for not informing them of their rights. Democracy is principled upon the proposition that the public has rights and has the freedom and information to exercise those rights. Rights of which the public has no knowledge are not rights at all.

VII. THE TREND TOWARD ACTIVE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The broadcast license is issued by the FCC for a three year term. Upon expiration, the licensee is eligible to renew.¹⁵ The statutory criterion for licensing is: "whether the public interest, convenience and necessity will be served by the granting of such application."¹⁷ Since the statutory language of licensing criterion is vague, the Commission has had to develop its own operational criteria consonant with the statute.

As recently as ten years ago, the Commission's criteria was criticized as confusing. The reason, Judge Friendly argued, was that the Commission mistook evidentiary items for elements of policy. He sought to isolate two main elements of policy: the community should have the programming best adapted to its needs, and ownership of the mass communications media should be diversified.¹⁸ The FCC officially adopted similar guidelines.¹⁹ The evidentiary items such as local ownership, integrated ownership management, and management participation in civic affairs are supposed to relate to an applicant's ability to achieve the policy goals.²⁰ For example, the local applicant was considered better aware of the community needs, and therefore more likely to be able to program in accordance with those needs. It was even better if the local applicant participated in civic affairs, because that indicated an awareness and interest in the welfare of the community. Furthermore, the fulltime participation by the applicant in the station's operation was of substantial importance because that enhanced the probability the station would be responsive to public needs and demands.

The use of such propositions to develop evidentiary items is understandable in hearings for new licenses. In an application for a license, empirical evidence concerning the relevance of the proposed programming to the community's needs is not available. However, in a license renewal hearing, the public's evaluation of the licensee's programming is readily available, is pertinent, and should be ascertained.²¹

The 1970 Policy Statement directly addresses this issue in the first step. In addressing this issue, the Commission has neglected to create a mechanism by which it can obtain an objective evaluation of the public's needs. It must be remembered that the adversarial function within the administrative system is different from that within the courts. The Commission has two roles—advocate for the public—and judge. The Commission cannot independently assess the public's interest and needs, so it gives that duty to the licensee. The licensee is required to complete FCC Form 303 Sec. IV-B Part I which asks: "to state the methods used . . . to ascertain the needs and interests of the public served by the station (and to identify) representative groups, interests, and organizations which were consulted." To satisfy this requirement, a licensee need simply talk to many important ("representative") people and organizations in the community.²² The applicant is also asked to list typical programs which "have served public needs and interest." Still missing is any well defined idea of what are the public needs and interests to be served. More bla-

Footnotes at end of article.

tantly missing is the use of any general public response in order to ascertain the needs and interests of that public. Unsurprisingly, two commissioners concluded in 1968 that the licensee's local surveys were useless.²⁰ Nonetheless, in determining whether the licensee's programming has been "substantially attuned," the Commission relies upon the licensee's own local surveys.

It is unquestioned that the FCC lacks the resources to properly police the licensees as the representative of the public. In 1969, the Commission's broadcast bureau staff was only three times larger than when it began operations. That staff was responsible for more than 7500 operating broadcasting stations, an amount ten times greater than the number of operating stations when the Commission began operation. Although the Act of 1934 provided for "any party in interest (to) file with the Commission a petition to deny any application," the public was not considered a party in interest until 1966. Chief Justice (then Judge) Warren Burger recognized that the Commission lacked resources and that:

The theory that the Commission can effectively represent the listener interest in a renewal proceeding . . . is no longer a valid assumption.²¹

The remedy was to extend standing to intervene in license proceedings to "responsible spokesmen for representative groups in the listening community." It remains for the public to protect its own interests in light of Chief Justice Burger giving judicial recognition to the right of the public to protect its rights.

The trend toward public participation in the mass electronic media is not complete. The FCC requires the licensees to consider the public interest in forming its programming by consulting representative public groups. It is our contention that the community's needs cannot be ascertained adequately by delegating the duty to the licensee. A more efficient means would be to give the public the duty to protect its rights.

Therefore, we propose that the FCC adopt the following rule:

I. The licensee shall be required to provide a specified period of time, to be determined by the FCC, to broadcast informative, impartial and effective notice to the public at large of its rights and the licensee's duties under existing statutes and administrative policy decisions. Such broadcasts shall be aired at intervals specified by the FCC, but in no event less than once every six months, and shall be made during the prime hours of 7:00 to 10:00 P. M.

II. Such broadcasts should be designed to impartially and effectively inform the public at large of its rights and licensee's duties including the following topics which are not meant to be exhaustive.

- a) The Fairness Doctrine including:
 - 1) right to reply to controversial programs, editorials, or opinions aired or expressed by licensee.
 - b) right to reply to personal attacks made by persons whose views have been broadcast by the individual licensee. Such time being provided by such licensee.
 - c) complete coverage of controversial subjects or programs.
 - d) right to unoffensive and factual transmission of news.
 - e) right to complaint either to station itself or to the FCC concerning any and all grievances felt by individual members of the community by licensee.
 - f) right to intervene in licensee renewal proceeding including:
 - 1) right to petition against granting of said license
 - 2) right of complaint to licensee or FCC
 - 3) explanation of the requirements under Rule 1.580 concerning license renewal.

(g) the licensee's duty to provide balanced programming in the interest of public spirit and taste without overcommercialization by such licensee's sponsors

(h) the licensee's duty to actively elicit public opinion concerning its overall operation

(i) activities of other groups contesting renewals

In order to insure the public's right under the proposed rule we recommend that each individual licensee be required to maintain a log of all responses made by the public to said licensee concerning all aspects of the licensee's performance as well as the action taken by the licensee regarding such responses. The maintenance of such a log would greatly facilitate the interaction between the licensee and the community being served as well as providing an effective aid in determining a licensee's performance in regard to the license renewal procedure. By having the individual licensee be responsible for maintaining a record of public response and actions taken accordingly, a large portion of the burden of policing the broadcast frequencies would be handled by the public at large, thereby reducing the role of the FCC in this area.

Thus, we believe that the individual licensees and the communities they serve, could through the operation of the proposed rule reach a considerably higher level of mutual discourse and cooperation while furthering broadcast standards, community interest, and effective utilization of the broadcast frequencies. This proposed rule will also make Rule 1.580 more effective by giving the public information upon which to make complaints.

We do not believe that this rule would be followed by increased dependence of the public on the Commission or an increased workload on the Commission's staff. Rather, just the opposite will occur. This rule will encourage critical monitoring and discourage frivolous complaints by the public because the public will be aware of what the licensee's duties are. Furthermore, this rule will encourage the formation of responsible civic groups which can open avenues of discourse with the licensee, and when necessary, provide the means to make program agreements like those in Rochester and Texarkana, bypassing the Commission.

Unlike the Illinois committee,²² the present petition for rulemaking does not ask the licensees to delegate to an outside organization the right to broadcast announcements. It does not depend on the FCC finding license renewal a controversial issue falling under the Fairness Doctrine but rather follows the Commission's implicit suggestion that the proper method through which to enlarge the licensee's requirement for publication of information is the rulemaking procedure.

Wherefore, these arguments considered, the Commission is respectfully requested to issue an appropriate notice of proposed rulemaking.

Respectfully submitted,

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ 47 U.S.C. 315a 303 m/1/d.
- ² Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ v. FCC 359 F. 2d 994 (1966).
- ³ Coase, Federal Communications Commission, 2 J. Law & Econ. 8 Oct. '59.
- ⁴ 47 U.S.C. 309a.
- ⁵ McDonald, Need for Standards in Selection of Licensees, 17 L.R. 61 Fall '64.
- ⁶ 47 U.S.C. 303.
- ⁷ 47 U.S.C. 315a.
- ⁸ 47 U.S.C. 303/m/1/d.
- ⁹ National Broadcasting Co. v. United States, 319 U.S. 190, 213, 215-17 (1943).
- ¹⁰ 317 FCC Annual Report 92 (1963).
- ¹¹ 25 Federal Regulation 7291, 7295 (1960).

¹² In the Matter of Editorializing by Broadcast Licensees, Docket No. 8516 13 FCC 1246 (1949) Sec. 3.

¹³ Capital Broadcasting Co.

¹⁴ Barrow, The Attainment of Balanced Program Service in Television, 52 Va. L. R. 633 (1966).

¹⁵ Broadcasting in America and the FCC's License Renewal Process: An Oklahoma Case Study. A Statement by Commissioners Kenneth A. Cox and Nicholas Johnson, 14 FCC 2d1 (1968).

¹⁶ 47 U.S.C. 307.

¹⁷ 47 U.S.C. 309a.

¹⁸ The Fed. Admin. Agencies, 1962, 57-9.

¹⁹ 1 FCC 2d 393, 1965.

²⁰ Ibid. p. 58.

²¹ One reason the 1970 Policy Statement omits diversification of ownership as an item of policy is because diversification is a surrogate measure of the likelihood of diverse programming designed to meet the community needs. In license renewal proceedings, direct evidence of licensee's past record is available to evaluate whether his programming was substantially attuned to the community needs, and surrogate measures are not needed.

²² WHDH: The FCC and Renewal Proceedings, 82 Harv. L. Rev. 1693 (1963).

²³ 14 FCC 2d 9.

²⁴ Federal Communications Commission reply to Illinois Citizens' Committee for Broadcasting, FCC 70 1141 Oct. 21, 1970.

WELFARE REFORM

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, one of the most pressing problems which the Government faces today is reform of the national welfare system.

Last year, during hearings conducted by the Senate Finance Committee, an outstanding contribution to understanding of this problem was made by the distinguished former Senator from Delaware, John Williams.

In the January 27 edition of the Northern Virginia Daily, an excellent editorial was published outlining the problems of welfare reform and paying tribute to the great role played by Senator Williams.

The Northern Virginia Daily is published at Strasburg, Va. Its editor is James J. Crawford.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, entitled "Welfare Reform," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

WELFARE REFORM

Because of his penetrating insight and his dogged insistence that legislative boondoggling be exposed for what it entails rather than for what it appears to be, recently retired Senator John Williams of Delaware had been described as the "conscience of the Senate."

It was a high compliment. Sen. Williams had earned it because through the years he appeared to put the people's right to know before legislative maneuvering and political dealing. He was one of that relatively small group of congressmen in both chambers to whom personal ambition is less important than the public trust.

The Delaware senator followed this course to the end of his tenure. One of the last services he performed for the nation was his expose of what is involved in the Administration's welfare reform.

The welfare reform which President Nixon proposed in his State of the Union message is essentially a revival of the family assistance and so-called work incentive plan introduced by the Administration in the 91st Congress last year. This bill, which passed the House last session but died in the Senate, had as its base a federal relief allowance of \$1600 a year for each family of four. The new Administration bill has not yet reached the Hill, but when it does it is expected to be largely a replay of last year.

Stressing the fact that since not one welfare recipient in any state of the Union would receive one dime less under the expected Nixon proposal than he is now getting under existing laws and after having this finding collaborated by the Secretary of HEW, Sen. Williams concluded:

"We therefore proceed on the premise that there is no reform in this bill, assuming there are abuses now. Quite to the contrary, all the inequities in existing law will be frozen into the new program, plus some more being added."

Human Events reported what would happen under the currently awaited new welfare reform legislation which will also have as its base \$1600 per year per family of four. Though the figures would vary somewhat from state to state here are decidedly impressive reasons why Sen. Williams and others opposed the Nixon plan last year in the Senate, and why those remaining will probably oppose it again.

Human Events compressed much of the reasoned opposition to the Nixon Administration's concept of welfare reform into the following two paragraphs:

The program would work in the following way. The federal government would furnish \$1,600 for a family of four on welfare, but this sum is only the beginning. For the federal subsidy would automatically trigger mandatory supplementary payments. In New York, for instance, the \$1,600 payments triggers in \$2,156 additional state supplemental payments, 70 percent of which is paid for by the federal government. This brings the family's cash income to \$3,756, tax-exempt. But this isn't all. The family can also collect food stamps worth \$312, Medicaid benefits averaging \$1,153 annually, plus another \$989 in rent supplements or public housing. This is a total of \$6,210 for this family in New York City.

But suppose, said Williams, "the city letter carrier that is delivering this welfare check has a family of four. His income is taxable, and after he pays taxes he has \$6,209 left, or \$1 less by working and earning \$7,000 a year than the same size family gets if on relief. Is that a work incentive?"

Instead of acting as a work incentive measure, the Administration's new bill "will pay a premium to the man who slides back into welfare." In addition, it will cost untold new billions of dollars more than present welfare costs, which already threaten to engulf many large cities. But, worst of all, it will be a way to give away more money—not reform.

This newspaper has supported the need for welfare reform for many years. Heaven knows, reform is overdue. But, except for the fact that it is labeled "reform," there isn't much to recommend the Administration's expected proposal.

Work incentive? People being people, how can we inspire the average welfare recipient to go to work and to improve his job skills if he can continue to have as much money coming in without working.

BOY SCOUTS 61ST ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, beginning on Monday, February 1, the Boy Scouts of America will launch a month's observance of the anniversary celebration of this outstanding organization. As you know, in the past we have had a national week in which attention was focused on the activities and accomplishments of the Nation's largest youth organization, but now this celebration will extend for a full month.

This year marks the 61st official birthday anniversary of this worldwide movement which was incorporated here in Washington on February 8, 1910. Certainly I think it is entirely proper to designate this longer period of time for mental protection, and during this annual anniversary, and once again I am proud and pleased to take this opportunity to express my wholehearted interest in and genuine admiration for this splendid organization.

Since it was founded in 1910, the Boy Scouts of America has been teaching and practicing conservation and environmental protection, and during this anniversary celebration a year-long program identified as Project SOAR—Save Our American Resources—will be initiated. It is estimated that over 6 million boys and their leaders will join forces with organizations and agencies at the community, Federal, State, and citizen levels to aid in saving our American resources. What better evidence do we need to illustrate the overall aim of scouting to make this splendid organization thoroughly relevant to the needs and interests of our youth and our Nation?

The long-range dynamic expansion plan known as Boypower 1973, which was adopted by the Boy Scouts of America last year, is going forward extremely well and will continue until 1976 which year will mark the 200th anniversary of the founding of our country.

As I have stated on previous occasions, I always enjoy recalling with true appreciation the many fine and interesting experiences which were mine as a Boy Scout, and I firmly believe that the basic concepts of this organization cannot fail to generate a sincere realization of one's duty to God and country as well as a keen respect for the fundamental rights of all people.

The fact that presently one out of four boys of Scout age is a member of the BSA fully supports the meaningful slogan "America's manpower begins with boypower" and reassures us that scouting is definitely one of the best proven methods of developing individual character and the qualities of leadership.

In Kentucky the scouting movement has expanded significantly and I am naturally pleased with the progress that has been made in the Second Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, our Boy Scouts continue to be among our greatest assets and as

they undertake a month-long observance of their 61st birthday I consider myself both fortunate and privileged to have this opportunity to congratulate them and to wish each and every one of them continued success in all their future endeavors.

CONVERSION: THE NEW MANAGEMENT GAME

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a perceptive and enlightening contribution to the current discussion of economic conversion was recently made by Dr. Albert J. Kelley, dean of the Boston College School of Management, and chairman of the Massachusetts Board of Economic Advisers. In a speech delivered on January 21, 1971, before the Smaller Business Association of New England, Dr. Kelley pointed out the vital need for action by the Federal Government to assist companies in adjusting from defense-contract work to civilian-oriented production. Since the conversion problems cited and some of the solutions offered by Dr. Kelley are directly relevant to the Economic Conversion Act which I have reintroduced at this session, I would like to share the speech with my colleagues.

The speech follows:

CONVERSION: THE NEW MANAGEMENT GAME (By Dr. Albert J. Kelley)

Conversion is a popular word these days. It is a subject about which there is lots of talk and little action. It reminds me of the way many problems are approached in the academic world these days. Many academicians feel that if they have talked about a problem long enough they've solved it. We're far from a solution to this increasingly important subject and the basic causes underlying it.

The problem is, of course, the deep cutbacks by the federal government in defense and space spending. In order to attack a problem and attempt to find solutions for it, we must first define it and admit it exists.

These cutbacks are having a very serious impact, an impact which will become more serious over the next year when one analyzes the three most recent federal budgets. The latest publicity on shipyard phase-outs, while important and even alarming in itself is only a manifestation of a problem that we all know has existed for some time.

Thus far, we have not seen a willingness on the part of our Administration in Washington to admit cutback problems exist, let alone tackle them. There seems to be a feeling in Washington that the impact on industry, from Government defense and space cutbacks, is either not the Government's problem, or will go away if we don't worry about it, or will be taken care of by overly optimistic projections of an upturn in economy.

Let me state categorically from studies that we at Boston College and others have run and my own personal review of federal and state information, that these cutbacks create a serious problem to our national and local economy, a problem which is going to get worse before it gets better. There are measures that the federal and state govern-

ment can undertake. I will propose a few of them before this talk is over. I hope to elicit more from you before this meeting is adjourned.

Many are worrying about individual unemployment and some are doing something about it. I will concentrate my attention in this meeting on the *unemployed company* and what we might do to help it.

Small business has many unique problems in this current cutback situation. Many of our small companies are sub-contractors, often to prime contractors located out of state. The sub-contractor is hit a double blow in a cutback situation.

When the prime contract is reduced, he is immediately reduced by his proportionate share. In addition, as you all well know the prime contractor then begins to "pull in his horns", to do more work in-house, and to sub-contract less. His "make or buy" decision becomes much easier, in fact, often obvious.

In order to best solve our regional economic and unemployment problem, we must get at the *root cause* and insure that industrial corporations maintain economic and industrial health with reasonable profit margins. If we can do this, maintaining strong companies, we can cut back on unemployment by causing less people to be released from the payroll and providing plenty of new job opportunities for those who are in transition.

Whether or not to convert and what to convert to is, of course, an individual corporate decision. I think it is important however, that each and every corporation decide for itself fairly quickly what market and product mix it desires to have over the next few years. It may be that a company, as many have, will decide to retrench and continue as a solely government contractor; it may be that a company will decide to go into wholly commercial markets; or it may be that a company will decide to establish some mix between government and commercial markets, the important thing is the company have a strategy and a plan.

A few general principles to help separate fact from fiction in your conversion decision and serve as an input to your own thinking:

It is fact that there is a serious cutback in government defense spending. It is fiction that there is non-defense government funding which will pick up the slack or differential.

Despite all the publicity in Washington about shifting our defense industries to environmental control transportation, urban systems, etc., etc., etc., neither I nor anyone else has been able to find significant or meaningful governmental funding in these new areas which could be considered in any way a dollar volume substitute for defense dollars eliminated from recent federal budgets.

It is fact that many new technologies have been developed under the Department of Defense and NASA's programs. It is fiction that these technologies have only to find the right problems in other areas and we will solve all our earthly woes.

We have too many technology solutions and advocates of them going around looking for problems to solve. We need more applications orientation, more down to earth market analysis. Sophisticated technology developed for military and space applications will not alone solve our problems. Mundane applications of it together with *good management* and realistic problem-solving might.

It is fact that many sophisticated management techniques have been developed under DOD and NASA sponsorship such as systems analysis, PERT, etc. It is fiction that these are a panacea for non-aerospace enterprises and management operations.

Many of these techniques are indeed excellent and have great potential for other applications. We have only begun, however,

to sift out those which have real transferability from those which are applicable only to the unique military-industrial-space project.

It is fact that marketing is the key to any successful business operation. It is fiction that there is any similarity between government and commercial marketing.

The dissimilarity in different types of markets presents, in my opinion, the greatest problem for a company wishing to convert out of a defense dependence. It is a primary reason why many companies who have been in both markets have had to run essentially two different operations. It is a primary reason why very few people, even within a company, have crossed lines between the government and commercial divisions.

Conversion is easy to define but hard to accomplish. But, before we accomplish we still must define the differences between the business environment a company is in now and business environment it wishes to enter.

Let's look at the government contractor for a minute and assess his business environment. He deals with a very sophisticated customer—the Federal Government. This customer writes good specifications and knows what he wants, sometimes almost too much so, down to the last comma, decimal point and fraction.

Marketing is largely of a personal nature, depending heavily on personal contacts and the reputation of the company. The market is very narrow and very deep. That is, a company expects to get relatively few contracts over a period of years, that is, make few individual sales, but expects these to run for some time and lead to follow-on contracts.

There is a unique budgeting, costing and contracting process in government business. Different financial incentives exist for a corporation in government business as compared with a commercial enterprise. While profit may be very small, return on investment for a government contractor can be very large—that is the name of the game.

On the other hand, the commercial company deals largely with a relatively unsophisticated customer. Market characteristics are quite different. Usually a higher number of sales of smaller dollar value are required to achieve the same market volume. The markets are diffuse and often fractionated.

There is a different cost approach and attitude in a commercially oriented company with tighter financial controls, which are not subject to government regulation and inspection and permit more ingenuity on the part of the manager and greater operating flexibility. Corporate management must run leaner than with the overheads allowable on Government contracts and the resulting numbers of middle managers.

In the commercial company there is a greater financial risk from the external investment viewpoint and from the internal financial control viewpoint. Profit and other performance measures are more directly tied to management performance and decisions.

By and large, it should be easier for the small company to convert than for the large defense contractor. The large aerospace companies have had a great deal of difficulty, as you know, in conversion. Their basic problem, in my opinion is they are accustomed to large overhead and large management and staff structures, so that they approach these other markets with all the complexity and overhead which they have been used to on large government contracts.

As a result, they often over-kill the problem and bring to it a solution that requires a budget in the seven and eight figures when only a six figure budget is available. This six figure budget, in turn, may be ideal for a small company, which can turn around fast and run lean and hard.

In addition to the decision and subsequent

action by the individual company, I think there is much that can be done by the federal and state governments to help ease this conversion and turn-around situation. There has been little done up to this point, and I see no reason why an organization such as SBANE could not provide information and apply appropriate pressure on government officials to help bring some action about.

Let me propose here a few steps which would be taken. They are not necessarily the best, the list is by no means complete. They are a few that I think can work and which our government can take action on relatively quickly. First the federal government:

We should take a hard look at the defense budget. Have we cut, in fact, too deep? In my opinion, we are dangerously close. At the time of the Cambodian invasion eight months ago the President released information indicating that a large gap was emerging between the defense strengths of our country and the Soviet Union. His own budget should serve to close this gap, not widen it.

The Federal Government should put money into conversion projects if it expects government defense contractors to work in these new areas, to turn around, to make the conversion. It should invest some seed money to get them started so that they can tackle these new problems in the business environment—that is government contracting—in which they've been previously involved.

The Federal Government should help reduce the risk conversion by providing some form of government guaranteed loans such as World War II and post War V-Loans. The commercial financial institution would provide funds, but their risk would be considerably reduced by a government-backed guarantee. This would stimulate more money flow into high risk conversion.

Take steps to reduce foreign competition in those areas to which American companies can convert. It makes no sense to have American capital, technology, and management spend the energy and take the risk to move into new areas when foreign competition could come in shortly thereafter and clean up the market, as we've seen too often recently.

There are many things that states and regions such as Massachusetts and New England can do.

Provide seed money and initial subsidy for academic institutions to institute training programs for executives in *companies*. Massachusetts is engaged in helping the unemployed retread or convert, and this is good. But, we must be careful that we don't spend all our energy trying to catch the horse after he leaves the barn. It's just as important to help *executives learn new management techniques* for new markets and businesses while they are in the company so that they can convert the company as well as themselves.

Provide industry-wide and individual corporate assistance to companies who are interested in converting. This could consist of state sponsored market surveys, assistance in locating government contracts, and many peripheral services which the smaller company is not able to provide for itself, either because of lack of information or funds.

Provide incentives to attract private risk capital to turn-around situations or new ventures. This could take the form of tax incentives, investment incentives, steps which would attract the private investor to conversion situations.

I think that we in the universities can help in this situation also. We have already taken steps at Boston College. In our School of Management we formed a Management Institute over two years ago to work with small and medium size companies by providing educational services such as seminars and courses.

Now that the economic situation has changed and we have matured our programs,

we think we can provide a valuable service to the community and are in the process of doing this.

We have run two national and international seminars on venture capital and management, the joining of technology, management and money.

We have run evening programs on such subjects as financial management for technical executives and modern marketing methods.

Under the sponsorship of the New England Regional Council, we have put on a program to educate regional and industrial development officials in New England on the process of forming new companies and of joining the entrepreneur with the financier.

We are putting on, in cooperation with the Institute of Electrical & Electronic Engineers and the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics a seminar series beginning February 9 on the organization and management of new enterprises. By new enterprises we mean not only new companies, but new divisions and new projects in existing companies. This seminar is keyed specifically to new market areas and, therefore, conversion.

We have just started to work with individual companies who need updating or re-orientation on modern business methods and techniques, particularly in new business and market areas. Our first program will start late in February, a four-day seminar for a well-known, and fast-growing technology company.

Until recently, I believed that the conversion problem was one which industry had to solve by itself and could solve by itself.

I am convinced now, however, that conversion requires some form of federal assistance. The alternative is to deal a serious blow to our economy on a national scale.

The snowballing and multiplier effect of a high technology community out of business cannot be isolated. It affects every element of our national and international strength and posture.

Also, I feel, the Federal Government has a duty and an obligation to assist high technology government oriented companies in the transition to other business areas.

The "management shock" of moving into a new business area, while at the same time assimilating new business methods and criteria, is just too much to expect many of these companies to absorb. Either one, new products or new business methods, would be difficult in itself. The cumulative combination of these two is a lot to absorb and a lot to expect.

There is much which groups such as SBANE can do to help bring about this government support. I would be glad to work with you in any way I can.

HELP FOR OUR ELDERLY

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, in the 91st Congress we acted on, and passed the social security amendments. Contained in that bill were provisions to provide an increase in benefits along with an automatic cost-of-living increase. We also provided that the allowable income levels would be raised to \$2,000.

These were steps in the right direction, and we, of course, still have to enact this legislation. I do believe, however, that we can go further to help our elderly

citizens who are living on low fixed incomes.

Many of our people who have retired, or semiretired, still want to work and many of them must work in order to supplement their retirement income. A needed benefit that we should provide to our retired citizens is to increase the allowable income.

I have supported in the past, and I am again introducing today, legislation to increase the allowable income to \$3,000. With this increase, our elderly will not have to take a reduction in their social security benefits and this would certainly help them in meeting their expenses in these inflationary times.

I hope my colleagues here in the House of Representatives will join with me in supporting this legislation.

THE LATE HONORABLE L. MENDEL RIVERS

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, the death of Mendel Rivers has removed from the House a man the Congress, the Nation, and indeed the whole free world can ill afford to lose. I join my colleagues and his family in a deep sense of personal loss and grief.

As the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mendel Rivers was a controversial figure, in the Congress and in the news media, but I would believe that there are few if any Members of this body or of the general public who would believe that this eloquent son of South Carolina was other than totally dedicated to his State, his country, and to his beliefs and principles.

His vigorous and eloquent support of those beliefs and principles—the belief in his country as the greatest country in the world and the principle that to remain in that role in this competitive world it must be always prepared to defend itself against any aggressor—was in fact the reason he became a controversial figure.

Men who fight, as Congressman Rivers always did, for their beliefs tend to become controversial. But the attacks of his opponents never daunted Mendel Rivers. He believed devoutly in what he believed, and he never deviated in the face of opposition. And even those who disagreed with some of his positions respected him for this.

Some of Mendel Rivers' opponents in the news media sought to portray him as the slave of the high brass in the military machine. But the truth—the demonstrable truth—is that he, more than any man in my memory in Congress, fought more vigorously and consistently in defense of the constitutional principle of civilian control of the military and in defense of the constitutional powers of the Congress with respect to civilian control.

Nor was Mendel Rivers the "slave" of the high brass when it came to the en-

listed personnel of the armed services. They, rather than the officers, were always his first concern. He was always their friend—and they knew it, as witness the flood of tributes paid him by the rank-and-file soldier and sailor both before and after his death.

Mendel Rivers was an intensely human person. He was devoted to his family and to his people—and, properly so, they to him. He was a prophet not without honor in his home country.

This House will sorely miss his eloquence, his forcefulness, his determination, his wisdom, and his all-encompassing knowledge of his legislative field.

REVENUE SHARING

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, yesterday representatives of Virginia's urban communities met with members of the Virginia congressional delegation to discuss ways of helping cities meet their financial crisis. One spokesman for that group was Dr. Joseph L. Fisher, chairman of the Arlington County Board, who submitted a statement on revenue sharing. While details of the administration's proposal still are not known, I nevertheless wanted to share with the Senate Dr. Fisher's views and I ask that his statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT ON REVENUE SHARING FOR VIRGINIA'S URBAN 12 TO VIRGINIA CONGRESSMEN

(By Joseph L. Fisher)

We in State and local government need revenue sharing, urban people deserve it, and Virginia's Urban 12 will work for it. The time has come to nationalize the Federal Income Tax and make it the American Income Tax.

The revenue sharing bill proposed by President Nixon and described generally in his State of the Union Message offers the best hope on the horizon for municipal governments to meet their fiscal crisis, which is an excruciatingly severe one. Local governments in 1971 are victims of inflation to a degree beyond anything they have ever known. Local revenue systems are not equal to these inflationary pressures. Property tax bills are skyrocketing, but local governments are still in deep trouble. In most instances, they cannot bleed property for more money and they cannot realistically expect to get much more from the State, so they must look to the Federal Income Tax for help.

Arlington—my community, one with admittedly well above average resources—today faces a short-fall of \$7.1 million in its budget for the fiscal year 1971-72, and this does not include salary increases for its employees and school teachers.

The revenue sharing bill soon to be considered by the Congress has several features that strongly appeal to Virginia's Urban 12. First, the distribution formula bases the share of each local government on its present local general revenue in relation to total State and local general revenue. Urban centers are where the people and the problems are; the Urban 12 jurisdictions have necessarily exerted a strong tax effort. Conse-

quently, their revenue sharing distributions would also be relatively high and reasonably related to their pressing needs. The distribution formula puts the money where the people and problems are.

The second intriguing feature of the bill is the ten per cent incentive that a State and its local governments can qualify for if they can jointly agree on a new State-local fiscal system. In our judgment, this is a powerful incentive for causing Virginia State and local governments to sit down to consider seriously whether revenue sources should be reallocated and whether there should be transfers of expenditure responsibilities between the State and its local government. They could evaluate the financing of education, welfare and transit, and consider such revenue system changes as an increased local sales tax, an income tax surcharge for local governments, gasoline tax changes, and perhaps others. Reduction or stabilizing of property tax bills would, of course, be a foremost objective. The governmental climate in Virginia augurs well for reaching a creative solution.

Under revenue sharing, the political accountability of State and local officials to the electorate would stand as a powerful and natural defense against wasteful fiscal practices. Local policymakers are keenly aware of a hard political fact—that they would be forced to ask their constituents to pay higher taxes if they frittered away revenue sharing funds. They are not, as has been claimed, evading responsibility for raising taxes to cover increases in expenditure programs.

We know that as revenue sharing grows, categorical aid programs may shrink in number and size. Arlington would welcome this shift. From Arlington's point of view the certainty of an annual revenue sharing allocation is infinitely preferable to the uncertainties of grantsmanship, which occupies key urban personnel and which often leads to dashed hopes, long project delays, and painful financial strain when the local share must be produced. We also know that local governments, when spending local dollars, start programs on a modest basis and build them cautiously. When they make one-shot Federal aid applications, they have then to contend with large and sudden increases if and when the Federal grant ceases. Revenue sharing, in short, promises certainty, flexibility, real economies, and the opportunity for orderly financial planning.

In conclusion, it should be underscored that the leading organizations that represent the States, the counties, and the cities have reached agreement that revenue sharing is the preferred and workable method of distributing Federal funds to meet problems at the State and local level. They are committed to presenting their case now in the hope that the 92nd Congress will go down in our history as the "Revenue Sharing" Congress.

WELCOME TO THE CLUB

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, last week we heard in this Chamber a report by President of the United States on the state of the Union. A few nights later, we were treated to the Democrat version of the state of the Union. We were told that the Democratic Party had requested this equal time, yet the distinguished Speaker of the House had decided not to appear and the majority leader of the

other body stated flatly that he was appearing only under protest. This leads to a question whether this time had really been requested by the Democrat Party, as the network said, or by the networks themselves. This suspicion was compounded by the aftermath of the presentation. The distinguished majority leader, a man with no presidential ambitions, was quite conciliatory in his approach and even made so bold as to utter the heresy that the Republican President of the United States actually placed country over party. For his moderation, the Senator from Montana was subjected, at least by CBS, to the snide and somewhat brutal instant analysis heretofore usually reserved for Republicans. To the distinguished majority leader of the other body, I can only offer my sympathies and say, "Welcome to the club."

FULFILLING THE AIMS OF THE CONSTITUTION

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply gratified when a young man or woman takes an active interest in our Constitution. Too few understand this magnificent enabling document. A dedicated 14-year-old high school freshman from my district recently won the American Legion oratorical contest, using the theme "Fulfilling the Aims of the Constitution." I am proud of Bennie Lee Varner who has received this award from the Perry County 213 American Legion Post in Tell City.

Our Nation needs more Bennie Lee Varners with an abiding interest in our Nation's Foundation Document. I would like to share young Mr. Varner's timely remarks with my colleagues and include this winning essay in the RECORD at this point:

FULFILLING THE AIMS OF THE CONSTITUTION (By Bennie Lee Varner)

The Preamble to the constitution states: "We the people of the United States of America, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America."

This is in essence what our forefathers tried to do in writing the constitution. They wanted to set up a government that was firm enough to be a strong government, yet pliable enough to be a lasting government. Now I will go back through the preamble and take each section discussing in depth the ideas behind its writing.

"We the people"—this is a whole group meaning everyone in the United States. In today's society you find a lot of people thinking of themselves as black, white, protestant, Catholic, Jewish, poor, middle income or rich.

But when our forefathers wrote this preamble, their desire was to be Americans. Maybe they themselves were broken down into groups, but they did not want their children broken down into these superficial classifications.

Next they wanted a more perfect union. Our forefathers knew that beyond a doubt their country was not perfect, but they believed through hard work they could make it one of the better ones.

The third part of the preamble says to establish justice. Work toward this goal can be seen in several of the amendments to the constitution.

Amendment 13 abolished slavery. It made all men free in the eyes of the United States Government. Amendments 14, 15, and 19 furthered this cause by making all people born in the United States citizens and by giving all citizens over twenty-one years of age the right to vote.

Through Civil Rights laws and many rulings by the Supreme Court, an attempt to establish justice has been made. Whether this justice can become a fact instead of a quote on a piece of paper will be left to you and me and our descendants.

By establishing justice our forefathers hoped to insure domestic tranquility. They desired a land free from nationwide riots and protests. They did not want to necessarily stop these practices, because this would be an infringement on our basic freedoms. But these authors of the constitution did want a land free from the social problems which cause upheavals in our society.

We, in today's society, are faced with the exact misfortunes that the constitution tried to guard against. Our country, through the past decade, has been racked by protests, riots and demonstrations. People have become vociferous about everything from sex education in public schools to finding decent housing for the poor and aged population. Our government has passed laws upon laws to try and deal with these situations. Before these laws can really become effective the people of the United States are going to have to believe in their government with all their heart and all their soul.

To have perfect domestic tranquility is a Utopian fantasy that will always remain a dream. Yet you cannot just throw away this plan and expect to find something better, because of a few idiosyncrasies that you as an individual do not like on some interpretations of the constitution. The idea is to have a policy laid down by the people to work toward gaining this dream.

"To provide for the common defense"—This statement is a most integral part of the constitution. This historic document was written in a time when the United States was a very weak country. We had just finished the first major war on our land and to say, provide for the common defense, was a very large and unpopular assignment. The framers of the constitution, such as Washington, Madison, Franklin and some of the other famous citizens who worked on this historic document, set up a rather rough goal for themselves. On September 17, 1787, they put their plan into final form and signed it.

In only a few years after the acceptance of the constitution, the United States found itself in another war, this one being the War of 1812. And so it has continued, one war after another up to and including the present time. All the wars have been fought using the principle that it was for the common defense. Even the present war in Viet Nam is a war for the common defense and needs the physical and moral support of our nation as has all previous wars. In all wars the United States has participated in, there has always been a group which has dissented and refused to perform their obligated battle for their country, but today, the news media, in many instances, is taking up the views of the dissenters and giving them mass news coverages with the choice time spots on the airwaves and favorable coverage in their publications in many instances. In so doing, this has led to many of our younger people who are grasping at something to rebel at in their families, schools, and local communi-

ties to use this as their scapegoat. Maybe at this particular time it might be wise for us to remember a quote from President Richard M. Nixon's inaugural address, when he said: "To a crisis of the spirit, we need an answer of the spirit. And to find that answer we need only look within ourselves." I believe this is what our forefathers were doing when they were framing this wonderful and precious document for all humanity, especially to those of us living in the United States.

The writers of the constitution had already put down their ideas about establishing justice, insuring domestic tranquility and providing for the common defense when they began to think about promoting the welfare of the people. By accomplishing the first three this last statement was practically provided for. Establishing justice tried to give equality to the people. Insuring domestic tranquility kept a calm over the land by helping them to understand their government. Through the defense clause their protection was assured. But there were still three things which plagued this new found government; hunger, poverty and illiteracy. To this day, they still play a big part in our nation's problems. The presidents of the United States have been aware of these stains on our pride. A few have tried to do something about it, particularly the last three, including Mr. Nixon. This past decade has seen many government programs begun, such as Job Corps, Vista, Headstart, Medicare, and the more recent Environmental Protection Agency. These agencies were set up to deal with the soaring domestic problems of our nation. Whether they have been effective or not will be answered in the next decade.

The last section of the preamble says to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. Liberty was a new word to the writers of the constitution. They had never experienced a lifetime of freedom. They had, until the Revolutionary War, lived under a government which was stationed 3,000 miles away. While writing this composition, I am sure they wondered if in some future time their children might not come under foreign rule again. Yes! To secure liberty was a blessing, but it was also a challenge. The United States of America, consisting of thirteen small states, was trying to do in a limited amount of time what took larger countries many years to accomplish. Our forefathers wanted to write an ideal document. When you read and study this constitution you find it isn't perfect, but it is the best the present world has, and I am proud to have the opportunity to grow up under it and will likewise be afforded the opportunity to defend it, thus fulfilling the aims of the constitution, while working with you as adults, hand in hand today.

DANGERS IN U.S. ROLE IN CAMBODIAN WAR

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Maine Sunday Telegram of January 24, 1971. In doing so I would like to stress that the author of this editorial, Mr. William Caldwell, has excellent and firsthand knowledge of this subject. He has just returned from a 3-month visit to Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and South Vietnam. During this visit he spoke frequently with statesmen and soldiers alike

and had numerous opportunities to observe both military and diplomatic aspects of our Nation's involvement in Indochina.

Maine citizens are fortunate to have as editor of their Sunday newspaper such a well-informed and well-traveled journalist. More important, however, is the importance to our entire Nation of Mr. Caldwell's well-informed and timely observations which I insert below:

DANGERS IN U.S. ROLE IN CAMBODIAN WAR

The United States is vastly increasing its direct military and economic involvement in the war in Cambodia, though no official announcements of the present size or future limits have been made.

As long as Cambodia is under major attack from North Vietnamese forces (which may be a long, long while) and as long as Cambodia cannot herself repulse such attacks (which is likely to be forever), there is a risk that American air, naval and logistic powers may become ever more heavily committed to support of the Lon Nol government now virtually besieged in Phnom Penh.

Reports that the U.S. military was already heavily involved in the Cambodia war, and forecasts that the U.S. involvement would increase further were made in this newspaper last November, in news dispatches filed from Cambodia by the Telegram's Bill Caldwell. At that time he reported that 40,000 North Vietnam troops were in Cambodia, controlling over 40 per cent of the territory of that "neutral" nation. His articles in the Telegram reported last November that U.S. C-119 cargo planes, flown by South Vietnamese, were already flying U.S. made ammunition many times a day into Phnom Penh for use by the Cambodian army, plus air force ordnance for use by the tiny Cambodian Air Force. Last November the Telegram articles stated that the U.S. was then a huge, although indirect, supplier of weapons and training to the rapidly expanding Cambodian Army, and that three Cambodian divisions had been trained and reequipped in South Vietnam and others in Thailand.

Following an interview in Saigon last November with President Thieu, Caldwell reported the President as saying, that South Vietnam was ready to train 10,000 more Cambodian troops by December. In other dispatches, Caldwell reported that U.S. planes were even then flying direct tactical support missions for Cambodian ground troops in specified areas.

This week, the intensity and escalation of this direct U.S. involvement in this war in Cambodia has been widely reported in the newspapers and television.

Army helicopters are reported engaged in the battle for Route 4, over which oil supplies from Cambodia's only port are transported. B-52 bombers are reported in action over Cambodia, a U.S. helicopter carrier and other supporting vessels are reported off the Cambodia coast in the Gulf of Siam, playing a key role in Cambodia fighting.

Many thousands of U.S. trained and equipped South Vietnamese ground forces are now fighting deep inside Cambodia, which of course means that these troops cannot fight to repulse any attacks launched inside South Vietnam.

News reports from the area also say that the planned withdrawals of U.S. Air Force squadrons from South East Asia have been stopped. The planned withdrawal of Air Force planes from bases in Thailand have been frozen. These measures have been taken, to insure a large presence of U.S. air strength in the region. U.S. air strikes into Cambodia are over 50 a day, and increasing.

We recite these facts to underscore three points which deserve wide public attention.

1. The conspicuous absence of any official

announcements from the White House of the present or future scope of U.S. involvement in Cambodia, although this has been mounting swiftly since last Fall. This is a mistake. For before long President Nixon may desperately need public understanding of the role U.S. air, naval, liaison and supply forces are playing in Cambodia, and why they are needed there. If he refuses to put these cards on the table, we believe the President risks another major confrontation with the Congress, the colleges and the public over increasing U.S. involvement in Cambodia. This could occur at the very moment that a major U.S. air assault in Cambodia may be necessary, in the President's judgment, to protect the withdrawal of U.S. troops at the rate to which he is so firmly committed. Therefore the President should prepare the ground now.

2. There is an inherent danger to the U.S. future in Asia if we continue wiping out whole Cambodian towns and cities with massive air strikes to achieve a short term reopening of one highway. (The once thriving provincial city of Prey Totung with 6000 inhabitants is now bombed to rubble.) There is an equal danger to the U.S. future in Asia if we continue aiding and supplying massive incursions into Cambodia of South Vietnamese troops. These troops can, in the short run, repulse the North Vietnamese far more competently than can the Cambodians. (The Cambodian Army, with U.S. assistance, has multiplied from less than 30,000 last March to over 180,000 spirited volunteers today. But it is no match for the North Vietnamese). But the danger is that Cambodians and the Vietnamese (be they from the North or South), are traditionally bitter enemies. Thus the huge presence of hated South Vietnamese inside Cambodia, sponsored by the U.S., could in the longer run drive Cambodians into war with South Vietnam and make them bitterly hostile to the U.S.

3. Perhaps the bitterest irony of all is that the Highway 4, now the scene of the bloodiest battles in the Cambodian war, is a U.S. highway, built with U.S. money and American engineers. Indeed this road was named the Khymer-American Friendship Highway. Indeed it was built to link that American-built port of Sihanoukville to the capital city of Phnom Penh. Since that time—so recent—we have swapped horses. We encouraged the overthrow of our former friend Sihanouk. And now the port and the highway which we built for him have become Cambodia's worst battlefield and the means by which the North Vietnamese are trying to throttle Cambodia.

The way Highway 4 has turned into a boomerang may be a warning. Massive U.S. bombardment of Cambodia today may also boomerang, working against future U.S. hopes of bringing any political and military peace to the area.

It is our belief that for the time being at least North Vietnam does not intend to deny to the Cambodians, to the Americans, to the South Vietnamese safe use of the major highways in Cambodia. If we force Hanoi to loosen their stranglehold on the oil road from the port to the capital, Hanoi will then tighten their grip on the rice road, which runs north and south from the capital. If they relax on oil, they tighten up on food. Then, on other occasions, Hanoi will try to put the stranglehold on the third major road, which links South Vietnam to the capital. Hanoi can in short lay siege to Phnom Penh.

If each of these threats, as they arise, is to be countered by a combination of South Vietnamese ground troops and the United States air support, the danger should not be hidden from the American public. The embroilment of the U.S. and South Vietnam into long war in Cambodia may open a Lew and horrifying Pandora's box.

Our belief is that it is against U.S. interests

to see the ARVN, so long and expensively trained and equipped by us, embark on any major commitments in Cambodia. Stories from Saigon clearly report that the South Vietnamese government is asking for \$20 millions in U.S. funds to pay for just the current ARVN operations on Highway Four. It is certainly not in U.S. interests to see American air power "blackmailed" into destroying more Cambodian cities and farmland. Our goal is peace, not expanded war, in Indochina.

But as long as there are U.S. troops and bases in the area, the dilemma will always plague us. For we must protect them. They are, in this way, hostages; and the price of their ransom may always be raised at will by the enemy. Hanoi, with Soviet and Chinese support, could make it a policy to keep the U.S. involved.

Thus, we believe the White House should define precisely to the Pentagon, the Congress and the public, the limits of U.S. involvement in Cambodia. For we are suffering today for our failure to define such limits many years ago in Vietnam. Let us not forget so soon that the Tonkin Gulf resolution, so innocently approved by Congress, ended up with 550,000 U.S. troops involved in the longest, losingest war in our history.

CONGRESSIONAL HOUSE SELECT
COMMITTEE ON CRIME A GREAT
SUCCESS

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the news media has reported in the last few days that crime statistics in most major cities, and especially over the Nation, have recorded a percentage of decrease. This is certainly good news. The Federal Government, States, and municipalities should expand further their fight on crime and the causes thereof.

The Special Select Committee on Crime created by the House in the last session has contributed greatly to this recorded decrease in lawlessness. This committee has held hearings all over the Nation and especially in major cities from coast to coast during the last session. The newspaper, television, and radio publicity in the various localities where hearings were held extended wide information and encouragement to the law-enforcing bodies in these localities. One of the great results of the work of this committee has been through the news media inculcating into the minds of millions of our youth the dangers of the use of drugs to the human body and contribution of drugs toward "the making of criminals."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call the attention of this body to a resolution, House Resolution 115, introduced by our colleagues, Chairman CLAUDE PEPPER of Florida and Minority Chairman CHARLES WIGGINS of California that would reauthorize this Select Committee on Crime, which we created in the 91st Congress. Congressman PEPPER served as the able chairman of the Select Committee on Crime, and Mr. WIGGINS was the ranking minority member. That these two men have joined

to sponsor the reconstruction of the committee is a sign of the harmony and dedication with which Members of both parties worked as they guided the Select Committee on Crime through its first 20 months of life.

Mr. Speaker, all of us realize that much work still must be done to reduce the appalling incidence of crime in America. Chairman PEPPER said in a letter to his colleagues:

While I am highly pleased with the work the Select Committee on Crime has done in its short life, I am cognizant that we could not have ever begun to "solve" the problem of crime in so short a time. That is why I am asking you to support my resolution to reconstitute the Committee. If the House acts favorably on my resolution, the Crime Committee would continue its investigation into synthetic analgesics for morphine and blockage drugs for heroin addicts as well as the effects such drugs as methadone have on decreasing the crime rate. Our attention will also turn to the increasing penetration and infiltration of organized crime into the ranks of legitimate businesses. And we would like to conduct a major investigation into the ever worsening state of our correctional institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I have followed closely the activities of the Crime Committee since its formation and I would like to briefly review its work for the benefit of our new colleagues.

In its 20 months of life during the 91st Congress, the committee held 14 public hearings in 12 cities and towns across the Nation as well as here in the Capital. These hearings have delved into drug abuse and criminal justice, marihuana, illicit and dangerous drugs, amphetamines, organized crime, court delay, juvenile justice and corrections, street crime, juvenile delinquency, heroin paraphernalia, and youth gang warfare.

As a result of this intensive and exhaustive study and investigation, the Select Committee on Crime also issued four comprehensive reports to the 91st Congress: Marihuana, Heroin and Heroin Paraphernalia, Juvenile Justice and Corrections, and Amphetamines. Members of the committee made available 40,000 copies of the Marihuana report for their colleagues to send to interested constituents. The last three reports, issued last month, contain bold and imaginative proposals for dealing with grave problems facing our Nation.

The committee also produced and made available at no cost to Members of this body an excellent radio documentary, "Facts and Fables of Drug Abuse," which was distributed to and broadcast by more than 500 radio stations throughout the Nation.

The Crime Committee, mindful of the jurisdiction of standing committees, has been most cooperative when its investigations disclosed information that might be of interest to other committees. The committee's study of amphetamine abuse, for example, disclosed that the U.S. military was purchasing large quantities of these drugs. This information was conveyed to the Special Subcommittee To Investigate Alleged Drug Abuse in the Military. Similarly, when a Crime Committee investigation in Philadelphia, Pa., uncovered possible

violations of FHA regulations, this information was turned over to the Banking and Currency Committee for their consideration and further investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the record of the Select Committee on Crime warrants its request to be able to complete the job it has so ably begun. In an area where there is often more rhetoric than action, the Crime Committee has built a record of solid accomplishment. At a time when crime is on the mind of citizens everywhere, I think this body needs its own committee to investigate crime. I think the 92d Congress can meet the challenge by reconstituting the Select Committee on Crime. I intend to support House Resolution 115, and I urge my able colleagues to join me in this worthy effort.

THE NIXON ECONOMY

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the decision by President Nixon to formulate a full employment budget, which he amplified today in his budget message, has been widely accepted as a desirable means of stimulating the economy. However, it is less well known that the concept of balancing the budget at full employment has long Republican antecedents.

This point was made recently in an article in the New York Times entitled "The Nixon Economy." The author was Mr. Herbert Stein, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. I insert Mr. Stein's article in the RECORD:

THE NIXON ECONOMY: I

(By Herbert Stein)

WASHINGTON.—Many observers seem puzzled by Mr. Nixon's espousal of the idea of balancing the Federal budget at full employment, with its implication that large actual deficits for the next year are not only tolerable but a positively good thing. Some regard it as a deathbed conversion from the obsolete Puritan ethic to the brilliant discoveries of the New Economics. Others consider it a politically motivated lapse from fiscal virtue to demagoguery. Some of my more adroit friends have it both ways—on the general principle that what was the New Economics for JFK is only the Old Politics for RMN.

In fact, the idea of a budget that would be balanced when the economy is operating at full employment and have a deficit when the economy is operating below that has a long, conservative, Republican pedigree. Although there were vague antecedents, the first full development and exposition of the idea was made by a group of businessmen and bankers, overwhelmingly Republican, the Committee for Economic Development, in 1947. The principle of balancing the budget at full employment was considered by its authors, in 1947, a correction of errors even then no longer new but later identified as the New Economics. These included over-emphasis on fiscal policy relative to monetary policy, exaggerated confidence in the ability of economists to fine-tune the economy and disregard of the political pressures that divert the budget from the economists' chosen path. The CED businessmen who wrote this

statement recognized that they had abandoned the traditional idea of annual budget-balancing. However, by 1947 most of them realized that the traditional idea was already long dead and the problem was to find a workable substitute.

The idea of the full employment budget was also presented in an article in the American Economic Review in 1948 by an economist who was then young but was neither then nor later a New Economist—Milton Friedman.

Although these early sources of thinking full-employment budget-balance were Republican, the idea soon acquired bipartisan support. In 1949 Senator Paul Douglas's subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee recommended its use. President Truman in his January 1950 Budget Message explained his program by referring to its effects at high employment.

President Eisenhower was not an annual-budget-balancer. He expressed wonder at the belief that our financial affairs should be attuned to the time it takes the earth to get around the sun. His affirmative views, however, ran more to balancing the budget over the business cycle, or some such period as five years, rather than to balancing at full employment. But his Secretary of the Treasury, Robert Anderson, gave a detailed exposition of the full-employment balance philosophy as a description of the Administration's position on fiscal policy. Of more interest today is the statement on budget policy of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth of which Vice President Richard Nixon was chairman. That statement, issued in October 1959, endorsed the full-employment balance idea, with its accompanying automatic deficits when the economy was low.

During the 1940's and 1950's, those who later became the New Economists maintained a tolerant but superior attitude toward the notion of full-employment balance. They regarded it as commendable progress for businessmen and Republicans because it was a step away from their primitive beliefs. However, it was not, in their opinion, reaching the basic truth that by any definition balancing the budget was irrelevant to economic policy.

When the New Economists came to Washington with President Kennedy they found the idea of full-employment balance convenient. It helped to sell expansionist fiscal policies, which could be defended to those who cared about such things as leaving the budget balanced, at full employment. However the requirement that the expenditures should not exceed revenues that would be obtained at full employment was not seriously regarded as a limit. When we moved into the Vietnam War we also moved into large deficits at full employment.

The Nixon Administration did not have to search the files left by their predecessors to find the full-employment balance idea and they did not have to abandon any deep Republican convictions to use it. President Nixon's previous connection with the idea has already been mentioned. The Chairman of President Nixon's Council of Economic Advisers, Paul McCracken, was a supporter of the full-employment balance rule long before the inauguration of President Nixon. One member of the Council, Herbert Stein, had been chief researcher and draftsman of the original CED statement in 1947.

However, the point is not that the Nixon Administration is applying some patented Republican remedy. The point is that the idea is now in the public domain and has been for many years, that its value has been endorsed by many bankers, businessmen and economists, conservatives and liberals, and that it only remained for someone to make a definite decision to put it into effect. That the President has done.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion in recent months about the Veterans' Administration hospital system. Much of the discussion has centered on budgetary limitations that have been imposed on the veterans' medical care program for the past several years. It is true that adequate funds are essential if the Nation's veterans are to receive the highest quality of medical care possible.

Equally important to the successful accomplishment of this worthy objective, however, is the need to recruit and retain highly qualified professional health personnel. It is readily apparent that the Nation's increasing demand for medical manpower has seriously impaired the Veterans' Administration's ability to compete in recruiting and retaining doctors and nurses.

If the Veterans' Administration is to continue rendering the high quality medical care to which the Nation's veterans are entitled, they must be able to compete in today's market for the services of talented and skilled professional medical personnel.

Accordingly, I am introducing a bill today that is designed to make medical service careers in the Veterans' Administration more attractive.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, will establish a minimum staffing ratio; that is the ratio of hospital staff to patients, in each of the Veterans' Administration hospitals.

To help maintain these staffing ratios, the bill authorizes the Administrator, upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, to establish higher maximum rates of pay for physicians, dentists, and nurses on a nationwide, local, or other geographic area basis where required to meet competitive pay practices.

The bill will authorize night and holiday differential pay for nurses, and nursing assistants. A pay scale for licensed vocational nurses would be established under the terms of the bill. The pay scale would be equivalent to the pay of classified employees ranging from GS-3 to GS-6.

The Administrator, under this bill, would be authorized to pay the preemployment interview expenses for prospective employees having technical or professional skills in a shortage category. Under existing law, this authority is limited to payment of the preemployment expenses for physicians, dentists, and nurses only.

The Administrator would also be authorized to pay the travel and transportation expenses of a new appointee and his family from his place of residence to his first duty station if the individual has technical or professional skills determined to be in the shortage category by the Administrator.

These are the principal provisions of this bill, Mr. Speaker. It is a reasonable

bill and it will enable the Veterans' Administration to better meet the problem of recruiting and retaining scarce categories of health personnel.

THE PRESIDENT AND YOUTH

HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that President Nixon's recent address to the faculty and students of the University of Nebraska will stand as a benchmark of the first 2 years of his administration. The speech was particularly remarkable for the perfect matching of form and content, which is rarely achieved even in a presidential address.

In a recent editorial entitled "The President and Youth," the Christian Science Monitor termed the President's University of Nebraska address "the finest speech of his Presidency." I insert this editorial in the RECORD.

THE PRESIDENT AND YOUTH

President Nixon gave the finest speech of his presidency at the University of Nebraska.

It was a healing speech, statesmanlike and fatherly. It reminded one of those moments in history when, moved by the vision of a common sonship and purpose, an antagonist rises above the sense of division and extends the hand of reconciliation:

"There can be no generation gap in America. The destiny of this nation is not divided into yours and ours—it is one destiny. We share it together, we are responsible for it together and, in the way we respond, history will judge us together."

And he backed this up with a concrete instrument for a continuing reconciliation—a new voluntary agency that would absorb the Peace Corps and VISTA: "an agency through which those willing to give their lives and their energy can work at cleaning up the environment, combat illiteracy, malnutrition, suffering and blight, either abroad or at home."

The radically changed tone in the President's speech was far removed from what many charged were the youth-baiting and imprecations of last fall's campaign. Perhaps he has sensed a positive change in youth activism, discussed in the adjacent editorial, or realizes he must better help channel the energies of youth's idealism. Perhaps he felt he must welcome the newest members of the voting public, the 18-year-olds.

But in any event, the country will welcome this leadership in downwinding the contention between the young and the old. Given the problems of the cities, of rural America, of education and technology enumerated by the President himself, the country surely needs no generation gap to try its patience and will.

A month ago Mr. Nixon had said, "divisions in this country are never going to end. . . . There's always going to be a generation gap." Having just said this, and knowing full well that in the public view his administration is at odds with youth, and recognizing the risks of skepticism, it may have been far harder for Mr. Nixon to take his peacemaking stance than it was two years ago, when he promised the country that reconciliation would be the keynote of his administration.

But the President nonetheless is giving it a try. This will make it easier for the older and younger at universities, in businesses,

and in homes to give getting on together another try too. Perhaps it is in the encouraging of such fresh starts that the essence of presidential leadership is revealed.

THE HONORABLE L. MENDEL RIVERS

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, in the February issue of Naval Affairs, which is the magazine for career enlisted personnel of the U.S. Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, a special tribute was paid to our late departed colleague, the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina, which I found to be most inspiring.

Chairman Rivers' entire career in the Congress was spent improving the life of the U.S. servicemen and he often stated that—

Servicemen in uniform don't have a lobby like some of the other people have. The only lobby servicemen have is the Committee on Armed Services.

I am sure that my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD will find this tribute to be both a fitting and apropos commendation to this great American:

THE HONORABLE L. MENDEL RIVERS: THE U.S. SERVICEMEN'S CONGRESSMAN AND A SHIPMATE

Shipmate L. Mendel Rivers of Charleston Branch 50, Chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Armed Services, joined the Staff of the Supreme Commander at 0240 E.S.T., Monday, 28 December 1970 while recovering from cardiac surgery at the University Medical Center in Birmingham, Alabama. Chairman Rivers underwent open heart surgery by Dr. John Kirklin on 11 December to replace a leaking mitral valve in his heart with a plastic valve. His post-operative recovery was progressing normally until 20 December when he suffered heart stoppage and was revived by chest massage. Thereafter, his condition remained critical, but improved slightly, until his demise.

The National Charter of the Fleet Reserve Association will be draped for thirty days. All Branches of the Fleet Reserve Association will drape their Charters for the same period commencing on 30 December 1970 in accordance with Section 2707 of the Fleet Reserve Association "Rituals."

Chairman Rivers was born on 28 September 1905 on a farm in Gumville, South Carolina, near a place called Hell Hole Swamp, in the low country of that state's coastal plain. His father farmed and operated a small turpentine still. When Mendel (he never used his first name "Lucius") was eight his father died. His mother lost the family home and moved her six children to North Charleston where she took in boarders.

Young Mendel grew up determined to be a lawyer. He clerked in a country store, delivered papers pony-back, played outfield for a semi-pro baseball team and worked in the Charleston Navy Yard. He attended the College of Charleston and the University of South Carolina but was economically forced to quit his formal education. He gained employment in a Charleston law office where he pursued his law studies. He passed the South Carolina bar examination in 1932 before obtaining a law degree.

He served in the South Carolina Legislature from 1933 to 1936. From 1936 to 1940 he served as a special attorney in the United States Department of Justice; and was admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States.

In 1940 he ran for Congress against the advice of seasoned and influential local politicians. He campaigned against "the Charleston crowd" and drew heavy support from the rural areas of the district. To the surprise of all, he won and thereafter never faced serious opposition. He had opposition in only two or three of his subsequent fifteen successful campaigns for reelection.

In the second session of the 88th Congress in 1964, The Honorable Carl Vinson, then Chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, announced his retirement. Representative Rivers was the ranking Democrat on that Committee and he succeeded "Uncle Carl" as Chairman upon the convening of the 89th Congress in January 1965.

Shipmate Rivers was always a strong advocate of legislation beneficial to military personnel. He played a key role in the House's passage of the provision to restore the principle of recompetition of military retired pay for those who retired prior to 1 July 1958 in the 1963 military pay bill. He was Chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Medical Benefits in 1964. His leadership resulted in the enactment of Public Law 89-614 establishing the Civilian Health and Medical Program for the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) in 1966.

As Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee he immediately began to exert strong influence for the improvement of military pay, allowances and benefits. The first test of his leadership was the successful passage and enactment of a military pay raise that was twice the amount proposed by the Administration in its 1965 budget. Following that victory, military personnel knew they had found a champion and their benefits increased each year because of his legislative innovations, expertise and dedication to his philosophy, "The Serviceman and his family are entitled to a standard of living equal to the standard of living they're defending."

Chairman Rivers left no stone unturned and he never missed an opportunity to act in behalf of all military personnel. His record of military personnel legislation enacted is almost legendary in the annals of legislative history. He fought tremendous odds, including two Administrations, to provide our nation with an adequate military defense.

Chairman Rivers was a member of the Grace Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina. Funeral services were held there at 1300, Wednesday, 30 December 1970 and interment followed in the town of St. Stephen, South Carolina. St. Stephen was the home of the Chairman's parents and is forty-six miles from Charleston. Shipmates National President Robert L. Bastian and National Executive Secretary Robert W. Nolan represented the Fleet Reserve Association at the church and graveside services.

His 82,500 Shipmates of the Fleet Reserve Association, indeed, all military personnel, active duty and retired, deeply mourn his passing. His beloved wife, Margaret, his daughters, Mrs. Robert Eastman and Marion, and young Lucius Mendel Jr. can take great pride in the Chairman's service to his nation and the Free World during the past thirty years. Dr. Albert Einstein said,

ONLY A LIFE LIVED FOR OTHERS IS A LIFE WORTH WHILE

Shipmate Chairman Rivers' life is the epitome of that statement. It will be a space of time before another like him walks with us and carries our burden to make the way easier for us, his Shipmates.

The family has requested that those who wish to remember Chairman Rivers in a special way may wish to address their remembrances to the L. Mendel Rivers Heart Surgery Research Fund, Department of Surgery, Alabama Medical Center, University of Alabama, Birmingham, Alabama. Messages of condolence may be addressed to: Mrs. L. Mendel Rivers, 640 Federal Building, Charleston, South Carolina 29403:

"As the years roll by, one by one, we end our cruise. The anchor is dropped to rise from the waters no more.

"Shipmate L. Mendel Rivers sailed through life's cruise, meeting more than his share of calms and storms, adverse tides and favoring winds; his ship of life has come to its final anchorage in a harbor still uncharted by mortal men. We who remain do not know the waters there, but we do know the course to steer and we believe that our Shipmate, setting his course by those beacons that have been given us, has found that harbor safely. To those loved ones whom our departed Shipmate has left behind, awaiting their own day of departure and voyage to that same harbor of eternal mercy, we can only offer our sympathy in this time of separation and loneliness. There are many words that could be used at this time to describe the good and outstanding qualities of the one who has gone before, but we of the Fleet Reserve Association, of which he was a member, sum it up in one word: Shipmate. That word, when spoken by naval men, embodies all that can be said of any man. Chairman L. Mendel Rivers was a Shipmate.

"We who remain to carry on should not think of Shipmate Rivers as gone from us, but rather that he has been transferred to another ship or station where we all hope to be Shipmates again."

FLORIDA FRONTIER RIVERS NATIONAL CULTURAL PARK—A NEW CONCEPT

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, there is a story of 400 years of history from the Huguenots to the astronauts waiting to be told about a tiny strip of land in north Florida.

While our Nation is preparing to celebrate our 200th birthday in 1976, the roots of America's beginnings actually began 400 years ago along 50 miles of the Florida coast adjoining the Atlantic Ocean.

This can be an exciting story for the millions who annually pass through the area but know little of what transpired there. The sum of all the parts of the history belongs in four centuries of exploration, settlement, and reaching for the moon: An American kaleidoscope from the 16th century to the 21st.

Here we have between three river basins near present-day Jacksonville—Florida's largest city—the first settlement by men and women for religious freedom in the New World, the oldest city in America, the first road, the southernmost battles of the American Revolution, and important Civil War events. In all, 10 sovereignties have held this land or parts of it.

But the total picture of this colorful area of antiquity and modern day involves more than the ancient and current history of North America. It also includes a unique ecological environment which must be preserved and protected for the enjoyment of future generations.

The Congress should establish the proposed Florida Frontier Rivers National Cultural Park. Legislation has been introduced in the U.S. Congress by the members of the Florida congressional delegation to bring this about. Because of the area's environmental geography and the role it played in our history, this new concept suggested by a study team of the National Park Service should be approved. As a sponsor of the bill to accomplish this, H.R. 586, pending in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I am working toward that end.

The Florida Frontier Rivers National Cultural Park would be a first of its kind—preserving and interpreting the natural, historic, and economic assets of a broad area in a cultural park. This concept of a national park is a new one, as it would coordinate, not take over, local, State and, even private facilities, together with federally owned facilities, under a broad cultural park umbrella.

The rivers involved in this proposed park include the majestic St. John's River, which flows northward some 300 miles along the east coast of Florida; the Nassau River, which still retains most of its pristine and primeval beauty of centuries, and the St. Marys River, the boundary between Florida and Georgia. The boundaries of the proposed park are the St. Marys River on the north and St. Augustine and environs on the south.

The initial legislation proposes clustering the virtually unimpaired Nassau River estuary, possessing important scenic, natural, ecological, historic, and scientific values, the St. Augustine's Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, the Fort Mantanzas National Monument, and Fort Caroline National Memorial, 10 miles east of Jacksonville. Four centuries ago this 50-mile stretch witnessed the first conflict between Europeans in North America. Today, not far from where the St. Johns River reaches St. Augustine—the southern boundary of the proposed park—astronauts have blasted off from Cape Canaveral to reach the moon. They have a common bond with their fellow explorers, the French Huguenots who founded Fort Carolina in 1564 under the leadership of Rene Laudonniere; for both sought to expand the geographical limits of man in an environment at first hostile.

It is in the national interest to establish the Florida Frontier Rivers National Cultural Park, which would explain the historical and cultural developments of the area heretofore only casually understood or investigated. Existing national park facilities would be included under the proposed bill, and cooperative agreements would be arranged with the State of Florida to include its many significant historical points, and only a small portion of land would be needed for a permanent facility to tell the whole story of the area. The

thousands of acres of untapped and unharmed estuarine marshes and streambeds in the Nassau Valley could perhaps be obtained through donation and other lands purchased by the Federal Government. The State of Florida and the city of Jacksonville own much of the land in the estuarial portions of the proposed park.

The peninsula of Florida is the cradle of America. Discovered and claimed for Spain in 1513 by Ponce de Leon, who named the land "Pascua Florida" because of its discovery "in the time of the Feast of Flowers," it was not until Laudonniere established Fort Caroline here that the permanent settlement by Europeans of what is now the United States began.

This began the European power struggle in Florida, stemming from the French toehold at Fort Caroline, which led to the founding of St. Augustine in 1565 by Pedro Menendez, who was sent by Philip II to wipe out the French. This history is marked already in National Park Service facilities, forming the basis of the new park idea.

The St. Augustine-St. Johns-Jacksonville area is one where we should have strong concern for preserving the environment and keeping alive the sweep of history in our area. Hard on the Atlantic Ocean, the northeast section of Florida is crossed with tidal rivers, covered with swamps, dotted with hammocks of hardwoods and pine flatlands, and cut with highly indented estuaries. Wildlife and vegetation abound throughout. At the sea are numerous long sand dune islands.

Besides the strong Spanish influence in Florida that excluded the French and the British for most of three centuries—except for the beginning at Fort Caroline by the French and the 20-year British occupation after the French and Indian War—the area is alive with the past.

In the proposed park location visitors and tourists would be able to travel the oldest road in America, which was first carved out of the wilderness on September 16, 1565, by Pedro Menendez and his Spanish soldiers from St. Augustine to Fort Caroline. As a result of a law passed by Congress in 1968, the Department of Interior is now considering the possibility of placing the route of the ancient trail in the National Trails System.

Other possible historic attractions which might be included in the Florida Frontier Rivers National Cultural Park:

The 1777 battle at Thomas Creek and the 1778 battle at Alligator Bridge, the southernmost battles of the American revolution.

Sawpit, where Sawpit Creek comes into Nassau Sound on the northeast side of Black Hammock Island, the Colonials rendezvous for the Battle of Thomas Creek. Nearby is the site of the 18th century Fort Dos Hermanos, on Talbot Island.

Amelia Island, where on its north end is located Old Fernandina and the site of the Spanish fortification, Fort San Carlos, and restored Fort Clinch, started in 1847 as one of the series of Atlantic and gulf masonry forts. Fernandina was

at times held by pirates; and the flags of Mexico and Venezuela flew over it.

Fort George Island, Big and Little Talbot Islands, the land first sighted by Frenchman Jean Ribault, when he sailed into the St. Johns River, May 1, 1562, laying the groundwork for Fort Caroline's establishment 2 years later.

Kingsley Plantation, whose owner Zephaniah Kingsley took over a Fort George Island fortified by James Oglethorpe in the early 1700's. Kingsley developed it into an extensive plantation for the training of slaves for resale.

Yellow Bluff Fort, built by the Confederates and then abandoned to Union forces in the fall of 1862.

The famous Citizen Genet incident, which sought to establish the French Republic in Florida in 1795 in this area. Then there were two other local republican grassroots movements in the early 19th century.

These are some of the places and events—stimulated by men hungry for power and fame, some bidding the wishes of kings and queens, which would form the Florida Frontier Rivers National Cultural Park. It should be established.

A copy of the legislation follows:

H.R. 586

A bill to authorize the establishment of the Florida Frontier Rivers National Cultural Park, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the three estuarine rivers of northeastern Florida—the Saint Johns, Nassau, and Saint Marys—unify a nationally significant cultural heritage with roots in four centuries of rich colonial and national cultural development. The Congress further finds that the virtually unimpaired Nassau River estuary is the only one of the three that graphically illustrates the historic setting and natural environment that shaped this heritage and in addition possesses important scenic, natural, ecological, scientific, and other values contributing to public enjoyment, inspiration, and scientific study. The Congress concludes, therefore, that it is in the national interest for the United States to join with State and local government and private institutions, groups, and associations to preserve and interpret the Nassau River estuary and associated cultural and historic sites and buildings of northeastern Florida in such manner and by such means as shall achieve public understanding and appreciation of the heritage fashioned by the past and present interaction of man with this environment.

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY

SEC. 2. In furtherance of this objective, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or by exchange, not to exceed eighty-five thousand acres of lands and waters and interests therein, of which not more than ten thousand acres may be other than estuarine marshes and streambeds, in the Nassau River estuary which in his judgment are necessary to preserve the historic setting and natural environment of said estuary from development adverse to the purposes of this Act. In addition thereto, the Secretary is authorized to acquire not to exceed one hundred and fifty acres at various locations in northeastern Florida for administrative and visitor information facilities. Lands, waters, and interests therein owned

by the State of Florida or any political subdivision thereof may be acquired only by donation. Any Federal property designated by the Secretary may, with the concurrence of the head of the administering agency, be transferred without consideration to the jurisdiction of the Secretary for purposes of this Act.

ESTABLISHMENT

Sec. 3. When the Secretary determines that he has acquired sufficient lands or interests therein to insure the realization of the purposes of this Act, he shall by publication in the Federal Register establish the Florida Frontier Rivers National Cultural Park to consist initially of the Nassau River estuary and the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, Fort Matanzas National Monument, and Fort Caroline National Memorial. Pending such establishment and thereafter, he shall administer the Federal property under his administrative jurisdiction in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4), as amended and supplemented.

STUDY AND DESIGNATION OF ADDITIONAL SITES

Sec. 4. (a) The Secretary shall study and may designate additional sites in non-Federal ownership for incorporation within the Florida Frontier Rivers National Cultural Park in order to provide a unified interpretation and commemoration of the cultural heritage of the Florida Frontier Rivers country. The sites to be studied for designation shall include, but need not be limited to: Thomas Creek Battlefield; Alligator Bridge Battlefield; Kingsley Plantation. Huguenot Memorial, and other sites on Fort George Island; Fort Clinch, Old Fernandina, and other sites on Amelia Island; Yellow Bluff Fort; Spanish Coquina Quarries; Saint Augustine Historic District; and the route of historic King's Road between Saint Augustine and Saint Mary's River. Designation of any site pursuant to this subsection for incorporation within the Florida Frontier Rivers National Cultural Park shall become effective upon publication of notice to that effect in the Federal Register.

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

(b) In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Florida, its political subdivisions or agencies, public and private corporations, associations, or individuals pursuant to which such parties agree to protect, preserve, maintain, and operate such additional properties as may be designated by the Secretary in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, and he may assist in the preservation, renewal, and interpretation of such properties: *Provided*, That any such cooperative agreement shall contain, but need not be limited to, provisions that: (1) the Secretary has right of access at all reasonable times to all public portions of the properties for the purpose of conducting visitors through them and interpreting them to the public; and (2) no changes or alterations shall be made in the historic properties, including buildings and grounds, without the written consent of the Secretary.

INTERPRETIVE MARKERS

(c) To facilitate the interpretation of the Florida Frontier Rivers National Cultural Park, the Secretary is authorized, with the concurrence of the owner, to erect and maintain tablets or markers at cultural or historic sites designated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section or along public thoroughfares in accordance with the provisions contained in the Act approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461-467).

APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

RESTORATION OF THE INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union message, the President spoke hopefully and promisingly of an upturn in the economy during the year of 1971.

He promised a full employment budget to help spur the economy even though such spending will run a tremendous deficit.

He spoke of reducing unemployment and he promised further pressure to reduce interest rates and halt inflation.

Certainly, all Americans join with him in this hope and look forward to fulfillment of these promises.

However, in the state of the Union message we were offered only the framework of the President's proposed program for 1971. We have yet to see the details. The flesh and muscle has yet to be added to the bare bones.

Thus, while we can hope with the President and with the American people that 1971 will breathe new life into a sick economy, we, the Congress, must move ahead without waiting for the initiatives to come from the administration.

The fact is that today, regardless of what tomorrow hopefully brings, the economic indicators are still pointing to danger.

Unemployment is at 6 percent.

Inflation continues to rise after marking an increase of 5.6 percent in 1970.

Interest rates are still high and the cost of borrowing to business and consumer is still excessive.

We must act quickly, therefore, to stimulate the economy.

Recently the administration announced, and I applauded, plans to accelerate the depreciation allowance for business and industry.

Back in the early 1960's, the accelerated depreciation was used to stimulate business expansion, creating the demand for more goods and services and new jobs.

Another economic tool which was applied at that time was the application of the 7½-percent investment tax credit.

This was repealed in 1969, but today I am introducing legislation to reinstate this tax incentive for economic expansion.

When the investment tax credit was repealed in 1969, it was done so for several important reasons:

First, At a time when the economy was dangerously overheating and posed the threat of runaway inflation, business was expected to expand at an alarming 14 percent compared to 4 percent in 1968 and 2 percent in 1967.

Second, The Federal Government was threatened with a growing deficit and the repeal of the investment tax credit would provide badly needed Federal revenues.

Third, Repeal of the credit was seen as an important tool in the effort to take

the big push out of the economy and ease inflationary pressures.

Today, much of what we hoped for has been accomplished but perhaps not as we wished or predicted.

Business certainly has cut back on expansion. However, with this has come rising unemployment and widespread wage increases often without corresponding increase in productivity which have led to increased inflation.

Today, we find ourselves, I believe, in an economic situation 180 degrees from that we were experiencing in 1969.

Business needs to expand because this will create more employment and the demand for more goods and services.

At the same time, further inflationary pressures must be eased and this is where a restoration of the investment tax credit can play an additional role.

In manufacturing, over the decade through 1969, the liberal application of new equipment increased output per man-hour almost 40 percent at a time when wholesale prices were increasing 10 percent. In industries in which modernization moved slowly, prices rose more rapidly.

If we will recall, it was the need for modernization and increased productivity which was a prime factor in the establishment of the tax credit.

Thus, I believe, that restoration of the credit, coupled with the new liberalization in the depreciation allowance will give the economy a lift which can help 1971 to be a year of stable economic growth.

Also included in this bill is a provision to apply the investment tax credit to the purchase of used machine tools. To the large manufacturer the need is most often for new equipment and machinery. But to the small businessman, the cost of this equipment is often beyond his reach. Thus, the used machine market for many small businessmen is the only market available. Yet, under previous legislation, the tax credit was not available to the small businessman because there was a \$50,000 limitation on these purchases.

The small businessman has just as much need of additional equipment to modernize, but he has often been discriminated against in the past because he could not afford new equipment and the used equipment that was within his means did not qualify for the investment tax credit.

This legislation will relieve this discrimination which existed in the previous law:

A bill to restore the investment tax credit and to liberalize the credit available for used machine tools

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 49 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to termination of investment tax credit) is amended—

(1) by inserting "AND RESTORATION" after "TERMINATION" in the heading for such section,

(2) by inserting "and completed before January 1, 1971," after "1969," in subsection (a) (1),

(3) by inserting "and before January 1,

1971," after "1969," in subsection (a) (2); and

(4) by repealing subsection (d) (relating to property placed in service after 1975).

(b) Section 46(b)(5) of such Code (relating to carryovers) is amended by inserting "and before January 1, 1971," before "shall not exceed 20 percent."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 48(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to dollar limitation on used section 38 property) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(E) Exception for machine tools.—For purposes only of applying the dollar limitation provided by this paragraph, machine tools shall be treated as property which is not used section 38 property. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'machine tool' means a nonportable power-driven machine used to shape metals and materials by cutting or forming under pressure, impact, electrical techniques, or a combination of these processes."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to property acquired after December 31, 1970, in taxable years ending after such date.

NEW INFLATION VIEWS

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent economic study which documents the urgent need for passage of H.R. 102 entitled the "Public Works Acceleration Act" which I have jointly introduced with 21 other Congressmen. Conducted by Dr. George L. Perry of the Brookings Institution, the economic analysis in question suggests that a more detailed structural view of the labor market which reveals the relative degree of unemployment among the various segments of the labor force must be adopted if we are to deal effectively with the rising rate of unemployment in this country. The Perry study points out that the job market for young workers is much tighter than the current rate of unemployment would indicate. Between 1956 and 1969, for example, the percentage of total unemployment accounted for by youth under 25 years of age has gone up from 31 to 50 percent.

This sharp increase in the number of unemployed young people is nowhere more apparent than in the building trades industry where young men predominate in the pick and shovel category. The Public Works Acceleration Act will greatly assist this often overlooked segment of our unemployed work force by providing public works projects in those most depressed areas of the country. The spiraling rate of unemployment among our youth, as described in the following article from the Washington Post—January 26, 1971—requires that the Congress take immediate action on this problem by enacting H.R. 102.

NEW INFLATION VIEWS: BROOKINGS STUDY ANALYZES LABOR'S EFFECT

(By Hobart Rowen)

A given rate of unemployment today puts less downward pressure on wages—hence has

less of an impact on inflation—than was the case 10 or 15 years ago.

That is the main conclusion of a new study by a leading Keynesian economist, George L. Perry, of the Brookings Institution. In broad terms, Perry's analysis of the anomaly of high wage rates and inflation persisting in the face of high unemployment is that those out of work today are more concentrated among women and young people who don't have much influence on the wage structure.

Between 1956 and 1969, says Perry, the percentage of total unemployment accounted for by youth (under 25 years) has gone up from 31 to 50 per cent. Turn that around, and what it says is that only 5 out of 10 jobless workers today are adults, instead of 7 out of 10 fourteen years ago.

Perry's conclusion is likely to suggest to some that the nation can live with a higher rate of unemployment than it once did; that perhaps a 5 percent unemployment rate is as tolerable as 4 percent used to be.

But the Brookings economist was careful during a press conference to reject such an interpretation. He indicated, rather, that the old Keynesian notion that a booming economy would "soak up labor" would have to be supplemented with a "better and more intensive structural approach to labor markets."

Perry's study, "Changing Labor Markets and Inflation," was published today as part of the third issue of the Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, edited by him and economist Arthur M. Okun. Perry's and other papers reflect individual views, not necessarily the institutional judgment of Brookings.

But at a conference in December, other distinguished economists accepted the broad thrust of Perry's conclusions, although some had their own explanations for the worldwide phenomenon of high wages accompanied by high unemployment.

What Perry did was to break down the over-all unemployment rate, and show that it is not the best index of labor market tightness. By counting all individuals the same, the overall index implies that an unemployed teen-ager or a woman exert the same downward pressure on wages as a male adult in the prime age brackets.

Since there is not in fact this one-for-one relationship, Perry developed a "weighted" index of his own.

This shows that a 4 percent official unemployment rate today would mean a much tighter labor market than 4 percent jobless in the 1950s because more teenagers and women are in the labor market today (working) and a greater percent of them is unemployed.

In commenting on Perry's observations, M.I.T. professor Robert M. Solow said: "According to his calculations, it takes 3½ teenage girls to push on wages as much as one prime-age man."

In the jargon of economists, Perry is offering proof of what has been suspected in recent years—a worsening of the "trade-off" between unemployment, (called the Phillips curve after the British economist) and inflation. The shift, or deterioration, Perry says, is about 1.7 percentage points since the mid-1950s.

Thus, in the 1950s, it was calculated that a 4 per cent unemployment rate would be consistent with an inflation rate of about 2.8 per cent and annual wage gains of about 5.5 per cent.

But today, says Perry, the "trade-off" for a 4 per cent jobless rate would have to be inflation of about 4.5 per cent and wage increases close to 7.5 per cent.

Looking at it the other way around, in order to reduce inflation to about the 2.8 to 3.0 per cent range, unemployment would have to average around 5.5 per cent.

Former Budget Director Charles Schultze, at the December conference on the Brookings

papers, suggested that there may be an additional sociological reason for higher unemployment rates among some age-sex groups than others—what Perry calls "unemployment dispersion."

"Among teenagers and young adults in the inner cities," said Schultze, "there may have been a revolution of rising expectations . . . (They) are inclined to say: 'I don't want those sweat jobs.'"

A similar point was made in a related paper by Robert E. Hall titled "Why is the Unemployment Rate So High at Full Employment?" Hall observed that the kind of jobs obtained by young blacks (and most white women) offer little hope for advancement.

Perry offered this table to show the deterioration in the unemployment rates of various age-sex groups as a ratio in which the males 25 to 64 have a unit value of 1.0.

SEX AND AGE GROUP—RATIO TO PRIME MALE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

	1960	1965	1969
Male:			
16 to 19	3.7	5.6	6.8
20 to 24	2.1	2.4	3.1
25 to 64	1.0	1.0	1.0
65 and over	1.1	1.5	1.3
Female:			
16 to 19	3.0	5.7	8.0
20 to 24	2.1	3.1	3.8
25 to 64	1.3	1.8	1.9
65 and over	.5	.8	1.3
Total male	1.3	1.5	1.7
Total female	1.5	2.3	2.8

The worsening unemployment rates for women and men has grown in a period when the relative number of prime-age men in the labor force has diminished. (From 1960 to 1969, the prime age male group dropped from 53.4 per cent to 48.2 per cent of the labor force.) What has happened, Perry says, is that the substitution across age-sex groups has not been sufficient: ". . . employers have pushed the already low unemployment rate of this group (prime-age men) even lower rather than expanding further the employment of other workers."

GUNS AND THE AMERICAN ENVIRONMENT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. Speaker, in a remarkable address given recently before audiences in various parts of the country, Mr. David J. Steinberg, executive director of the National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, makes some noteworthy points about the growing proliferation of guns into irresponsible hands. For example:

In the seven decades since President McKinley was assassinated at the turn of the century, more Americans have been killed by gunfire in the United States than in all our wars since the Declaration of Independence.

And again:

Our national environment is polluted with countless guns that are just "around"—guns for which no one assumes strict and legal accountability and which can move, and too often do, into the hands of others who do not assume responsibility for them, lack the essentials of responsible gun ownership and may too often use them illegally.

They have easy access to this pool of guns via purchase, loan or easy theft. The pool gets bigger, uncontrollably it seems, with every passing day. It was from this pool that Sirhan Sirhan easily obtained the gun he used to kill Senator Robert Kennedy. Acquired by its original owner as "protection" following the Watts riots, it passed from one person to another as easily as a lawn mower or a sewing machine.

Mr. Steinberg deals at length with the points raised by opponents of gun sensible gun owners who oppose reasonable regulation are not serving their own interests.

I wish that all Members of Congress who oppose stronger Federal gun control laws would take the time to read Mr. Steinberg's address, the text of which follows:

GUNS AND THE AMERICAN ENVIRONMENT
(By David J. Steinberg)

Moving at last to reverse the long neglect that produced our environmental crisis, the nation is still mired in long neglect of a different environmental problem: escalating violence, the growing proliferation of guns into irresponsible hands, and the threat posed by both in combination. The price of this negligence in lives, lawlessness and the declining quality of American life keeps going up. Lacking the will to stop this inflationary spiral, the world's best educated and most affluent society moves mindlessly toward an imponderable peril point, the limit of its patient permissiveness. How high the price of negligence will have gone by that time is anyone's guess, as are the circumstances that will trigger determination to do what is long overdue. How far the nation will then decide to go will be strongly influenced by the cost of past neglect and the enormity of whatever national tragedies may spark its tardy resolve. Those who now oppose "gun control" thus have a vested interest in getting effective gun control *now* before the atmosphere becomes emotionally charged by some unpredictable event, with unpredictable consequences.

Understandably shaken by the rising level of armed violence in their midst, the American people have been roused only sporadically, and still inadequately, to corrective action. And then only by climactic tragedies—the assassination of public figures—that sear the national conscience. The thousands of run-of-the-mill tragedies in between are accepted almost as routine news, like the ball scores and the stock market quotations. The aggregates are striking, but apparently not yet striking enough.

In the seven decades since President McKinley was assassinated at the turn of this century, more Americans have been killed by gunfire in the United States than have been killed in all our wars since the Declaration of Independence. The criminal use of guns substantially exceeds the criminal use of any other weapon, and has risen more rapidly. In 1969, guns were the weapons used in 9,480 murders, 73,500 assaults short of murder, and 112,400 armed robberies besides thousands of suicides, accidental deaths and nonfatal accidents.

There are, of course, many other ways to meet violent death or suffer serious injury. The shocking statistics of automobile accidents suggest a glaring example. But the automobile is rarely used deliberately to kill, threaten or assault anyone. And of all the weapons of either deliberate or accidental danger to people, the gun is the most easily used and the most destructive. According to FBI estimates, it is about 700 percent more destructive than all other personal weapons combined. Its potential for rising levels of violent crime on the highways and byways and in the hallways of America is obvious.

The possibilities of self-destruction or the accidental shooting of bystanders are tragically and extensively documented.

Half the households of this country have guns. There are 200 million people in the United States, and there may be nearly as many guns as people. Fear and distrust grip the nation. Countless millions arm themselves against whatever it is they fear, without fearing the consequences for the nation's safety and their own.

The gun problem is thus not just a crime problem. Those who possess firearms are not simply divisible into qualified gun owners on the one hand and criminals on the other. A very large percentage of those who have guns for sport, protection, collections, or any of these in combination, possess the basic credentials of responsible gun ownership. Too many others, however, do not, many of them law-abiding citizens. Large numbers of guns are owned and still being acquired by people whose attitude toward gun ownership is at best casual, too often careless, not the attitude of conscious and cautious responsibility it ought to be. Our national environment is polluted with countless guns that are just "around"—guns for which no one assumes strict and legal accountability and which can move, and too often do, into the hands of others who do not assume responsibility for them, lack the essentials of responsible gun ownership and may and often do use them illegally. They have easy access to this pool of guns via purchase, loan or easy theft. The pool gets bigger, uncontrollably it seems, with every passing day. It was from this pool that Sirhan Sirhan easily obtained the gun he used to kill Senator Robert Kennedy. Acquired by its original owner as "protection" following the Watts riots, it passed from one person to another as easily as a lawn mower or a sewing machine.

The easy availability of guns tends to escalate the violence of urban and suburban disorders, just as it has long been magnifying the general problem of crime across the nation. Riots may largely be a matter of internal combustion. But the easy availability of guns to those bent on violence contributes dangerously to the igniting of these explosions as well as to their level and duration. It also tends to trigger violent reactions against provocation far removed from the purpose for which these guns may originally have been acquired. It is too often true that just as the finger pulls the trigger so the trigger pulls the finger.

This environmental crisis demands but is not getting the closest attention of officials, legislators and concerned citizens everywhere. We need to clean our air, clean our waters and clean our communities. *But we also need to cleanse our society of violence, and the possession of the most destructive of weapons by those not equipped to use them responsibly.*

Nowhere in the United States does government convey to gun owners or prospective gun owners standards of firearms responsibility that society expects and indeed requires of them. Nor have most states and localities made a determined effort toward effectively keeping guns out of irresponsible hands. It was only after the assassination of a President, a religious leader and a United States Senator within the short span of 4½ years that the Federal government bestirred itself to convert the highly perforated sieve of Federal firearms laws into a policy more in tune with the nation's needs. The assassination of a President had itself not been enough to produce the needed reform of laws which were already out of date when they were enacted a third of a century before and had become increasingly and deplorably archaic. Even the Federal gun legislation enacted in 1968 is seriously inadequate.

The Gun Control Act of 1968 tightened Federal controls over the sale of guns by Federally licensed dealers. It tightened controls over the movement of guns in interstate and foreign commerce, and over mail-order shipments both within and between states. This went a considerable distance toward closing the interstate channels through which state and local firearms regulations, abysmally inadequate most everywhere, were being bypassed. But state and local laws can still be bypassed via interstate channels without great difficulty.

The main reason is that Federal law does not effectively reach the private movement of firearms across state lines, and most states (the exceptions are exceptional) do not themselves deal adequately with private gun transfers within their borders. In most states, guns of one kind or another can even be purchased from licensed dealers by criminals, drug addicts, the mentally sick, and individuals awaiting trial on criminal charges, although such sales are illegal under the new Federal law and sometimes state and local laws. This can happen because too often dealers have no effective way to check the identity of the purchaser. Private sellers are even less equipped. Besides, they are less obligated to practice caution, there being no business license at stake if they are noticeably negligent. Some states require brief waiting periods and some form of licensing to acquire handguns. But most of even these states leave rifles and shotguns virtually unregulated. And the handgun regulations are usually limited to acquisitions from dealers.

Five laws were broken—aside from the final horrendous act that shocked and shamed the nation—when Sirhan Sirhan acquired the gun he used against Robert Kennedy. Not one of these laws required him to provide definitive identification as a qualified person—a license to possess a gun—before the transfer could legally be made. There was no law requiring the person who gave him the gun to insist on seeing a license, at the risk of a sizeable penalty (including loss of his own license to possess a gun) for failing to do so. It took five years and two more nationally traumatic assassinations before a law was passed making illegal the mail-order gun transaction that led to the assassination of John F. Kennedy. No step has yet been taken to counter the kind of gun transaction that led to the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy.

In recent years, the escalating problem of firearms misuse has been given a new, highly dangerous push by the growing acquisition of guns for supposed protection against criminals and other objects of fear and suspicion.

Calls to arms are sounded from the extremes of the nation's color spectrum. Extremists at one end issue a call to arms against blacks, and sometimes against "reds" (appearing to cloak themselves with the mantle of those who fought redskins and redcoats in the early years of the Republic). Extremists at the other end arm themselves against hostile elements known to be armed, sometimes against the police to protect themselves against what they regard as unjustified use of firepower. The arming of one group, whatever its motive, triggers a call to arms from others.

The calls for arming Americans against other Americans come, not just from extremist groups at the fringes of our society, but from cathedrals of firearms responsibility that regard themselves as pillars of the nation's strength and promise. The largest and best-known of these organizations, the National Rifle Association, proclaims that "the armed citizen represents a potential community stabilizer." Every gun group and firearms magazine in the country appears to agree. But not one of them urges government policies to help ensure that armed citizens are responsible citizens, whatever their potential as community stabilizers. The gun organizations oppose effective gun control. So

do the extremists of left and right. What a motley crew of bedfellows.

Many steps are necessary to slow down the domestic arms race.

The effectiveness and prestige of the police as the chosen instrument of public protection must be enhanced. More, better paid and better trained police are urgently needed. And restraint consistent with the demands of effective self-defense should condition their use of firepower. Otherwise, police practices may themselves contribute to the arms race.

Another necessity is quick and fair administration of justice by the courts, and a penal system that effectively, fairly and constructively punishes the guilty and keeps incarcerated those not clearly capable of returning to society as responsible citizens. Fulfillment of these needs will go far toward deterring groups and individuals from taking the law into their own hands. Even when such private assumptions of police power are motivated by the best of intentions, they are often counterproductive. Posing serious dangers to public order and safety, they may foster the very instability they are intended to counter.

A very high priority on this agenda for national defense against violence must be a massive effort to solve the economic, social and political problems—to stop the economic, social and political violence—that breed much of the violent crime and other afflictions of late-20th century America.

Indispensable and too long neglected is a national firearms policy that truly meets the needs of our time. The following are the essentials of such a policy:

(1) enforceable state codes establishing standards of responsible gun ownership in accordance with minimum Federal guidelines;

(2) state licensing of legitimate gun owners and users in accordance with minimum Federal standards—the license reflecting an obligation to adhere to the state code, at the risk of losing the license and whatever guns are involved if there are serious violations;

(3) strict accountability of every licensed gun owner for every gun in his possession until its sale or gift to another licensed individual (or to a minor for whom a licensed individual assumes full responsibility)—or the gun's loss or theft—is properly reported to the appropriate law enforcement agency;

(4) strict Federal controls over the production of handguns now banned from foreign sources by the 1968 law;

(5) stiff, practical penalties for the criminal use of guns (permitting an appropriate degree of court flexibility consistent with the demands of effective law enforcement and fair administration of justice);

(6) comparable regulations on the acquisition and use of explosives.

Enforcement of these rules should feature the simplest, fairest and most inexpensive procedures, including provisions for appeal. The program should place no unreasonable burden on legitimate gun owners. On the contrary, it should be designed to win their confidence as well as that of the general public. It may even provide the basis for loosening, perhaps removing, the present stricture banning all interstate movement of firearms except between Federally licensed dealers and manufacturers. Without a nationwide system of gun-owner licensing and accountability, this rather harsh provision of the 1968 law was the only effective way to combat the heavy flow of guns across state lines in violation of state and local laws, however inadequate.

We are a long way from such a national firearms policy, and making no progress in shortening the distance. The Administration has nothing to offer, not even a bill to prohibit the escalating production of handguns now banned from foreign sources. It has in fact helped Congress weaken the Gun Control Act of 1968. Less than a year after the

law took effect, and without a minute of hearings, both houses voted by huge majorities to cut back its identification requirements for the purchase of ammunition. The Administration supported this move. More whittling may be in the offing.

The strong national majorities that favor strict firearms policies seem unready to compel the necessary national commitment via political pressure and ultimately the ballot. They seem to be waiting for a White House initiative that will not come soon—or another shock to the national conscience they pray will never come. Yet an effective campaign against violence urgently requires such a commitment. And the life of private gun ownership in America depends on it. For it is only through effective firearms laws adequately serving the overall public interest that private gun ownership can be ensured an optimistic future.

The organized gun and hunting interests, and large numbers of individual gun owners, are not yet alert to this reality. They, too, are opposed to guns falling into irresponsible hands. But they propose no effective way to minimize this danger. They appear to place their faith and hope in one basic proposition: stiff, mandatory jail sentences for using guns in crime. That is, a stiff, mandatory sentence in addition to whatever sentence is imposed for committing the crime itself. It is possible that such sentences may to some extent deter the criminal use of firearms. But let us have no illusions that this can effectively deal with the problem.

The history of penology, including the effect of special penalties now imposed for committing violent as against non-violent crime, belies the expectations of those who press this as a solution. Nor does the proposal meet the need to deter and minimize criminal access to guns in the first place. Nor does it meet the need to encourage and in fact require conscious concern among all gun owners with keeping, using and disposing of guns responsibly, and to deny possession to those who are not ready to assume such obligations. Moreover, it is the judgment of the Department of Justice (stated in a letter of April 27, 1967 to the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and reflecting the views of many with long experience in the law) that "harsh mandatory or minimum sentences often tend to deter juries from rendering guilty verdicts."

Realistic supporters of strict gun control have no illusions about how much can reasonably be expected from the policies they advocate.

There is admittedly no air-tight way to deny criminals, the mentally ill, drug addicts, children and others who lack the basic credentials of responsible gun ownership access to firearms. But neither is there an air-tight way to keep unlicensed drivers and defective automobiles off the roads or to prevent excessive speeds. Yet who would deny the need for these regulations on the use of automobiles?

There are many other weapons available for criminal purposes (metal objects, wooden objects, even hands and fists). But the unique destructiveness of the gun is a fact of life, and several hundred percent more likely to be a fact of death than injuries inflicted in any other way.

Realistic advocates of strict gun control also understand that, because of variations in the economic and social conditions of different parts of the country, firearms laws do not have to be the same everywhere. But those who oppose strict gun control oppose it everywhere. They fail to recognize that no state has been spared the violent misuse of guns against its citizens, or is immune to the advancing forces of economic change and the many social complexities that follow. The firearms policies outlined above would permit variations among the various states—stricter controls in New York than New Mexico, or in Massachusetts than Mon-

tana. But mobility of people from one state to another makes minimum Federal standards necessary to protect the residents of all fifty.

Opponents of strict gun control place great emphasis on the rights of legitimate gun owners, invoking the Second Amendment of the Constitution to support their claim that gun ownership is a fundamental right of citizenship. Less attention is given the right of the public at large to protection against irresponsible possession of firearms. Responsible gun owners themselves need such protection, both on and off the hunting range. Besides, the "right to keep and bear arms" in the Second Amendment does not establish the constitutional right of an individual to acquire firearms. The history of the Amendment, as well as court interpretations down the years, support this view. Even if the Amendment did establish an individual right, such a right, as with any other right, is not absolute. The right to free speech does not convey the right mischievously to shout fire in a crowded theater. The right to religious freedom does not convey the right to practice polygamy, or to sacrifice a lamb in the town square. The sanctity of rights must be handled with great care. But it is compelling and constitutional for society to give appropriate weight to the needs of the overall public interest. These are reflected in the objectives of the Constitution summarized in its preamble: "to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

One of these liberties is freedom from violence and from the fear of violence, eloquently illuminated in a Presidential message to Congress on September 11, 1970:

"... there is no greater need in this free society than the restoration of the individual American's freedom from violence in his home and on the streets of his city or town. . . . The issue of crime is freedom. When individual citizens are the direct victims of violence, or the indirect victims when they are forced to restrict their own movements out of fear of violence, fundamental liberties are abridged. A government that fails to protect those liberties is not worthy of the name."

The government responsible for this eloquence has been less than responsible in its attention to the clear and present need for strict control over the acquisition and possession of the most destructive instruments of violence. By its own definition, the government has in this falling called into question its worthiness of the name.

It is ironic that those who advocate strict firearms policies seem more aware of the destructive potentialities of firearms—and the special credentials that ought to be required of those legally allowed to possess guns—than do the gun interests who oppose such proposals at every turn. One would have expected these interests to be aware of the danger of guns in irresponsible hands, and to take such pride in the skills and responsibilities of legitimate gun ownership, that they would not oppose—but in fact advocate—laws limiting legal gun ownership to those who possess carefully delineated qualities of skill, maturity and responsibility. Yet they block even the moderate proposals I have outlined—proposals which, contrary to the claims and suspicions of many who oppose them, carry no ulterior motives such as increasingly severe controls leading ultimately to confiscation.

There are other ironies in the "gun control" controversy.

It is ironic, for example, that many who oppose strict gun control emphasize the value of private gun ownership as a line of defense against possible tyranny. Yet, in their opposition to laws that would restrict legal gun ownership to responsible gun own-

ership, they tend to foment anarchy that is a breeding ground for the tyranny they fear.

They oppose the growth of Federal power, but in blocking efforts being made at state and local levels to serve the overall public interest, they in effect have invited Federal action to solve a growing national problem that now makes such action essential.

They stress the merits of gun safety in the home and in hunting, and the need for improved programs to promote it. Yet their commendable awareness of the danger of firearms in unskilled hands does not extend to the need for laws that encourage, indeed require, conscious as against casual attention to the duties and obligations of proper possession of guns, and that limit legal possession to those who possess certain basic credentials.

It is also ironic that those who are so concerned with the Second Amendment fall to appreciate that, without strict gun-control laws, the "unorganized militia" (the armed citizenry) in which they place such store would be, not the "well-regulated militia" highlighted in the Second Amendment, but a disorganized militia, a danger to its own safety and that of the nation.

The obstacle to effective firearms laws in the overall public interest is not just the myopia and obstructionism of those who oppose such policies. It is also the insufficient determination of the public at large to press for the changes most of them know are long overdue. The strong support for strict gun control shown in public opinion polls (even among gun owners) is not expressed in sustained political pressure. What will it take to get the general public to stick up for its rights (including the right to life itself) with the intensity so evident in the other side's dedication to what it sees as its rights?

Many who understand the problem are not waiting to be aroused by more national tragedies in the assassination class. They are already sufficiently aroused by the national tragedy they see in the escalating statistics of gun deaths, gun assaults and armed robbery, and in the violence and potentials of violence that plague the nation. Policies to deal effectively with these current and continuing desecrations of our country and its ideals may go far toward preventing the political assassinations that have come to punctuate this rising trend of violence with frightening frequency.

"It is in this way—with vigorous Federal leadership, with active enlistment of Governments at every level, with the aid of industry and private groups, and above all with the determined participation by individual citizens in every state and every community—that we at last will succeed in restoring the kind of environment we want for ourselves, and the kind the generations that come after deserve to inherit."

This is what the President told the Congress in his call for action against pollution. Nothing less is needed from the Administration to solve another environmental crisis of our time. But nothing approaching it is in the offing. The Administration is waiting. The Congress is waiting. America is waiting. The powder keg gets bigger, in an atmosphere itself combustible. And the fuse flickers on.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE OBSERVANCE

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as visitors to this great land come to Washington, the seat of our National Government, they are often heard to remark at length

about the freedoms which those of us who are Americans enjoy. We have, throughout our history as a Nation, enjoyed liberty and freedom and it is difficult for us to imagine how life would be were we to be deprived of those same privileges. For us, such thought is merely a mental exercise; however, for many millions of people it is a fact of life. Today, we are observing the 53d observance of the struggle of Ukrainians for independence and freedom. For those women and men who currently are living under the Communist domination of the Soviet Union, independence is something that others—relatives and friends—have died for, and freedom a long unanswered prayer. It is only fitting that we today recognize their struggle and that we impart to them—in spirit, at least—our hopes that they will soon be able to control their own destiny and to direct their own affairs.

It is wise that we remember the plight of the Ukrainian people, for it is too easy in this complicated world to forget the tragedies of the past and the continuing agonies of the present. But, past wrongs do not fade away—and in every American of Ukrainian descent, the hope survives that his fatherland will be restored again to the full status of a free and proud nation. For us, today, there is a signal relevance to such hope. For no matter how dark are stained the affairs of men, if we remember past injustice, and recommit ourselves to fighting that injustice, a truly "new world" will be inherited by future generations of Ukrainian—and of all men everywhere.

HOW THEY VOTED: CONGRESSMAN UDALL'S LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE OF DECEMBER 1970

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, last month I sent a questionnaire to all the residents of the Second Congressional District of Arizona. Approximately 32,000 of my Arizona neighbors responded, and I think my colleagues will find their views on some of the important issues facing the 92d Congress as interesting as I do. Before looking at the findings as a whole, I would like to comment on some of the highlights and take note of those responses which I think are most significant.

In conducting a survey of this kind I think it is important to realize that the people who mail in questionnaires are not necessarily representative of the total population. Obviously, they are people who take a more active interest in public affairs than some of those who do not respond. However, I believe that when as many as 32,000 persons in a constituency express their views overwhelmingly on a given question, that may be taken as a pretty good indication that a majority of the residents of that district hold the same view.

Where responses are tabulated by demographic groupings, the structure of the public opinion on a given question

becomes all the more clear. In this survey I found a number of real surprises which would not have been so evident if the results had not been tabulated in this way.

Among the more interesting results of the survey was the evidence of a shift in opinion toward early termination of the U.S. effort in Vietnam. Whereas past surveys have shown general support for the war, this survey found a majority—56 percent—favoring either immediate withdrawal—25 percent—or withdrawal on a fixed timetable with a deadline such as December 1971—31 percent.

I was also struck by the evidence of very substantial opinion favoring recognition of Red China. I could not have anticipated such a result, nor could I have anticipated that such a policy would be advocated by every demographic group in the survey—members of all parties, all ages, and so forth.

I was also impressed by the sizable opposition to continued funding of the proposed supersonic transport, SST. I found that fully 69 percent of my constituents responding to this questionnaire opposed further Federal funding for the aircraft. Only 26 percent favored the SST; 5 percent had no opinion.

Because I had room on the computer in tabulating the questionnaire responses to the Vietnam war question as a basis for tabulating all other responses. The result was most interesting. Generally, I found that "doves" and "hawks" agree on most other issues of the day.

Let me explain how I arrived at the grouping of "doves" and "hawks." On the Vietnam question, my constituents were asked which of four policies came closest to their own view. The precise language of these options is set forth in the tables below. Those who chose the first two options are classified as "doves." Those who chose the fourth option I classified as "hawks." I felt it would be unfair to classify those who chose option No. 3 in either group, and I excluded them from the "dove-hawk" grouping on the other eight questions in the survey.

Earlier this week I issued two press releases concerning the results of this survey, and without objection I will insert the text of those press releases and the detailed results of the questionnaire tabulation at this point in the RECORD:

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

WASHINGTON (Special).—A survey conducted by Rep. Morris K. Udall, D-Arizona, reveals substantial bi-partisan opposition to continued federal funding of the supersonic transport (SST), the congressman reported today.

The survey, sent last month to all residents in Arizona's 2nd Congressional District, showed that 69 per cent of Udall's constituents oppose further support for the controversial aircraft. Only 26 per cent favored the SST; 5 per cent had no opinion.

About 32,000 persons responded to the questionnaire. They included about 4,000 from Cochise County, 23,000 from Pima, 2,000 from Pinal, 500 from Santa Cruz and 2,500 from Yuma.

Opposition to the SST cut across party lines, with 76 per cent of the Democrats and 60 per cent of the Republicans opposing further federal funds for the aircraft. Existing appropriations expire in March, and a lively debate is expected when the 92nd Congress takes up the issue soon.

Udall, who voted against the SST last year, said he was pleased to have a "renewed mandate" to oppose the program.

The survey also indicated that residents of Southern Arizona are willing to help pay the bill for an improved environment. They were asked whether they would support strict standards on automobile exhaust emissions if that meant an increase of \$200 "in the price of your next car."

Eighty-six per cent of Udall's respondents voted in favor of tougher standards. There was no difference between Republicans and Democrats on the question.

In another environment-related question, 71 per cent of the respondents said they favor the proposed Environmental Protection Act. The measure, sponsored by Udall and other members of both parties, would permit citizens to seek court orders to stop practices that damage the environment without having to prove that they, themselves, were suffering specific economic loss.

On the great controversy of recent years, the Vietnam War, Udall noted a shift toward early termination of the U.S. effort there. Whereas past surveys have shown general support for the war, this survey found a majority (56 per cent) favoring either immediate withdrawal (25 per cent) or withdrawal on a fixed timetable (31 per cent) with a deadline such as December, 1971.

Twenty-four per cent favored gradual withdrawal of troops over as many years as are needed to "Vietnamize" the war, while 16 per cent chose sending more American troops to achieve a military solution.

One of the "real shockers" of the Survey, Udall said, was the response to a question on recognition of Red China. Fully 70 per cent of his respondents said they favor recognizing the Communist regime.

Udall said this represented a major shift in opinion of his constituents in the past decade. The question of recognition was approved by Democrats, Republicans, members of the American Independent party, those with no party affiliation, by all age groups, by men and women, by newcomers to Arizona as well as old-timers, and by residents of all five counties in the district.

The option which drew such massive support read as follows:

"Like it or not, the government in Peking is the government of 1/5 of the world's population. It is unwise not to recognize its existence and try through diplomatic and trade contacts to find ways of reconciling differences, as we are now doing with some 20 other Communist countries."

Udall said he takes the response as indication that public opinion in this country will give the President the freedom to pursue initiatives toward Red China when he deems it in the national interest. In the past 20 years, he said, the opposite has been true.

Another shift in public opinion was revealed in responses to a question Udall asked on the draft law. The congressman said he was surprised to find only 11 per cent of his constituents voting for continuation of the draft system as it operates today. Nineteen per cent voted to extend the draft while ending student deferments.

Two alternatives to the draft drew stronger support. Twenty-nine per cent voted for establishing a volunteer army, while 38 per cent said they prefer giving young men a choice: volunteering for two years of military service, taking their chances on the lottery, or volunteering for three years of civilian service in the Peace Corp, etc.

Udall took particular note of responses from constituents who are under 21 years of age—those most concerned with the draft. Of this group, 52 per cent chose the volunteer army, 36 per cent the choice of military or civilian service, 8 per cent the ending of student deferments, and 4 per cent the continuation of the existing system.

Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate will begin hearings soon on the

draft. The current draft law expires July 1.

On other issues Udall's constituents:

Favored, 60 to 33, attempts to rescue U.S. prisoners-of-war held in North Vietnam.

Approved, 75 to 21, amending the Constitution to abolish the Electoral College and elect the President by direct, popular vote.

Favored, by a margin of 64 to 33 per cent, a plan to abolish residency requirements in voting for President and Vice President. The plan would require the Census Bureau to make door-to-door canvasses every four years to ensure that every eligible citizen has an opportunity to register and vote.

SPECIAL ANALYSIS WITH QUESTIONNAIRE

WASHINGTON (Special).—How deep are the divisions among Americans? How polarized is our society? To what extent do people who disagree on Vietnam disagree on other issues of the day?

Answers to those questions were hinted at in a special analysis made by Rep. Morris K. Udall, D-Arizona, of constituent replies to his annual legislative questionnaire. Results of that survey, reflecting the views of about 32,000 Southern Arizonans, were released today.

As usual, Udall had answers to the nine questions on his "opinion ballot" tabulated by age, sex, political affiliation and other factors. But, because he had "room on the computer," Udall also had answers to eight of the nine questions tabulated to show how Vietnam "doves" and "hawks" looked on other controversies of the day.

"Overall," Udall said today, "I found very little evidence of the polarization that many people would have us believe exists. And there were a few real surprises."

For example, he found that both "doves" and "hawks" agree that the United States should recognize the government of Red China.

For another, both "doves" and "hawks" oppose continued federal funding for the supersonic transport (SST).

To make his special analysis Udall first tabulated responses to a question on Vietnam policy. His constituents were asked which of these policies come closest to their own views:

1. Withdraw all troops from Vietnam immediately.
2. Fix a deadline for withdrawing all troops—say December, 1971—and stick to it.
3. Withdraw troops but take as many years as are needed to turn the war over to the South Vietnamese.
4. Send more troops to Vietnam and step up the fighting, invade North Vietnam or take whatever steps are necessary to achieve a military solution.

Overall, 25 per cent approved of the first option; 31 per cent the second; 24 per cent the third; and 16 per cent the fourth.

For purpose of his analysis Udall grouped the respondents who chose No. 1 or 2 as "doves", and those who chose No. 4 as "hawks." He concluded it would be unfair to characterize those who chose No. 3 with either label.

Eighty per cent of the "doves" and 53 per cent of the "hawks" gave their approval to recognition of Red China.

Similarly, majorities of both groups agreed on three questions relating to the environment. These included:

—The supersonic transport (SST). Eighty-three per cent of the "doves" and 54 per cent of the "hawks" voted to cut off further funding for development of the airplane.

Environmental Protection Act. This proposal, of which Udall is chief House sponsor, would allow citizens to seek court orders to halt acts of pollution without having to prove specific economic damage. The plan drew support of 83 per cent of the "doves" and 53 per cent of the "hawks".

Automobile pollution. Ninety per cent of the "doves" and 78 percent of the "hawks" voted for tougher air pollution standards

even if this meant an increase of \$200 in the price of automobiles. There was general agreement, too, on the question of what Congress should do to replace the current Selective Service law, which expires June 30. Udall asked his constituents to choose one of four options:

1. Extend the draft law pretty much as it is.
2. Extend the draft but end student deferments.
3. End the draft and establish a voluntary army.
4. Keep the draft but require young men to choose one of the following: (a) volunteer for two years of military service, (b) take chances with the draft lottery, or (c) volunteer for three years of service in a police force, VISTA, the Peace Corps, etc.

The proposal to extend the draft law as it stands fared worst among "doves" and "hawks" alike. Only 9 per cent of the "doves" and 16 per cent of the "hawks" chose this option.

Surprisingly, both groups also agreed on the option they most prefer. Forty per cent of the "doves" and 32 per cent of the "hawks" chose the plan which would give young men a choice between military and civilian service.

The other two options drew differing support. "Doves" preferred the volunteer army to a modified draft system, 36-13 per cent. "Hawks" took the opposite view, preferring the modified draft to a volunteer army, 31-19 per cent.

On other issues "hawks" and "doves":

Split on the advisability of attempting more prisoner-of-war rescue missions. Eighty-eight per cent of the "hawks" approved of such missions compared to 49 per cent of the "doves." Of those "doves" favoring immediate withdrawal such missions received only 32 per cent approval.

Agreed that the Electoral College should be abolished and that the President should be elected by direct, popular vote. Eighty-five per cent of the "doves" and 57 per cent of the "hawks" voted for the change.

Agreed that residency requirements be abolished in voting for President and Vice President, and that the Census Bureau should make door-to-door canvasses to get people registered. The plan won support of 69 per cent of the "doves" and 63 per cent of the "hawks."

A. VIETNAM WAR

Americans continue to be divided about the right course for us to take in Vietnam and Indochina. Which of the following policies comes closest to your own view?

1. Withdraw all troops from Vietnam immediately.
2. Fix a deadline for withdrawing all troops—say December, 1971—and stick to it.
3. Withdraw troops but take as many years as are needed to turn the war over to the South Vietnamese.
4. Send more troops to Vietnam and step up the fighting, invade North Vietnam or take whatever steps are necessary to achieve a military solution.

[In percent]

	1	2	3	4	opinion	No
Male.....	25	31	26	16		2
Female.....	25	33	22	16		4
Under 21.....	40	32	16	12		0
21 to 29.....	22	34	24	19		1
30 to 39.....	28	25	24	18		4
40 to 49.....	25	39	20	15		2
50 and up.....	25	30	26	14		3
Democrat.....	31	36	16	13		3
Republican.....	13	29	37	18		3
American Independent.....	34	19	17	28		2
Other.....	40	35	7	16		2
Overall.....	25	31	24	16		3

B. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT

Under existing law it is difficult for ordinary citizens to play an active role to protect their environment. For example, to get an air pollution case into our court citizens usually must show that they have suffered *specific economic damage*—often impossible to do. The proposed Environmental Protection Act would change this, permitting citizens to seek court orders to stop polluting activities without having to prove economic loss. Proponents see this as a way to get prompt action against serious threats to the environment. Opponents contend it would permit harassment of industry and immobilize our courts with too many cases. Would you generally (1) favor or (2) oppose legislation of this kind?

[In percent]

	1	2	No opinion
Male	71	73	5
Female	24	19	7
Under 21	72	16	12
21 to 29	75	21	4
30 to 39	71	25	3
40 to 49	80	15	5
50 and up	67	25	9
Democrat	77	17	6
Republican	65	29	6
American Independent	66	30	4
Other	84	16	0
"Dove"	83	12	5
"Hawk"	56	37	8
Overall	71	22	7

C. AIR POLLUTION STANDARDS

Most scientists agree that the worst contributor to air pollution is the automobile. Suppose we could reduce this pollution drastically by imposing new standards on automobiles—but that this would mean an increase of \$200 in the price of your next car. Would you (1) favor or (2) oppose a law to set such standards?

[In percent]

	1	2	No opinion
Male	87	11	3
Female	87	11	2
Under 21	76	20	4
21 to 29	92	7	1
30 to 39	91	8	2
40 to 49	94	5	1
50 and up	80	16	4
Democrat	87	10	3
Republican	87	11	2
American Independent	85	11	4
Other	93	7	0
"Dove"	90	8	2
"Hawk"	78	20	1
Overall	86	11	2

D. UNIVERSAL VOTER ENROLLMENT

In national elections only about 60% of U.S. adults vote, compared to 80-85% in other free countries. Our poor performance comes, in part, from restrictive voter registration laws. A proposal before Congress would abolish residency requirements in voting for President and Vice President, and would require the Census Bureau to make door-to-door canvasses every four years to ensure that every eligible citizen has an opportunity to register. Would you (1) favor or (2) oppose such a system of universal voter enrollment?

[In percent]

	1	2	No opinion
Male	63	34	3
Female	63	32	5
Under 21	64	28	8
21 to 29	76	22	2
30 to 39	61	37	3

	1	2	No opinion
40 to 49	62	35	3
50 and up	59	37	5
Democrat	68	29	4
Republican	57	41	2
American Independent	77	21	2
Other	79	21	0
"Dove"	69	27	5
"Hawk"	63	36	1
Overall	64	33	4

E. POLICY TOWARD CHINA

A recent vote in the United Nations indicates that Communist China may get the votes to be admitted as a member next year. This raises anew the question of U.S. recognition of the Peking government. Which of the following statements comes closest to your view?

1. The government of Peking is not the legal government of China. It is Communist. It aids our enemies. We should not recognize it or have any trade or contact with it until it changes its ways.

2. Like it or not, the government in Peking is the government of one-fifth of the world's population. It is unwise not to recognize its existence and try through diplomatic and trade contacts to find ways of reconciling differences, as we are now doing with some 20 other Communist countries.

[In percent]

	1	2	No opinion
Male	23	73	4
Female	26	67	7
Under 21	32	64	4
21 to 29	27	70	5
30 to 39	26	69	4
40 to 49	23	73	4
50 and up	22	71	7
Democrat	19	75	5
Republican	30	66	4
American Independent	30	66	4
Other	16	79	5
"Dove"	16	80	4
"Hawk"	43	53	4
Overall	24	70	6

F. SELECTIVE SERVICE

The Selective Service law expires next year, and Congress will have to act. Several proposals have been made. Which of the following would you tend to favor?

1. Extend the draft law pretty much as it is.

2. Extend the draft but end student deferments.

3. End the draft and establish a volunteer army.

4. Keep the draft but require every young man to choose one of the following: a) volunteer for 2 years of military service, b) take chances with the draft lottery, or c) volunteer for 3 years of civilian service in a police force, VISTA, the Peace Corps, etc.

[In percent]

	1	2	3	4	No opinion
Male	12	20	31	35	2
Female	11	17	26	41	5
Under 21	4	8	52	36	0
21 to 29	6	11	27	53	2
30 to 39	15	14	33	36	2
40 to 49	9	15	33	42	1
50 and up	13	26	26	30	5
Democrat	11	19	29	37	4
Republican	13	19	25	41	2
American Independent	4	15	36	40	4
Other	5	16	37	37	5
"Dove"	9	13	36	40	2
"Hawk"	16	31	19	32	1
Overall	11	19	29	38	3

G. SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

The Supersonic Transport (SST) will require \$1 billion or more of government sub-

sidy in order to be built. Supporters argue that the SST is needed to continue U.S. leadership in aviation, that it would help our balance of payments in world trade, and would create thousands of American jobs. Foes say this money could better be spent for pressing domestic needs and raise questions about pollution of the upper atmosphere and sonic booms. Do you (1) favor or (2) oppose continued Federal funding for the SST?

[In percent]

	1	2	No opinion
Male	29	67	3
Female	23	72	5
Under 21	40	56	4
21 to 29	20	74	6
30 to 39	27	71	3
40 to 49	27	69	4
50 and up	29	68	3
Democrat	20	76	4
Republican	36	60	3
American Independent	15	77	9
Other	23	77	0
"Dove"	84	13	3
"Hawk"	44	54	2
Overall	26	69	4

H. PRISONER RESCUE MISSIONS

Recently the United States sent a commando-type force far into North Vietnam in an unsuccessful attempt to rescue some U.S. prisoners of war. Critics said this might endanger the lives of Americans held prisoner there, but supporters said this shows concern for the prisoners and that we "mean business" in Vietnam. The Administration has indicated it might try such raids again. Would you (1) favor or (2) oppose further operations of this kind?

[In percent]

	1	2	No opinion
Male	62	33	5
Female	59	33	8
Under 21	64	28	8
21 to 29	66	29	5
30 to 39	75	22	3
40 to 49	56	40	5
50 and up	55	37	8
Democrat	50	42	8
Republican	75	20	4
American Independent	66	28	6
Other	51	49	0
"Dove"	43	51	6
"Hawk"	88	8	4
Overall	60	33	6

I. DIRECT ELECTION OF PRESIDENT

Congress will be asked again next year to abolish the Electoral College in order to elect the President by direct, popular vote. Some argue that Arizona and other small states would thus lose some of the extra weight they now have in national elections. Those who want to abolish the Electoral College claim that the present system could result in the election of a candidate who lost the popular vote; also, that a third-party candidate could bring about a deadlock. Do you (1) favor or (2) oppose amending the Constitution to abolish the Electoral College and elect the President by direct, popular vote?

[In percent]

	1	2	No opinion
Male	75	21	4
Female	75	21	4
Under 21	84	16	0
21 to 29	80	16	4
30 to 39	75	21	4
40 to 49	77	19	4
50 and up	71	25	4
Democrat	79	18	3
Republican	68	27	5
American Independent	83	15	2
Other	86	9	5
"Dove"	86	11	3
"Hawk"	57	37	6
Overall	75	21	4

ON SAVING SAN FRANCISCO BAY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in today's RECORD a recent editorial from the San Jose Mercury emphasizing the importance of the proposed San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge—H.R. 111—to the preservation of San Francisco Bay, one of the great natural resources of this Nation. There are few cities in the world that rival San Francisco in charm and beauty. The climate and geography of the surrounding area, from Marin County on the north to southern Santa Clara County, make it one of the most desirable places in the world in which to live. The bay itself, because of its esthetic beauty, its potential for recreation, and its effect on the climate of the area, must be preserved. It is now severely threatened by industrial and municipal wastes, oil spills and excessive landfills which have reduced its surface area by one-third during the past century. There is no indication that this process of spoilage has been halted or reversed, although many environmental organizations and agencies are working on the complex and, no doubt, expensive solutions to the problems. Pollution-free solid waste disposal facilities must be built. Industrial polluters must be controlled with appropriate laws backed up by rigorous enforcement. The wildlife refuge bill is an essential part of the third problem area—the problem of preventing further landfills. It is true that the refuge has great potential as a recreation area. It is true that it will save a number of species of endangered birds and wildlife. It will also provide access to the bay for the several million people who live within an hour's drive of the proposed refuge site. But more important, I believe, than any of these other important considerations is the prevention of further landfills which, if allowed to continue as before, will radically alter the climate of the area and perhaps make it as unhealthy a place to live as our unfortunate neighbor to the south, Los Angeles.

We Members of the House, and particularly those of us from California, have it within our power to determine whether San Francisco will remain a queen jewel among cities, set in an emerald bay, or whether the entire bay area will become a cancerous urban sprawl encircling a shrinking cesspool. I urge my colleagues, therefore, not to look upon this refuge bill as a matter of narrow local concern, but as part of a national effort to save a great natural resource. With that, I would like to present the Mercury editorial.

[From the San Jose Mercury, Jan. 25, 1971]
BAY WILDLIFE REFUGE BADLY NEEDED

Seven Northern California Representatives, including San Jose Democrat Don Edwards and Gilroy Republican Charles S. Gubser, have reintroduced the San Francisco Bay wildlife refuge bill.

It is greatly to be hoped that hearings will be scheduled early in the 92nd Con-

gress on this particular piece of legislation, which would establish a permanent wildlife refuge on 21,000 acres of marshes, tidal flats and sloughs in Santa Clara, Alameda and San Mateo counties.

Development of the bay, particularly filling it for industrial and commercial use, has endangered a number of species of migratory birds by eliminating their feeding grounds. San Francisco Bay is an integral part of the bird world's northwest flyway.

Preservation of the bay is in the interest of man as well as bird, and Congress should establish the San Francisco Bay wildlife refuge as quickly as possible.

SOCIAL SECURITY DILEMMA FACING OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the dilemma of social security facing the growing segment of our population 65 and over is a problem that must be faced by this Congress and faced now.

The following letter from Mr. R. E. Knipe, of Cheyenne, Wyo., gives you some indication of the basic inequities in medicare payments today and attacks head on the fiction of setting a basic for additional medical coverage at a given time.

The only cost that counts on a fixed base income is the present cost of medical service. Any other rule is really a sham.

CASPER, WYO., January 14, 1970.

Congressman TENO RONCALIO,
Cheyenne, Wyo.

DEAR SIR: I would like to call your attention to a couple of instances in regard to our Social Security.

As you know, the Social Security Administration is charged, by Congress, to pay Medicare claims based on "reasonable charges" for a particular area. The Jan. 1971 News Bulletin of the American Assoc. of Retired Persons, (membership quite a number of millions of people) states, and I quote: "Medicare is supposed to pay 80% of 'reasonable charges'. Six months ago, a Social Security Administration decision, never publicly announced, limited Medicare payments to the 1968 'reasonable charge' level, ignoring rising costs of doctor fees". End of quote.

The bulletin gave two instances of the lowered payments. They figured to about 60% of the actual costs. The excuse was that there is, pending in Congress, a bill to change the payment basis, probably to lower them, and that therefore the 1968 basis should be used for now.

You know yourself that the phrase, "reasonable charges" in regard to medical costs is just a cruel travesty of words. The retired person, with the drastically declining purchasing power of a fixed income, has to pay the present costs. Medicare was supposed to be his life saver and many company medical insurance plans, like mine with Marathon Oil, which were good for life, were terminated with retirement on the theory that Medicare would be sufficient. Now, if a completely fictitious basis, such as 1968, or next time 1948, or 19xx, can be used, a retired person has no other choice than to go into the insurance market and buy additional medical coverage, on a single person, (not group) basis for himself and his wife. He cannot stand 40% of today's medical costs. Surely this prospect cannot be hidden

in a pending bill—if it is please seek it out and kill it.

In the pending health bill, which the Senate did not consider, there is an item concerning catastrophic health insurance for people under 65. I have not seen the bill; I am quoting only from the newspapers, but they gave the provision as being limited to those under 65. This measure is supposed to safeguard against a prolonged illness—a cost that no insurance will pay. But those over 65 have no such safeguard; medicare lasts for 90 days only (with 60 more emergency days spread over a life time); and this has always been one of its failings. Surely Congress would not exclude from this coverage, the group that needs it the most. I cannot believe that this is the case but nevertheless this is what the papers carried. And it just might happen that things could wind up with the over-65 group the only one with no safeguard against such costs. Would you please consider this angle and please see that this does not happen?

Yours very truly,

R. E. KNIPE.

FIFTY-FIVE HOUSE MEMBERS URGE 15-PERCENT INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of last session's major items of unfinished business was the passage of the 1970 Social Security amendments, H.R. 17550. Our failure to enact this legislation was a serious disappointment to America's 26 million social security recipients who have been particularly hard hit by a rampant inflation.

The rise in the cost of living during 1970 has already eaten away the 5-percent increase in benefits that H.R. 17550 would have provided. And even before the consumer price index began to rise so sharply, millions of elderly recipients were living in poverty. The Senate Select Committee reports that the incidence of poverty is rising steadily among older people. Today, one out of every four Americans 65 and over must live on a poverty level income, according to the Senate Committee.

Fifty-five of us in the House have agreed that a 15-percent increase in social security benefits is warranted in view of the severe financial pressures confronting older Americans. We have also endorsed special increases in monthly minimum benefits and the annual earnings limitation.

Below is a copy of a letter to Ways and Means Chairman WILBUR MILLS which outlines our views:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., January 26, 1971.

Hon. WILBUR MILLS,
Chairman House Ways and Means Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are pleased to note that your committee intends to act on a social security increase early in the session.

A significant increase in benefits is essential to the well being of America's 26 million social security recipients who were particularly hard hit by the rapid rise in the cost of living during 1970.

Now that the rising cost of living has surpassed the 5% increase in benefits provided in the 1970 Social Security Amendments, H.R. 17550, we feel that major improvements must be made in the 1971 bill.

More specifically, we urge adoption of the

1. A 15% across-the-board increase in benefits retroactive to January 1, 1971.

2. An increase in monthly minimum benefits from \$64 to \$100.

3. An increase in the annual earnings limitation of \$2400.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

James Abourezk, Brock Adams, Joseph P. Addabbo, Glenn M. Anderson, Les Aspin, Herman Badillo;

Bob Bergland, Jonathan B. Bingham, John Brademas, Frank J. Brasco, Phillip Burton, Charles J. Carney;

Shirley Chisholm, William Clay, John Conyers, Jr., Jorge L. Córdova, Dominick V. Daniels, John G. Dow;

Robert F. Drinan, Joshua Eilberg, William D. Ford, Donald M. Fraser, James G. Fulton, Ella T. Grasso;

Michael Harrington, William D. Hathaway, Ken Hechler, Henry Helstoski, James J. Howard, Robert L. Leggett, Mike McCormack;

Ray J. Madden, Spark Matsunaga, Abner J. Mikva, Joseph G. Minish, Patsy T. Mink, Parren J. Mitchell;

John E. Moss, Lucien N. Nedzi, David R. Obey, Bertram L. Podell, Roman C. Pucinski, Charles B. Rangel, Thomas M. Rees;

Henry S. Reuss, Benjamin S. Roenthal, Edward R. Roybal, William F. Ryan, Fernand J. St Germain, James H. Scheuer;

John F. Seiberling, Robert O. Tiernan, Jerome R. Waldie, Lester L. Wolff, and Gus Yatron.

FORT DETRICK—A NATIONAL ASSET

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, in November 1969 President Nixon announced the end of offensive biological warfare research. The facilities at Fort Detrick, Md. which were involved in the offensive biological warfare function are now available for other, peaceful uses. These facilities at Fort Detrick and the men who man them are unique and should be considered a national asset to be employed for the benefit of all Americans. The following article from Science magazine gives an excellent description of Fort Detrick's physical and manpower assets and outlines the problems of conversion:

FORT DETRICK: A TOP LABORATORY IS THREATENED WITH EXTINCTION

Fort Detrick, a biological warfare center which is probably the nation's largest and most sophisticated facility for research in microbiology and acrobiology, is headed for mothballs and can be taken over for a song. Yet no one seems to want it—at least not badly enough to pay the cost of operating the mammoth complex in Frederick, Md., some 50 miles northwest of Washington, D.C.

Detrick has been nervously awaiting its death sentence ever since President Nixon announced, on 25 November 1969, a total renunciation of offensive biological warfare.

The Army subsequently declared Detrick "surplus" and a number of high-level scientific committees and government officials have trooped through the place seeking to determine whether the military laboratories might be converted to civilian work.

CIVILIAN USE RECOMMENDED

Several agencies, notably the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Agriculture, and the old Environmental Health Service (which has since been transferred to the new Environmental Protection Agency), indicated last year that they could, indeed, make good use of parts of the Detrick complex. What's more, two expert scientific committees that studied Detrick—a panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee and a group put together by the National Academy of Sciences—unequivocally concluded, according to Detrick and congressional sources, that the facilities are so valuable that they should be saved and put to use. Yet, in the 14 months since Nixon's announcement, all efforts to find the \$15 million or so in annual operating costs needed to keep Detrick going seem to have failed.

Last fall the Army publicly stated that it planned to cut the number of civilian employees at Detrick to a minimal level of 240 personnel by 30 June 1971, thus essentially closing down the biological research facilities. Detrick could still be saved by a last-minute infusion of funds from any number of sources—the White House, the Office of Management and Budget, the Congress, or even the Defense Department itself. But Detrick's supporters on Capitol Hill acknowledge that the installation's fortunes are "at a low ebb" and that the prognosis is not particularly favorable.

Meanwhile, the staff and facilities are shriveling away. The number of degree-holding scientists and engineers has dropped by roughly 25 percent, from about 400 to about 300, since Nixon's announcement 14 months ago, while the total number of civilian employees has dropped by 33 percent, from about 1600 to about 1050. (There are also about 160 military personnel at the laboratories, a number which has not changed greatly over the past year.) With the exodus of personnel, 63 of Detrick's buildings have been vacated, including 21 laboratory buildings which have been decontaminated to render them safe for occupancy by another tenant. Ironically, two brand new facilities—a \$1.6-million microbiology wing and a \$2.2-million animal holding laboratory—could end up being abandoned shortly after completion.

In the eyes of some scientists who know Detrick well, mothballing the facility would amount to a blunder of tragic proportions. J. Roger Porter, chairman of microbiology at the University of Iowa College of Medicine and chairman of the Academy team which looked into Detrick, considers the facilities "one of a kind in the world." Porter told Science that Detrick is a "national asset" which could easily be converted to civilian work and he expressed "disappointment" that Detrick seems to be withering away because of "interagency squabbling" over who is willing to pick up the tab for operating the place. "The whole damn bureaucratic system is so bogged down that it's producing a sad situation for science and for everyone else," he complained. Similarly, another prominent scientist who has looked closely at Detrick called it "very shortsighted" to let the place close down for lack of a few million dollars in annual operating funds. "If Detrick is mothballed or dismantled it will probably be a long time before that kind of capital investment is made again," he warned. "In a number of fields, facilities such as those at Detrick will be required before important progress can be made."

Riley Housewright, former scientific director at Detrick and former president of the

American Society for Microbiology, is even more emphatic in his denunciation of the fate that seems to be befalling Detrick. He says it would be "a blunder—a terrible mistake—to let all those facilities just rust because no one has had the forethought to plan for conversion." Housewright is rather bitter that the pressures to abandon biological warfare became so great that the Administration was "more interested in seeing Detrick closed than in making any constructive move to determine what else it could be used for." As a result of discouragement over the nation's repudiation of the kind of work he had performed at Detrick for 26 years as well as discouragement over his inability to line up any substantial amount of civilian work for Detrick, Housewright resigned his position last summer to take a job as vice-president and scientific director of Microbiological Associates, Inc., a private firm in Bethesda, Md. "I didn't care to preside over the demise of the place," he explained.

WHAT DETRICK HAS

What has Detrick got that makes some scientists wax so enthusiastic over its potentials for civilian use? The answer is that it has some facilities which appear to be unique, at least in terms of scale, and others which are certainly scarce. It also has a competent research staff, which has pioneered in the science of aerobiology, developed a number of vaccines and toxoids, as well as lethal germ weapons, and published some 1400 or 1500 papers in the open literature since 1946. However, most scientists who proclaim Detrick's possibilities think primarily of the extraordinary facilities and only secondarily of the personnel.

Detrick occupies some 1230 acres of federally owned land, about half of which is used for buildings and half of which is open land currently leased to local farmers. The post contains some 460 structures, with a total area of 2.2 million square feet, ranging from sophisticated laboratories to decaying housing to a bowling alley. The replacement value of the land, buildings, and equipment was estimated at \$190 million on 30 June 1970.

The part of the installation which is in danger of being mothballed is that which has been exclusively concerned with biological warfare. The post also has several smaller tenants—an Army medical research institute devoted to infectious diseases, an Army reserve armory, and a Signal Corps communications center—that will apparently not be affected by whatever happens to the main part of Detrick.

The installation's most striking facilities include the following:

The most sophisticated containment facilities for handling infectious materials that Housewright has ever seen or heard of. Many Detrick laboratories are a maze of barriers designed to permit men, animals, equipment, air, liquids, and solid wastes to move in and out without permitting the passage of microorganisms. The buildings are subdivided into areas of different degrees of contamination; the movement of air is always from less contaminated to more contaminated areas; and there are ultraviolet air locks, change rooms, and disinfectant showers separating the various zones. Detrick makes wide use of the so-called "Class III" safety cabinets—gas-tight enclosures which have rubber gloves attached and a system of pass boxes and autoclaves (superheated steam devices) designed to contain hazardous materials completely. All effluents—liquid, air, and solid—are heat or steam sterilized, and local lore has it that a post commander once offered to drink Detrick's sewage to prove to skeptical reporters that, while it might taste bad, it was perfectly safe to ingest. Detrick's safety features are considered so advanced that a two-volume book of design criteria developed at Detrick

has been used as a model for building such other high-hazard facilities at the Lunar Receiving Laboratory in Houston, the National Cancer Institute's Emergency Virus Isolation Facility, and the Department of Agriculture's National Animal Disease Laboratory, among others.

A 1-million-liter gas-tight sphere which an official Army publication claims is "unique in the free world." The sphere is the largest in a series of chambers at Detrick that have been used for studying what happens to aerosols of pathogenic microorganisms under varying conditions of humidity, temperature, and pollution. Animals can be exposed to controlled aerosols in many of these chambers and then held for subsequent observation and testing. One laboratory has a mirror which follows the sun and directs its light into an aerosol chamber so as to observe the effect of sunlight on airborne organisms. Detrick scientists believe the various spheres could be used to study the transmission of respiratory diseases or the behavior of air pollutants.

Pilot plants which can produce bacteria, viruses, and tissue cultures on a scale which "very few places, if any, can match" in Housewright's opinion. Housewright notes that work on several viruses implicated in cancer has been seriously slowed by lack of a large supply of the viruses. "People doing the work have had to stop and grow them," he says.

Extensive animal facilities. In addition to the new \$2.2-million holding laboratory, which is designed to house animals that must be observed for months or even years, Detrick has an animal farm which can produce annually some 900,000 mice, 50,000 guinea pigs, and 2500 rabbits and can at the same time condition some 4000 monkeys. There is also a large "corral" area for holding larger animals such as horses, cattle, and sheep.

ROADBLOCKS TO CONVERSION

If Detrick is such a red-hot facility, what's been blocking its conversion to civilian uses? The chief problem, it seems, is money. Pentagon officials say the Department of Agriculture has agreed to take over a tiny part of the complex devoted to plant studies. And the National Institutes of Health has said it would like to perform a small amount of research at Detrick. But apparently no agency wants to divert from its existing budget the \$15 million or more needed to keep Detrick functioning at a reasonable level. And neither the Office of Management and Budget nor the Congress has thus far been willing to provide special funds to any agency to take over Detrick. Last year the Senate passed an amendment, sponsored by Maryland senators, that would have given the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (the parent agency of NIH) \$15 million to operate the facility in fiscal 1971, but the amendment was killed in a budget-paring House-Senate conference.

Other problems which are said to be blocking the conversion of Detrick include Detrick's inconvenient distance from metropolitan Washington; the reluctance of some civilian scientists to be associated with a place that once engaged in the "dirty" business of biological warfare; and the fear by some agencies that Detrick, once taken on, would become an albatross that could not easily be dropped should budgets get even tighter in the future.

DETRICK TOO EXQUISITE?

Another key problem—cited by officials at NIH, the agency which has generally been regarded as most likely to find use for Detrick—is that "Detrick may be more than we need—it may be just a little too exquisite." Leon Jacobs, assistant director for collaborative research at NIH, said NIH probably "couldn't use" the 1-million-liter aerobiology sphere effectively in the study of airborne infections, though some of the

smaller chambers might serve admirably. Moreover, contrary to some opinions expressed, Jacobs said Detrick is "not the hottest facility in the world. It needs a lot of repair work. Just because it's there doesn't mean it couldn't be improved upon considerably if you started from scratch." Jacobs also said that while some of Detrick's personnel might fit into any program NIH mounts there, he did not contemplate that NIH would want to take over the entire Detrick staff.

Still, the Detrick facilities could obviously be of unique value. NIH, in fact, has concluded that several high priority studies could be performed as well or better at Detrick than anywhere else, and the agency would consequently be willing to fund these studies out of its own budget. The studies would include research on extremely hazardous viruses, such as the Machupo, Marburg, and Lassa viruses; research on certain "slow" viruses which may cause chronic disease in man but which can only be studied if there are facilities for long-term holding of experimental animals; and various studies that would benefit from Detrick's large-scale pilot plant production of bacteria, viruses, and tissue cultures. Robert Marston, director of NIH, told *Science* this work would probably cost only \$2 to \$3 million a year—not enough to provide a "critical mass" at Detrick. Marston also said that if NIH were given additional funds and a particular justification, beyond the scientific opportunities presented, for using Detrick (such as the desire to make Detrick a "model" of conversion), then NIH could do additional "useful work" there.

A number of separate forces are still struggling to save Detrick. Maryland's two Republican senators—Charles McC. Mathias and J. Glenn Beall—were recently joined by Democratic Senator Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine, in advocating conversion; a group of young microbiologists at Detrick has formed a committee to lobby for conversion; and some labor union officials have recently been exploring the possibility of locating a new occupational health institute at Detrick. The Defense Department is also considering several plans to keep certain unclassified research at Detrick so as to avoid shutting the place down completely. Several knowledgeable officials doubt that there will be any special money allocated for the conversion of Detrick in the fiscal 1972 budget that President Nixon will soon make public. But the question of an allocation for Detrick will definitely be considered by Congress during appropriations hearings on that budget later this year.

The ultimate fate of the installation thus remains to be determined. But the Detrick case has already made one thing painfully clear: conversion from war to peace is difficult to accomplish—even when one is dealing with a scientific facility that could redirect its programs almost overnight.

—PHILIP M. BOFFEY.

LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY, 91ST CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to present a brief summary of the major legislation passed by the 91st Congress, which I feel will be of interest to my constituents in the 27th Congressional District of California:

LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY, 91ST CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

H.R. 18546 (PL 91-524), the Agriculture Act of 1970: imposes for the first time a ceiling (\$85,000) on the amount of subsidy payable to any producer, for any crop, for any year; continues certain farm subsidy programs and milk marketing quotas.

H.R. 4249, (PL 91-285), Voting Rights Act of 1965 Amendments: continues 1965 Act's provisions relating to Federal intervention to register voters in certain States; lowered the voting age to 18 for Federal, State, and local elections (Supreme Court sustained lowering only for Federal elections); banned, nationwide, all literacy tests as a requirement for voting; established uniform, minimum residence requirements for voting in presidential elections.

S. 2163, (PL 91-405), Not-Voting Delegate in the House for the District of Columbia: Provides, for the first time in nearly a century, representation in the House of Representatives for the residents of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 514, (PL 91-230), Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments: continues basic Federal-aid programs for public schools, for adult education, and for bilingual education programs and authorizes over a three-year period approximately \$24.8 billion for these and other programs.

H.R. 14252, (PL 91-527), Drug Abuse Education Act: authorizes over a three-year period \$29 million for grants to local educational agencies, and other organizations, for development of programs to disseminate information about the dangers of drug abuse; authorizes another \$29 million for community education projects.

S. 3318, (PL 91-600), Library Services and Construction Amendments: extends for five years programs which enable communities to construct libraries and offer services to their residents: the programs funded by this Act have benefited approximately 85 million people to date.

H.R. 17255, (PL 91-604), Clean Air Act Amendments: authorizes \$1.1 billion in Federal aid over three years to assist States in developing air pollution control programs; requires State and local programs to comply with national air pollution standards; provides that by no later than January 1976 automobile manufacturers must develop a minimally polluting automobile.

H.R. 4148, (PL 91-224), Water Quality Improvement Act: establishes legal requirements for cleaning up polluted waterways; provides that owners of vessels guilty of oil discharge may be held liable for costs of cleaning up spillage if negligence can be proven; establishes Office of Environmental Quality and authorizes \$348 million through fiscal 1972 for costs connected with programs it undertakes.

H.R. 18260, (PL 91-516), Environmental Quality Education Act: authorizes \$45 million through fiscal 1973 for development of new programs for environmental education.

H.R. 11833, (PL 91-512), Resource Recovery Act: authorizes a three-year, \$462.75 million extension of Federal Solid Waste Disposal programs and promotes development of programs to recycle and recover materials and energy from solid waste.

S. 3598, (PL 91-343), Public Land Utilization Programs: to authorize Federal assistance for executing, as well as planning fish and wildlife or recreational programs to ensure that American communities will have access to such areas.

H.R. 15770, (PL 91-559), Water Bank Act: to ensure protection of wetlands used by migratory birds for nesting and breeding.

S. 1076, (PL 91-378), Youth Conservation Corps: establishes a pilot three-year program to employ 3,000 youths in summer jobs connected with conservation work.

H. Con. Res. 454, Vietnam Prisoners of

War: calls upon North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front (Vietcong) to treat American prisoners of war humanely, in compliance with the Geneva Convention, and urges them to consider releasing American POWs.

H.R. 17070, (PL 91-375), Postal Reorganization and Salary Adjustment Act: establishes the U.S. Postal Service as an independent agency in the Federal Government, to be governed by an 11-member board, nine appointed by the President who then select the Postmaster General and, with him, a Deputy Postmaster General; the board to have authority over postage rates, rates of pay, and services provided by the Postal Service; collective bargaining authorized, 8-percent pay raise provided.

H.R. 17654, (PL 91-510), Legislative Reorganization Act: revises committee and floor procedures in both Houses of Congress; requires additional fiscal and budgetary information to be supplied to the Congress; expands information resources and services for the Congress.

H.R. 11102, (PL 91-296), Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Act Amendments: to authorize \$2.79 billion in grants over the next three years for construction and modernization of hospitals and other health facilities.

S. 2264 (PL 91-464), Communicable Disease Control and Vaccination Assistance Amendments of 1970: to continue programs which assist State and local governments in eliminating diseases controllable by vaccination and to control other communicable diseases such as VD.

S. 3835 (PL 91-616), Comprehensive Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act: to provide grants which will assist States and communities in developing programs for dealing with alcoholism.

S. 4106 (PL 91-623), Emergency Health Personnel Act of 1970: to authorize assignment of Public Health Service officers to communities and areas in critical need of health services.

H.R. 19436 (PL 91-609) Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970: to continue Federal housing programs through fiscal 1972; to authorize Federal crime insurance in any State where it is not available or prohibitively expensive after August 1, 1971, to authorize a program for urban growth and new community development.

S. 3685 (PL 91-351), Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970: to authorize funds to encourage and expedite the construction of new housing, and the financing of existing housing, through bolstering of the mortgage market.

H.R. 17795 (PL 91-431), Emergency Community Facilities Act: to authorize \$1.35 billion through fiscal 1972 to assist communities in the construction of water, sewage, and other public health facilities.

S. 30 (PL 91-452) Organized Crime Control Act: to authorize means by which Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies can cope with and control organized criminal activities including stricter penalties and improved evidence-gathering processes.

H.R. 17825 (PL 91-644), Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act Amendments: to authorize \$3.15 billion through fiscal 1973 for programs administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to ban unauthorized entry into a building where the President is residing; to make it a Federal crime to assassinate, kidnap, or assault a Member of Congress, to impose stricter penalties for carrying a firearm while committing or attempting to commit a Federal felony.

H.R. 18583 (PL 91-513), Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970: to provide for expanded drug treatment and rehabilitation programs to revise Federal narcotics laws so as to increase penalties for drug sellers but decrease them for inci-

dental drug use; to provide for better enforcement tools.

S. 2224 (PL 91-547), Investment Company Amendments Act: to limit mutual fund sales charges and to establish broader authority for Federal regulation of mutual fund industry.

H.R. 19333, (PL 91-598), Securities Investor Protection Act: to protect investors against total loss of cash and securities held by their brokers who bankrupt by establishing a Securities Investor Protection Corporation which will guarantee losses up to \$50,000 (\$20,000 in cash and the rest in securities).

S. 3154, (PL 91-453), Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act: commits the Federal Government over the next 12 years to a \$10 billion urban mass transportation program.

H.R. 14465, (PL 91-258), Airport and Airways Development Act: authorizes a 10-year program for expansion and improvement of the Nation's airport and airway network to be financed in large part through the Airport-Airways Trust Fund; the Fund to be financed by taxes on users of the airways.

H.R. 17949, (PL 91-518), Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970: creates a National Railroad Passenger Corporation to ensure rail service between cities; authorizes Corporation to accept transfer to intercity passenger operations from railroads no longer able to maintain them.

H.R. 16710, (PL 91-506), Veterans' Housing Act of 1970: permits WW-II veterans to continue to apply for VA housing loan guarantees; establishes a program to guarantee purchase of mobile homes.

H.R. 11959, (PL 91-219), Veterans' Education and Training Assistance Amendments of 1970: provides a 34-percent increase in monthly educational allotments among other things.

S. 3342, (PL 91-370), Disability Compensation Increase: provides for an average 10-percent increase for in-service-connected rates of disability compensation.

H.R. 693, (PL 91-500), Veterans' Medical Care: removes requirement that veterans 65 or older must certify inability to pay in order to be treated for a nonservice-connected disability in a VA hospital.

H.R. 18582, Food Stamp Act Amendments: continues Food Stamp program, allows family of four with less than \$30 per month income to get free food stamps, requires all able-bodied adults in family to accept available work in order for family to receive food stamps; mothers with dependent children exempted from work requirement.

THE 18-YEAR-OLDS VOTE DECISION EMPHASIZES NEED TO CURB TYRANNY BY POLITICAL JUDICIARY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, from the October term of 1954 through the October term of 1968 the U.S. Supreme Court issued 214 five to four decisions—a rule of law by democracy of one vote. These decisions have had momentous impact upon the daily lives of the American people as well as the future of their children. These rulings and others have torn down barriers against Communist penetration, taken from States and citizens control over their own property and livelihood, and handcuffed law-enforcement officials and State courts in the execution of their duties. Instead of following

judicial precedent and the Constitution in arriving at decisions, the Supreme Court has in some cases relied upon the myth of sociological testings and its own power by consensus in arriving at its decisions.

We must curb the judicial tyranny of the runaway members of the U.S. Supreme Court. The issue is whether the people shall be protected by a written Constitution which is subject to change by their will or whether that Constitution shall be rewritten by unelected Supreme Court Justices to subvert our society and to remake the U.S. Constitution to suit their personal or ideological whims and fantasies.

I have, therefore, reintroduced the following legislation to curb the power being exerted by members of the Supreme Court and to return the ultimate power of government to the people:

H.J. Res. 152. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that a Justice may be removed from office by a majority of voters in a congressional election.

H.J. Res. 153. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appointments of judges to the Supreme Court and judges to all other Federal courts, as established under section 1 of article III, be reconfirmed every 6 years by the Senate; and to require 5 years' prior judicial experience as a qualification.

H.R. 373. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to limiting the power of the Supreme Court to pass on the constitutionality of provisions of State and Federal statutes and of State constitutions.

H.R. 381. A bill which provides that no court of the United States shall have either original or appellate jurisdiction in any action in which the case or controversy involves exemption of a bona fide religious institution from taxation.

H.R. 382. A bill providing that no court of the United States shall have either original or appellate jurisdiction in any action in which the Congress, or either House thereof, in its official capacity, is a party.

H.R. 390. A bill denying appellate jurisdiction to the Supreme Court to decide any provision of a statute of the United States, a State statute, or a State constitution is invalid because it is in violation of any provision of the Constitution of the United States; or to reverse, alter or modify any decision or rule of law made by the Supreme Court, except upon the concurrence of full membership of the Court.

The recent 5-to-4 decision which by one vote enfranchised 18-year-olds to vote violates the rights expressly reserved to the States by the U.S. Constitution in the area of voting.

The Court has spoken. What has it said to the States? That the right of 18-year-olds to vote given by Congress applies only to Federal elections—not to State elections. If we are now to have two kinds of elections—Federal and State and two kinds of voters—Federal and State, why should the States concern themselves with registering the new Federal voters or with financing and conducting new Federal elections?

Why should the States pay for or concern themselves with any field of political endeavor which even the Supreme Court by one vote says does not apply to the States?

Thomas A. Lane, major general, U.S.

Army, retired, and former Commissioner of the District of Columbia, has written a provocative column for his series, "Foreign Affairs," prescribing what States can do to rectify this latest judicial dictatorship by one vote. General Lane's Public Affairs column follows:

STATES REACT TO COURT DECISION

(By Thomas A. Lane)

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: If the States are to preserve any of the authority and dignity reserved to them by the United States Constitution, they must resist such crass encroachment on their powers as is embodied in the unconstitutional attempt of the United States Congress to enfranchise 18 year olds. The spectacle of some state officials hastening to accommodate the encroachment of Congress and Court does little to honor our state governments.

The Constitution clearly provides that electors for federal offices shall have the same qualifications as electors for "the most numerous branch of the State Legislature". The opinion of Justice Black that this constitutional provision is not binding in federal elections defies law and fact. This binding rule qualifying federal electors was adopted by the framers of the Constitution in order to avoid the cost and confusion of having two sets of electors and separate elections for state and federal offices.

If the Court rule is to be accepted, the States should now refuse to conduct federal elections. If Congress is to assume the Court-granted authority over federal elections, the States should withdraw from the field. It would be imprudent for the States to conduct elections in which the qualifications of electors were subject to the whim of Congress. They should instead conduct only their state elections and leave entirely to Congress the conduct of federal elections. Congress would of course have to set up federal election machinery in every precinct in the country.

That costly duplication of election machinery, implicit in the Court's decision, should not be embraced before other remedies are exhausted. There is reason to believe that the Court acted precipitately in issuing its order. Eight of the nine opinions opposed the conclusion which the Court reached. The Attorney General of the United States and the Attorneys General of the States should now petition the Court for a rehearing so that argument against the Black opinion may be entered.

There is also a federal legislative remedy for the chaos projected by the Court decision. Congress can repeal its legislation enfranchizing the 18 year olds and proceed by constitutional amendment to put the issue before the States for ratification.

It seems clear that Congress did not intend what the Supreme Court has wrought—the creation of separate sets of electors for state and federal elections. Congress should therefore go back to its original purpose of establishing uniform qualifications for all electors. It should act in the way which is open to it—by constitutional amendment.

Unless either the Court or the Congress repeals what has been done, the country faces a period of electoral chaos. Some states will doubtless reject amendments to state constitutions to enfranchise 18 year olds. If they also refuse to conduct federal elections, Congress will be forced to set up federal election machinery for those states.

The individual state should not therefore suppose that hurried amendment of the state constitution is the way to repair the damage of these Court and congressional actions. It should first petition the Court and the Congress to correct their damaging measures. This the Court and Congress can and should do.

Falling that remedy, the state should notify the President and the Congress that the state will not conduct federal elections until the constitutional uniformity of electoral qualifications is restored.

GOVERNOR SHAPP'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS DRAWS MOORHEAD PRAISE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I introduce in the RECORD for the edification of my colleagues, the inaugural address of Milton J. Shapp, the new Democratic Governor of Pennsylvania.

Governor Shapp's remarks were brief and to the point. He made few promises but those that he did offer were welcome.

He promised that his next 4 years in office were going to be marked by innovation.

This is certainly good news to a State that has suffered from a paucity of leadership and innovation.

And Governor Shapp promised to rescue Pennsylvania from its growing fiscal crisis.

I believe that Milton Shapp is the man for this mammoth assignment. He has met and overcome challenges in the past and by employing that same skill and determination, plus a little help from his friends, I think Milton Shapp will put Pennsylvania back on the track of economic well-being.

The following are the Governor's remarks:

HERE'S SHAPP'S INAUGURAL SPEECH TEXT

A century ago, this nation settled the question of legal freedom as opposed to human slavery. But we have yet to deliver full justice and equal opportunity under law to all our people.

At Gettysburg, only 30 miles from here, Abraham Lincoln called the Civil War a time of testing. Could any nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, long endure? America is being tested again today.

The circumstances are different. But the question is the same.

Today we are confronted by civil unrest. The generations are not at peace with one another; the races do not live in harmony; the gap between rich and poor widens constantly.

And another war, in a distant part of the world, has for too long contributed to our internal division.

DESTINED FOR FOREFRONT

I could state in ringing phrases that it is Pennsylvania's destiny to be in the forefront of the nation. But Pennsylvania is not some abstract idea nor is it a geographic or economic entity seeking prominence on an artificial rating scale.

Pennsylvania is 12 million people seeking a better way of life.

Pennsylvania is 12 million people seeking to educate its youth, to provide comfortable housing for all, to care for its young and old, to clean up its environment, and to make equal justice and equal opportunity a reality.

Solutions to our problems are not obvious.

But solutions can never be found if we throw up our hands and bow under the weight of our problems.

TASKS OUTLINED

There is much to be done, and there is an urgent need to start at once.

We can—and will—rescue Pennsylvania from its current financial crisis. Then we can—and will—prove the workability of state government and achieve genuine progress.

We can—and will—restore the people's faith in their government and close the widening gap that now separates those who are governed from those who govern.

Our first task is tough, realistic and immediate: We must take a government on the brink of bankruptcy and return it to solvency—not because of the need for dollars alone but because those dollars are needed to meet the needs of our people.

And our second responsibility is as important as the first: To turn the encrusted bureaucracy of state government into a responsible instrument for human services.

PUBLIC INTEREST GUIDE

Trite as it may sound, we shall succeed only if we are guided by the public interest and if we never forget that we who lead the commonwealth are here only because the people have put us here.

We do not govern by divine right. We do not hold office by grace of any special interest.

Thomas Jefferson said it plainly in the Declaration of Independence: This government exists only by consent of the governed.

We will be the servants of our government only so long as the legitimate needs of the people are met.

Let me sound the note now: This administration—in spirit and in action—will be the people's advocate—in the legislature, in the courts of justice, and before the boards, commissions and agencies which regulate our social and economic life.

Our institutions face severe tests because they have become too remote from the people.

In our lifetime the world has changed more radically than in all the centuries past. Before age 6, the vast majority of today's children—well-to-do, poor; city, farm; white, black—have seen much more of the world via television than most of their grandparents saw in their entire lifetime.

The irony is that science has raised the aspiration of all people but government has failed to use science to create opportunities for achievement for many.

Our government agencies, designed for a slower-moving, simpler world, have not kept pace with the swift changes affecting our society.

The demands for human services not only far outrun today's financial resources but also overtax our existing governmental machinery.

CENTURIES IN CONFLICT

Stated simply, the problems of the last half of the 20th century are coming into 19th-century solutions.

Unmet needs collide with obsolete institutions.

Fragmented local governments seek more aid from the states. And because of limited sources of revenue, the states and cities plead for help in Washington, but the national government seems unable or unwilling to act.

The demand for services may indeed have outstripped the capacity of our institutions, but it will never outstrip our determinations, our ingenuity and our commitment.

America today faces economic stagnation, unemployment and inflation. And because we do not live in isolation, Pennsylvania suffers serious consequences.

We are part of a great nation. We must

solve our problems in harmony with all America.

We shall continue to press for additional aid from Washington, but there is much we can and must do ourselves.

The next four years will be a time of innovation for Pennsylvania.

We must—and will—improve the delivery of human services.

We cannot accept the traditional existence of any state agency, department, bureau or procedure.

Instead, we shall first ask whether a particular function is necessary. If it is, we shall then ask whether that necessary function is really being met. If it is, then we shall ask if there is a simpler, more economic way to achieve that goal.

We shall, in short, put the operation of this government on a streamlined, business-like basis.

There is no contradiction between efficiency and compassion. The first is imperative if delivery of services is to be truly humane.

Let us never forget that this state is a commonwealth of 12 million individuals who live together.

The young child in the ghetto whose life may be changed by our concern for his education, his health and his entire environment.

The 18-year-old whose vote may bring him into the system which determines his future.

The college student who questions the impersonality and hypocrisy of government

INEQUITABLE TAXATION

The workingman, tired of neglect and of inequitable burden of taxation, and fearful of his job.

The businessman who seeks a favorable climate for enterprise.

The housewife who feels the impact of inflation and wonders why.

The elderly citizen who sees his golden years tarnished by the dwindling value of pensions and savings.

The farmer who believes more and more that he is the forgotten member of our society.

And yes, the woman I met as I walked off the train during my whistle-stop tour on a gray day last September.

She told me she was thankful that her son was home from Vietnam but unhappy that he couldn't stay in Pennsylvania because he could not find a suitable job.

OPPORTUNITY ELSEWHERE

He moved to another state that offered a better opportunity and wanted her to go with him. But she didn't want to leave her friends and the home she had lived in all her life.

She asked what I would do if I were elected governor to make it possible for her son to work near home.

What could I say to her?

Statistics show that many thousands of young Pennsylvanians are forced to leave our farms and cities each year to seek opportunity elsewhere.

But how can I as governor talk to a lonely mother, a victim of these statistics? All I can do is work with all my strength to reverse this trend and make Pennsylvania once again a state with a future.

Eight years ago I wrote a book about Pennsylvania—its people, its natural resources and its transportation systems. The book was called "New Growth . . . New Jobs for Pennsylvania."

RESOURCES UNLIMITED

On the cover of that book, I wrote: "Our state was blessed by nature. Man was blessed with intelligence, skill and imagination. There is no limit to the wealth that can be produced if we but combine natural resources and human talent."

Today I stand here as your Governor, prepared to implement the words I wrote in 1962. They still embody my aspirations for Pennsylvania.

This is not a time for personal pride, although I am filled with gratitude to the people of Pennsylvania who have bestowed upon me the highest honor they can give.

It is a time only for the reaffirmation of personal commitment—by me, by you and by all the citizens of this state.

Let us work together—not as Democrats or Republicans but as Pennsylvanians and Americans.

Let us prove—as Lincoln did—that we are ready for our time of testing.

It will not be easy. We shall be bucking adverse national economic tides.

But we must work with all our intelligence, strength and capacity.

There is no other course.

And, with the help of God, we shall succeed.

ALUMINUM INDUSTRY OFFERS PROCESS TO RECYCLE WASTE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of January 26, 1971, carried an article by David Bird describing a solid waste recycling proposal which has been put forward by the Aluminum Association. The article also discusses proposals for improved handling of solid wastes by the city of New York.

I find both of these proposals to be of interest and I include the text of the article at this point in the RECORD:

ALUMINUM INDUSTRY OFFERS PROCESS TO RECYCLE WASTE
(By David Bird)

The aluminum industry presented a plan yesterday for a recycling plant that could take in all municipal garbage as a raw material and process it into reusable material ranging from sand and paper to various types of metal.

Such a plant, for which the industry has completed feasibility studies, is designed to solve the disposal problem by turning every bit of garbage into something useful.

In another aspect of the garbage-disposal problem, Mayor Lindsay signed into law yesterday a bill that would allow plastic and paper bags to replace the familiar metal garbage can.

In a City Hall ceremony the Mayor said the bags would contain the garbage better and simplify collection. As a result, he said, "we anticipate a cleaner and quieter city."

A COMPLETE PROCESS

The proposal for a recycling plant, which was described by the Aluminum Association at a news conference in the Biltmore Hotel, is one of the first for a process that would take care of all garbage, not just part of it.

So far, individual industries, under pressure from environmentalists who are concerned about the growing mounds of waste, have tended to concentrate on salvage drives to recover just their own products that become waste.

These were piecemeal salvage drives—the Boy Scouts for example, bringing back old bottles. Gradually, it became evident that such drives were not going to be enough to solve the waste problem.

The recycling operation proposed by the Aluminum Association would be a \$15-million

pilot plant that could handle 500 tons of garbage a day, about the amount produced by a community of 175,000 to 200,000 people.

The Aluminum Association would not actually build the plant. Rather, it hopes that its engineering studies showing that such a plant could allow a community to make a profit out of its garbage will spur others into action.

The plant itself would need no new technology because it combines existing processes to grind up garbage, ranging from potato peels to old refrigerators, and then separate it into its valuable components.

Any material that could not be recycled into a raw material, such as plastics or some paper, would be burned to generate steam or electricity.

The aluminum industry is pushing the plan because aluminum is worth \$200 a ton as scrap, or more than ten times as much as paper or glass. The aluminum industry reasons that if a community wants to make more profit out of its garbage it will encourage its citizens to use more things like aluminum cans and other aluminum packaging.

Richard D. Vaughan, director of the Federal Bureau of Solid Waste Management, who was at the news conference yesterday, praised the recycling concept. But he said that aluminum prices could become depressed if collections were stepped up significantly.

David P. Reynolds, vice president of Reynolds Metals Company, said, however, that his industry would buy all the aluminum that could be collected at the \$200-a-ton price.

KRECHMER SOUGHT LAW

The legislation allowing plastic and paper bags that was signed by the Mayor had been sought by Jerome Kretchmer, the city's Acting Sanitation Commissioner.

Mr. Kretchmer, who was at the ceremony, said tests had shown that when bags were used instead of metal cans there was less litter, fewer litter fires, a substantial reduction in flies and a 20 percent increase in productivity of sanitationmen.

Also at the ceremony was John J. DeLury, president of the Uniformed Sanitationmen's Association, who warmly endorse the bag legislation. He said it was the only issue on which "we had a unanimous decision by 11,000 sanitationmen." He cautioned, however, that the bags would have to be picked up from the sidewalks before they were kicked open by small boys.

The bags, which must meet tougher strength standards than for those that have been generally offered for sale so far, are expected to be in the stores as early as this week. Approved bags will carry a drawing of a hand with the thumb and forefinger forming the letter "C."

J. EDGAR HOOVER: AN UNTARNISHABLE RECORD OF SERVICE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at the first of this month, this Nation's esteemed FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, observed his 76th birthday and the onset of his 47th year of dedicated public service. Some newspaper columnists, politicians and other self-styled critics used the occasion to level criticism in Mr. Hoover's direction with some even calling for his resignation. To me, it seems far more appropriate at this time to focus atten-

tion on Mr. Hoover's outstanding record and to thank him for his continued efforts in preserving the Nation's peace and safety.

A recent newspaper editorial praising Mr. Hoover's record of service was headlined: "J. Rock of Gibraltar Hoover." Such a billing is appropriate: During the years in which he has molded the world's most efficient law enforcement agency, Mr. Hoover has been acclaimed for his unalterable adherence to the principles of objectivity, honesty and fairness. In taking the directorship of the FBI 46 years ago, his first acts eliminated favoritism and corruption in the then small and inept agency. Since that time, Mr. Hoover has battled domestic subversives who would resort to violence to alter our form of Government. He has faced the problems of skyrocketing crime, and at 76, he remains active and vigorous, fully directing his agency.

I am sure many of my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. Hoover well in his continuing years of service to the Nation.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the recent disclosures of mercury contamination in tuna and swordfish should convince the remaining skeptics in our Nation of the very real threat posed by environmental pollution. For the first time, ecology became an immediate and critical concern to all Americans—not just a matter for another day in smog-choked cities or dying harbors. It touched our lives closer than ever before, and the evidence stared down at us from supermarket shelves across the Nation.

Less dramatic incidents occur regularly, but with considerably less public outcry. They occur for one simple reason: there are, as yet, no standards to regulate the dumping of waste products in our waters. This cannot continue.

I am introducing two measures which will go a long way toward solving this problem. The first will provide for the orderly regulation of dumping into the coastal waters of the United States; the second, for the creation of a standing Committee on Environment in the House of Representatives.

At present, the Army Corps of Engineers, by authority of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, has the responsibility to set standards for the dumping of waste materials in our navigable waters. In the early years, they concentrated solely on activities that would impede navigation. In recent times, they have been directed to consider as well their effect on the wildlife and ecology of the area.

Yet, in one 15-mile stretch off the Atlantic coast they granted permission for the dumping of 35 pounds of mercury, 750 pounds of beryllium, 1,000 gallons of sulfuric acid, and hundreds of

gallons of other dangerous chemicals. The Army Corps of Engineers is simply not taking this matter seriously.

And it is a serious matter. The coastline of the United States, including the Great Lakes, is 99,613 miles long. Seventy-five percent of our population lives in the 30 States that comprise the coastal zone. Forty-five percent of our urban population lives in coastal counties. Twenty-five percent of our entire population lives within 50 miles of the coast. As you can see, the pollution of our oceans directly affects more than 150 million people in this country.

Our scientists tell us that the oceans hold the key to our survival. We hear that our food supply may eventually come in greater proportion from the ocean than from the land. As a source of oxygen and industrial minerals, the oceans are of crucial importance to our future existence.

But, if dumping continues unregulated, there is a real danger that our coastal waters will be irreversibly damaged for many generations. Nature has a tremendous capacity to recover from the abuses of pollution—but only up to a certain point. We are stretching that capacity too far and too fast. We are approaching the breaking point.

Mr. Speaker, we need a nationwide program to prevent the pollution of our oceans and Great Lakes, and we particularly need to restore those areas where dumping has already caused serious harm. That is the purpose of the bill I have introduced.

Persons wishing to dump will be required to prove that their materials do not endanger the natural environment of the area. Up to now the burden of proof rested on the Government alone. It is high time that this expense be borne by the private concern, not the taxpayer.

Strict standards will be set for dumping, and violators will be subject to fines as high as \$10,000. All Americans must realize that this is a matter of the utmost urgency—a matter of survival. If we continue to allow indiscriminate dumping into our coastal waters, not only will we seriously endanger our own lives, but we will have to spend billions more to clean up the mess. We may even go beyond the point of being able to correct our mistakes. That is not my idea of sound policy. I urge that this bill receive the immediate attention it truly deserves, so that we may begin at once the crucial effort to restore our natural surroundings.

For the same reason, I ask my colleagues to pass the second measure I have introduced; the measure to create a standing Committee on Environment in the House of Representatives.

The proposed committee will deal with air pollution, water pollution, solid waste disposal, herbicides, and pesticides. It will have full legislative authority to report bills to the floor, and it will have the benefit of a professional staff whose primary concern would be environmental legislation.

Of course, there are already committees with jurisdiction over these problems. But that is precisely the issue:

there are too many such committees. Rarely, have they been able to provide the concerted effort so necessary to solve the crisis of our environment. Too often, our approach has been fragmented—with considerable loss of time and efficiency.

The various environmental threats we face are closely related to one another, and they demand a concerted attack by the Congress. Just as an army must be tightly coordinated to face a military threat, so too, Mr. Speaker, the Nation must have the advantage of unity, if it is ever to win the war on pollution. Our survival as a people depends on it.

TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with the distinguished chairman of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, Mr. MILLER, and other concerned members of the committee in sponsoring legislation establishing an Office of Technology Assessment.

This concept is not a novel one; neither is this proposal. The deliberations which gave rise to it have spanned the last 5 years. Countless committee meetings have been held, numerous advisory panels and public seminars have been convened, and two comprehensive sets of congressional hearings have been conducted. All have pointed up the same need: If science and technology is to be productively utilized and guided in the future, Congress must be provided with an organized method of gathering, organizing, and utilizing relevant information regarding the effects of science and technology upon man and nature.

This need is a relatively new one in point of time. It is new because until recently, scientific advances occurred infrequently and without conscious anticipation of their long-range effects on society. Man could afford to look upon the activities of scientists with some complacency. Innovations came slowly. They were put to use in a relatively leisurely fashion. Their side effects developed at a sufficiently modest pace so as to allow society to adjust to them without undue stress or strain.

All this has changed, however. It is history. Man has learned some critical lessons. He has learned, for example, that the advancement of knowledge does not automatically improve the human condition. He has learned that society can no longer blindly adopt scientific discoveries and technological advancements on the assumption there will be ample time to iron out any bugs. He has learned that although science and technology have brought western civilization to heights undreamed of by ancient man, science and technology have also combined to create certain significant social and economic problems.

Paradoxically, where science and

technology have expanded man's problems, it may take more scientific understanding and more technological advancement to surmount them. A cure for the pollution of rivers by detergents is the use of nonpolluting detergents. A cure for bad Federal program design is better Federal program design.

I am confident science and technology can continue to be modern man's horn of plenty, but only if they are guided in directions that are consistent with the public and national interest. To facilitate this process, to provide a device by which these twin engines of progress can be harnessed for the good of man, I propose that an Office of Technology Assessment be established. I make this proposal because in my view, technology assessment is a vital necessity. During the past few years, man has used technology to dominate nature. But in the absence of rational planning and guidance, technology may well eventually dominate man.

Mr. Speaker, the only constant feature of life in this, the latter third of the 20th century, is change. Thus, probably few human institutions will continue as they are for another half century. If they are not changed in response to the problems of today, they may well be changed to avoid the problems of tomorrow.

The future will surely bring widespread alterations in everything from our styles of living to our philosophies of man. But, will the future unfold on a world where individual freedom and democracy prevails? Will it unfold on a nightmare like George Orwell's 1984? Or will it unfold on a postnuclear wasteland dotted with grotesque monuments to the folly of man?

The decisions of science policy and the acts of legislative leadership during the next few years will significantly determine the answers to these future possibilities. This is why Congress needs the best possible information upon which to base its enactments. This is why Congress needs an Office of Technology Assessment.

REPORT ON COMMITTEE STAFFING

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of a report to my constituents on the subject of committee staffing:

A shocking act of political perfidy marred the opening of the 92nd Congress last week.

After passing the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 with great fanfare last fall, the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives voted to repeal one of its major reform provisions before it could take effect.

At issue was the question of providing minority members of House committees an allocation of funds for the employment of committee staff members who would work for the minority. In the past, this arrange-

ment has been left to the discretion of the committee chairmen. Some have been generous in providing minority staff assistants, but more have refused to do so.

Last fall, when some of the polls indicated the possibility that Republicans would become the majority party in 1971, the Democrats in Congress embraced as a reform provision an amendment to the House rules providing for the employment of one-third of committee professional staff members by the minority. Republicans, in the minority for most of 40 years, welcomed the decision, and it became law in the glow of bi-partisan reform.

As everyone knows, the polls were wrong and the Democrats retained their majority. Almost their first official act was the repeal of the minority staffing section of the reorganization law. It no longer served their purpose. Indeed, one chairman frankly stated that it would cost the jobs of three or four of his long-time patronage employees.

Too often, it seems to me, our reformers seem to think that men's natures and men's motivations will change if the rules are changed. This should be a lesson in practical politics, indicating the futility of some of our reform efforts when a sincere desire for reform is lacking.

HANFORD REACTOR SHUTDOWN MUST BE REVERSED

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposed budget for fiscal 1972 calls for the immediate deactivation of the two operating nuclear reactors at Hanford, Wash.—"K" reactor and "N" reactor. There are no budgeted funds for operation or closedown of these reactors in the 1972 budget. The Atomic Energy Commission has been directed to initiate deactivation procedures at once with present operating funds so that operation of both reactors will be terminated by the end of the current fiscal year. The reactors were shut down this morning.

The President's plan, if carried out, will have a catastrophic effect on the thousands of scientists, technologists, and craftsmen and their families in the Hanford area; on the brainpower pool which will be so desperately needed for research in advanced power reactor technology during the decade; and on the availability of electric power presently being supplied to the residents and industries of the Northwest through the Northwest power pool. There obviously will be a loss of plutonium production for the Defense Establishment.

I cannot really believe that the President understood the implications of his budget recommendation with respect to Hanford.

The loss of plutonium produced by these two reactors for the Defense Department may be significant. This information is, of course, classified, and cannot be discussed here.

The impact on an already depressed community where unemployment is now near 11 percent—it is much higher in much of the rest of Washington State—cannot be overestimated. The thousands

of scientists, technologists, and skilled craftsmen who have partially paid mortgages on their homes, and children in school in the Hanford area, will be forced onto unemployment rolls and will be forced to seek new jobs in communities hundreds or thousands of miles away.

It is estimated that approximately 5,000 jobs will be lost in the Hanford area and that unemployment may reach 30 percent.

Aside from the personal tragedy involved in this sort of abrupt loss of income, the damage to the Nation will be even greater. These men and women constitute one of the finest brainpower pools for nuclear research and operation on earth. They will be desperately needed during the coming decade for research in advanced power reactor technology, which is almost certain to be carried out at Hanford. It seems to me that one must weigh the cost of continuing this program against the consequences of terminating it at this time in terms of the national interest, as well as the interest of these scientists and their families.

Deactivating the dual-purpose "N" reactor would, in addition to causing a loss of plutonium production, remove 800,000 kilowatts of electric power from the northwest power pool. The Congress has had no opportunity to evaluate the impact of this power loss on the economy of the West. It is obvious that certain basic industries, such as aluminum reduction, would lose power now available to them. The loss of employment and production in these industries scattered throughout the West has not been determined. Both unemployment and production loss would be serious in certain areas. The loss of 800,000 kilowatts of power will affect the amount of power available to California and the Southwest during their peak load periods this summer. The impact of this situation has not been appraised by Congress.

It has been projected that without the power currently being produced by "N" reactor, there will be a 300-kilowatt deficit of electricity in the northwest power pool during the winter of 1971-72 if all other factors are ideal and if the winter is warm. In the event of a severe cold winter and/or reduced river flow, this deficit could be much more severe. John Nassikas, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, speaking in Richland, Wash., in 1970, was critical of the low reserve of power in the Northwest at that time, assuming the production of "N" reactor would be continuing.

The unilateral and deliberate withdrawal of 800,000 kilowatts from the northwest power pool at this time, and without consulting the Congress, is utterly unthinkable.

In view of the reasons stated above, I am convinced that it is in the interest of the Nation, as well as the Northwest, that the President's budget recommendation with respect to deactivating the Hanford reactors not be implemented until the Congress has had an opportunity to evaluate its consequences.

As a matter of record, Mr. Speaker, "N" reactor at Hanford, if it had not

been shut down today, would have produced by Sunday night next, the 31st of January, 533 million kilowatt-hours of electricity during this month of January. This is more electricity than has ever been produced by any nuclear power reactor on earth. It is power that stabilizes the northwest power pool in the winter and provides firm power for the demands of the Southwest in the summer.

I call upon the President now to withdraw his order for the immediate shutdown and deactivation of "N" reactor. The impending energy crisis faced by all areas of this Nation is a matter of common knowledge. This is no time to throw away the production of the largest nuclear power reactor on earth.

REVENUE SHARING IS ESSENTIAL

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last week President Nixon formally announced that revenue sharing would be one of the six major objectives of his administration in the coming year.

I congratulate the President for his strong support of the revenue sharing concept and eagerly await the full details of his plan. Revenue sharing is absolutely essential for the States, cities, and towns in this country. Without it, some will go bankrupt or cut back on essential services and the ensuing fiscal chaos is neither tolerable nor necessary.

The President and many Senators, Representatives, Governors, mayors, and State and local officials support revenue sharing. But revenue sharing is not limited to elected officials alone. The Gallup poll conducted on January 9 and 10 found that 77 percent of the public supports the concept of revenue sharing, with only 14 percent expressing opposition.

Mr. Speaker, Gallup has polled the American public on this subject for over 4 years. As early as January 1967, 70 percent of those polled favored revenue sharing. It is obvious that a clear majority of the American people, favor this plan. Hearings must be held on the legislation—and not with intent of "killing" the bill. Revenue sharing is the best solution to the financial problems besetting the States. It has been said that "nothing can stop an idea whose time has come." The time for revenue sharing has come.

The Boston Globe published the results of the poll on January 24. I would like to include the article at this point in the RECORD:

TAX SHARING WINS BROAD PUBLIC SUPPORT GALLUP POLL

PRINCETON, N.J.—Although President Nixon's plan to share Federal income tax receipts with state and local governments may face rough sledding in Congress, the concept has the overwhelming support of the American people.

A Gallup survey of the nation's adults conducted Jan. 9-10 finds 77 percent of the public in support of the concept of revenue sharing, with only 14 percent expressing opposition. Nine percent do not express an opinion.

Public support for the revenue sharing idea has reached its highest point to date, with the percentage in favor up six points from a year ago.

Favorable reaction to the concept cuts across party lines, with large majorities of rank-and-file Democrats (77 percent), Republicans (81 percent), and Independents (73 percent) in favor of the plan.

In Friday's State of the Union message, the President made a strong plea for revenue sharing. The plan would return a small percentage of Federal income tax receipts to state and local governments. This would represent a basic shift from the present practice of rigidly allocated Federal grants to states and municipalities for welfare, hospitals, housing, highways and other programs.

The idea of revenue sharing was first advanced in 1964 by Walter Heller, then chairman of President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisors.

In the latest survey, a total of 1502 adults were interviewed in person in more than 300 scientifically selected areas of the nation Jan. 9-10. The following question has been asked of representative samples of the nation's adults five times during the last four years to determine attitudes on revenue sharing:

It has been suggested that 3 percent of the money which Washington collects in Federal income taxes be returned to the states and local governments to be used by these states and local governments as they see fit. Do you favor or oppose this idea?

(The 3 percent figure in the question is based on plans that had been proposed prior to President Nixon's State of the Union message.)

The latest results and four-year trend follow:

TAX SHARING

January 1967—70 percent favor plan; 18 percent oppose plan; 12 percent had no opinion.

April 1967—70 percent favor plan; 15 percent oppose plan; 15 percent had no opinion.

July 1967—72 percent favor plan; 17 percent oppose plan; 11 percent had no opinion.

January 1969—71 percent favor plan; 17 percent oppose plan; 12 percent had no opinion.

Latest—77 percent favor plan; 14 percent oppose plan; and 9 percent had no opinion.

The thinking of the man-in-the-street is indicated by the following comments.

"Housing, road construction, education—problems like these—are really all local problems. I can't see why the Federal government has to get involved with huge programs that often don't work." This was the view of a 36-year-old tax appraiser.

A middle-aged laboratory technician commented: "I'm against the idea of revenue sharing until I see rigid guidelines as to how the money is to be spent. The possibility of state and local corruption could greatly increase with all that money to be used."

Congressional proponents of revenue sharing argue that the program would halt the increasing centralization of power in Washington. Others support the idea in the belief that state and local governments are closer to the social and economic problems for which money is needed.

Opponents of the plan in Congress believe that state governments are no more likely to be efficient in dealing with social and economic problems than the Federal government has been.

Gallup Poll editors sought the views of

mayors of 20 large cities in the nation on the subject of tax sharing. The mayors interviewed were in general agreement that anything to help the cities, would be welcome, but some expressed concern that the money might not get to the cities that need it most because of state and local "red tape."

The views of Mayor William J. Ensign of Toledo, O., typify the attitudes of many of the urban mayors contacted:

"Any means by which some of the local money now going to Washington can be returned to our cities and states would be welcome relief. The President's proposal sounds good, but I would like to see a lot more cash and much less conversation.

"Cities, such as Toledo, cannot survive under their present financing formulas. A revenue sharing plan, minus the usual strings and red tape, could mean the difference between satisfactory municipal services (police, fire, sanitation) and continued municipal problems."

GALLAGHER REINTRODUCES RESOLUTION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON PRIVACY, HUMAN VALUES, AND DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduce a resolution to establish a Select Committee here in the House of Representatives on what I believe to be one of the most important, and most overlooked areas of concern to the Congress. Mr. FRANK HORTON of New York, Mr. SIDNEY YATES of Illinois, Mr. JOHN MURPHY of New York, and Mr. EDWARD KOCH of New York, join me today as cosponsors.

For 6 years I have been conducting my privacy studies within the House Committee on Government Operations and while we have been effective in the major investigations we have pursued—psychological testing, the computer, and the National Data Bank, initiating congressional concern with the credit reporting industry, and the threatening expansion of giving behavior modification drugs to grammar schoolchildren—I believe the time has come for the House to recognize the magnitude of the task we face and to form a Select Committee with major support.

One area which we were forced to give only the most cursory attention to was the Federal funding for programs to identify young men who had the XYY chromosome, allegedly a creator of antisocial activity. The disclosure of the dangerous aspects of this program was largely the work of Miss Diane Bauer of the Washington Daily News who disclosed that young men thus identified in the preliminary research phase were not to be protected against having their names released into the criminal justice system and that consent forms were not required from the parents or guardians.

When the information was brought to my attention, I issued several statements about the question of preordained doom for young men based on the incredibly shallow supporting knowledge which ex-

ists. The facts now show that my doubts were based on substantially accurate independent scientific opinion. I attach at the end of my statement today a news item from the Christian Science Monitor of December 2, 1970. This article reports a British conference which debunks the entire idea of proceedings with our present state of knowledge to brand young men as potential criminals. It further discloses something I had not realized: abortions have been based on such genetic garbage.

As in so many cases, we are tampering with the basic physical makeup of human beings and doing unknown, probably untold, harm to future generations of people.

As in the matter of giving drugs to alter schoolchildren's behavior and the late, unlamented proposal of Dr. Arnold Hutschnecker to test every 6- to 8-year-old in the Nation for possible future criminal behavior, to cite just two additional examples, the privacy study's original insights were correct. Just 1 week after my hearing of September 29, 1970, into the drug issue, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare announced that a "blue ribbon" panel would be convened to discuss the issues we had raised, and the day after I had announced I was considering hearings, HEW reported unfavorably on the Hutschnecker plan and it was dropped.

However, Mr. Speaker, because my privacy study has not as yet become a major part of the Committee on Government Operations ambit, plans have gone forward which radically alter the cohesiveness of American society and which pollute the political atmosphere just as much as more tangible technologies have polluted our natural atmosphere.

At the risk of redundancy, let me elaborate on that point. I believe there is a campaign against the human spirit being waged here in the United States. Its loci of power are diverse: academic circles, the military industrial complex, the medical educational complex, Federal, State and local bureaucracies, private industry, and last but not least, a Congress which is unprepared to cope with an influx of data. I would ask my colleagues in the House how many times you have voted for authorized and appropriated funds for projects which you were vaguely uneasy about but which you just did not have the expertise and solid data to question. My point is that all the power, all the experts, all the funds are on the side of those who wish to see short range success of a narrowly defined mission and we here in the Congress, whose concern it should be to evaluate long range effects on human values and democratic institutions, spend next to nothing on keeping ourselves relevant.

This is the basic reason why I have offered again a resolution to establish a Select Committee on Privacy, Human Values and Democratic Institutions. We here in the House are particularly vulnerable to failures in Federal policy for we must go to the people every two years. Yet, those who create many of the programs which cast so much discredit on the American government are buried

deeply within the middle, almost mindless stretches of the bureaucracy and they are seldom if ever, identified or held accountable. The glacial indifference of these structures was well criticized when James Farmer left his position at HEW, but the problem far exceeds one man's frustrations and disillusionments. It is in the process of destroying the trust the governed must have in those who govern. It is fracturing the fragile interrelationships between citizens and their leaders and it will, in my opinion, ultimately lead to anarchy and its handmaiden, dictatorship.

Naturally, no such select committee as I propose could ameliorate all the malaise which so obviously grips America. But I think it will show that we are serious about what Americans are serious about: the deteriorating quality of life. I recently keynoted a conference on the computer and the data bank society in London and the headline of the article from the Sunday Times of November 22, 1970, which I will insert at the end of my remarks, sums up what I believe to be the basic purpose of my proposed select committee. It is headlined, "Self-Protection in the Age of Aquariums." Truly, the Age of Aquarius is going to be the Age of Aquariums in which every action takes place in a fishbowl and unless we take steps to protect ourselves, all the good we have done here in the Congress will be drowned in a cataract of disenchantment. For those who wish a much more complete discussion of my concerns, a full treatment of these themes appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 26, pp. 34942-34946.

I would urge my colleagues to join with me by cosponsoring the resolution. Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the resolution and the two news reports referred to earlier in the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the development of technology is advancing at an unparalleled rate of speed and is rapidly coming to affect every level of American life; and

Whereas the operations of industry and Government are coming more and more to rely on highly sophisticated computer technology to assist them in their operations; and

Whereas the full significance and the effects of technology on society and on the operations of industry and Government are largely unknown; and

Whereas computers and other technological innovations aid in the gathering and centralization of massive information of all kinds on individuals and, consequently, call into question the effect of technology on the right of privacy; and

Whereas Congress needs a committee ready and able to evaluate the effects of technology on the operations of Government, on the democratic institutions and processes basic to the United States, and on the basic human and civil rights of our citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on Privacy, Human Values, and Democratic Institutions to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the development and proliferation of technology in American society, including the role and effectiveness of computer technology in the operations of industry and Government, the consequences of using computers to solve questions which traditionally have been addressed without the assistance of computers and other machines, and the effects of technology and machines on democratic institutions and processes. The committee shall also study the use of computers and other technical instruments in gathering and centralizing information on individuals and the effect of such activity on the human and civil rights.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Dec. 2, 1970]

BIOLOGISTS DEBUNK CRIMINAL GENE (By Robert C. Cowen)

LONDON.—Geneticists feel embarrassed by the so-called "criminal" chromosome.

It is a human genetic factor that recently, and falsely, was thought to make its possessor criminally inclined.

This notion was introduced in American courts as an indication of criminal "insanity." It has been used, in Britain at least, as reason for abortion of unborn children.

All of this was the result of an erroneous conclusion drawn from bad statistics.

Now geneticists are concerned lest people again be improperly stigmatized as "abnormal" on equally hazy genetic grounds as medical centers build up files on the genetic background of adults and children.

This is one of the dangers cited at a meeting here on the social implications of biology, a meeting convened by the British Society for Social Responsibility in Science.

In this instance, the "criminal" chromosome story provided an archetypal example.

Chromosomes are objects seen within bodily cells which carry the blueprint of how the body is constructed. Some of them determine sex. Thus a female usually has two so-called "X" chromosomes. A male has one X and one called "Y."

Occasionally, extra sex chromosomes turn up. In the case in point, males have an extra Y—the "criminal" chromosome.

Studies made over the past five years at certain penal and mental institutions indicated what seemed an abnormally high percentage of males with the XYY chromosome set among inmates. This was taken as evidence that the extra Y inclined its possessors toward aggressive criminality.

As experts pointed out at the meeting, geneticists now consider such a conclusion scientific rubbish. It was drawn without any knowledge of or reference to the proportion of XYY males in the "normal" population. It was drawn with no knowledge whatsoever of how the extra Y chromosome actually does manifest itself in bodily structure or human behavior. Finding this out would take massive research, which has scarcely begun to be tackled.

Yet invalid as the concept of the "criminal" chromosome may have been, it had begun to be used publicly as a criterion for judging people. This, said Prof. Geoffrey Beale of Edinburgh University, has shocked geneticists. They just had not been aware of what the social consequences could be when they relaxed socially sensitive research information.

While valid as research, the XYY studies were no basis for social decisions. Scientists, he said, must exercise more control over how much information is released to the public.

MEDICAL DATA PILING UP

He added that he is particularly concerned about the data some medical centers now gather and record about the chromosome sets of new born babies and adults. "Who is to have access to these data?" he asked. "How are they to be used?" There must be stringent safeguards to make sure that the data are not used to label people.

Dr. R. C. Edwards of Cambridge University picked up this point, too. He pointed out that genetic studies are made of unborn children. Decisions then are sometimes made on whether or not to abort the fetus. In other words, he said, unborn children are being judged unfit to live on genetic grounds that are often poorly understood. Here, he said, both biology and society "are on very thin ground."

Dr. S. Lal, an official of the British Society for Social Responsibility in Science, asked Dr. Edwards, "why label people as anomalous? . . . Why start eliminating people in the womb on the basis of social need for certain genetic constitutions? Doesn't this violate the concept of individual worth and sanctity," he asked.

Dr. Edwards replied that he is specifically concerned about this. Labeling people as "anomalous" because they possess the XYY chromosome set has been a warning. There are many XYYs walking around today who are perfectly normal, he said.

[From the Sunday Times, Nov. 22, 1970]
SELF-PROTECTION IN THE AGE OF AQUARIUMS
(By John Fryer)

The computer, which the public once feared would quickly gobble up their jobs, has now assumed a much more sinister threat: as a machine keeping a watchful eye on their lives. But, paradoxically, it is now not the public that is so concerned, but the men who are actually running the computers. So much so that they have jointly called on the Government to act.

Fifty of Britain's leading computer men, plus a similar number of academics and civil servants, met in London last week to discuss what is being called the Data Bank Society. Data banks are stores of electronically-controlled information files which can give a rundown on a person's history in a matter of seconds. It was little wonder that the conference, called by the National Council for Civil Liberties, saw them as a step towards George Orwell's 1984.

There is already evidence of what they can do. Like the case of the American General, wounded five times in Vietnam, who found his name listed in a data bank operated by the U.S. Army as a possible anti-war protester. It came as a surprise to him, and indeed the army, for he had previously been recalled from Vietnam for fighting so hard that too many of his men were getting killed.

The army later discovered that the General's name had found its way into the data bank after a junior soldier jokingly wrote it on the subscription form for an "underground" newspaper. But it is "mistakes" such as these that a growing section of Britain's computer industry fear could get out of hand.

Data banks already exist here: the Giro and motor licensing authorities both have them. Next year the police and social services hope to switch on similar systems.

If the police, social services and inland revenue could all feed information into a central data bank, so the argument runs, it would then be possible to build up a complete profile of a person from birth.

An American Congressman, Cornelius Gallagher, told the conference that in 1966 a plan was unearthed for a "hook up" between a number of government departments. It had been arranged behind the scenes by the permanent officials and, according to Gallagher, even the President did not know until the late stages what was going on. The plan has now been shelved.

Gallagher sees the problem of data banks intertwined with the growing menace of electronic surveillance equipment, such as bugging and wiretapping devices. This, he says, could lead us into the "Age of Aquariums, in which every action takes place in a fishbowl."

Britain, Gallagher assures, is about three years behind America. But surveillance systems here are already being built up. There are at least 1,000 private detective agencies in Britain, as well as personal dossiers on employees, and blacklists of bad debtors. A Parliamentary Committee is investigating how much this affects the privacy of the individual.

So where does this leave Britain's computer men? The NCCL was obviously surprised by the response to the conference, which included delegates from IBM, Honeywell and ICL. It reflected an underlying feeling amongst the hardware manufacturers, software houses and programmers themselves that they will be the first to face any public opinion backlash. In America, for instance, the recent blowing up of a computer by students is seen by some as an omen for the future.

The industry is convinced that ultimately the Government will have to control data banks, but precisely how it cannot say. The delegates, however, made it clear that they are in business to make (albeit small) profits, and will not "dictate other people's morals" by deciding who they should or should not supply with data bank equipment.

The industry claims it can provide adequate technical safeguards on computers to stop "pilfering" by inquisitive civil servants plugging into the necessary program. John Hargreaves, IBM's director of public affairs, says these safeguards, including scrambling devices, are already available. He says: "There is an industrial responsibility. I believe it is being discharged."

So, it seems the ultimate decision to control data banks must be political. But the industry seems to be waiting for the conventional British drive of public opinion to force through legislation that could, for instance, license data bank operators. Public opinion, despite the NCCL's efforts, is not yet so mobilized. However, it may gain strength soon, if, as is rumoured, Lord Crowther's committee recommends the setting up of a national credit data bank.

The computer men, who have surrounded themselves with an esoteric shell of New-speak technical terms, want the public to know the dangers but they have difficulty explaining what they are. It will be sad if we have to wait for a British General to be classified as a pacifist before Parliament is forced to face up to the problem.

TO MAKE SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION SERVE THE PUBLIC BETTER

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the last decade has taught us all a number of important lessons. The Congress would do well to consider in particular, however, the experience of the Sixties as it relates to the financial needs of the American public. I think the reading of this experience will indicate some rather salient deficiencies. The first and most obvious deficiency has been that the flows of capital to consumers have waxed and waned at incredible rates. The early 1960's saw periods of almost unprecedented low interest rates on home loans. This was followed by a period of terrible stringency in 1966 and 1967, which was repeated in 1969 and 1970. We find ourselves now on the threshold of this new decade once more with a rapid shift of funds to the consumer sector and a rapid decline in the interest rates situation, but with the surplus of funds in the hands of commercial banking institutions, a situation which has resulted, in large measure, from the policies of the Federal Reserve Board.

The second lesson that needs to be learned from the 1960's is that the housing industry is increasingly a cyclical activity, generally running counter to prevailing economic trends. Historically, housing activity has increased substantially during periods of economic malaise. However, the 1960's saw this historical pattern exaggerated with housing starts rising and falling at precipitous rates, along with the attendant cost of the allocation, disallocation, and reallocation of resources. The fact that housing activity has fluctuated so rapidly is of course in like measure a function of the cost of money and availability of money. No institution has been more vulnerable to the flows of funds and their availability than the savings and loan associations, whose activities are closely linked to the housing sector, and whose investments are in the form of long-term fixed interest rates mortgages—which deny it the flexibility to adapt its portfolio to changing economic conditions. Hence, when interest rates rise rapidly, and, as a result, likewise the rate at which depositors in savings and loans expect to secure payment on their accounts, savings and loans are rickshawed by reason of their investments being in mortgages which were written at a time when rates were lower and which do not yield a sufficient timely return in an amount to permit the savings and loans to pay a competitive yield. This, of course, is part of the rationale for regulations—two—on the ceiling on interest rates.

As we approach the 1970's, it is evident that something must be done to even out the hills and valleys which afflict both the consumer in his capacity as a borrower for essential purchases and the savings and loan in its capacity as a primary home mortgage lender. Of

course, if both of these problems can be solved through a single step, it is simpler and more efficient. The proposal that I have advanced, calling for the establishment of consumer banks, is just such a step. These consumer banks would be somewhat different from the commercial banks. A commercial bank well deserves its name. Its function is largely to serve the mercantile sector. The extent to which commercial banks acknowledge that to be their function has been well evidenced during the 1960's. During that time, in periods of monetary stringency, their financial flows were shifted away from the consumer lending activities and toward lending to business and industry. The consumer bank, on the other hand, would have as its sole function servicing the needs of individuals and families. The powers that this act proposes to extend to consumer banks would permit them to offer the public the full range of banking services required by a family. This change in the law is in no way intended to exclude the commercial bank from exercising its powers to serve consumers. It is, however, to embody the well-seasoned American nostrum that competition breeds better services, and what better way to encourage competition than to establish an institution which, in its functions, competes with commercial banks in serving the public.

The savings and loan association has traditionally been a family-oriented financial institution. Going back to their earliest beginnings, the associations were founded to help individuals to acquire homeownership. This is a function which they still play a most important role in performing. The act which I propose to the Congress today would permit the savings and loans to continue to furnish that service, and also to serve the public by offering a broad array of services including checking accounts, trust services, small business loans, insurance, and credit cards. By extending the powers of savings and loans into these areas and thereby making them a consumer bank it would not only be possible to secure to the savings and loan the ability to better serve the American public, but it would also be possible to buttress the savings and loan against the vulnerabilities which in the past have jeopardized its existence. Historically, as I have noted, savings and loans have suffered during periods of economic stringency. During those times the demand for home mortgage loans has diminished, thus reducing the opportunity for savings and loans to make profitable investments of the funds available. At the same time, the requirement for the savings and loan to pay competitive interest rates has increased, thus putting savings and loan associations in a profit squeeze. The proposal that I offer today would permit the savings and loan association to engage in a number of areas of activity which would bring it substantial profit centers and permit it to gird its financial loins and thereby be better prepared to perform its original and still primary function of financing home mortgage lending. It is imperative that in the

1970's housing activity be increased substantially. For that goal to be obtained, it is necessary that increased supplies of funds be made available, in all sectors, not only in the subsidized housing area, but also in the market-rate housing area. The proposal that I offer today will substantially strengthen savings and loans and thereby help assure an adequate flow of funds into conventional home mortgage lending.

To sum up, this proposal assists in dealing with two very serious problems that were made manifest during the 1960's. My proposal would provide financial services which, it has become evident, are not available to consumers during periods of financial tightness/monetary stringency. Secondly, it would insure to the savings and loans the viability that comes from having a broader economic base. It would help the savings and loans survive in periods of tight money, periods which, in the past, have jeopardized the very existence of the savings and loan business. In short, my proposal offers better service to the American public, and at the same time offers needed support to an institution which has clearly demonstrated in the past the ability to serve well the American public, both in the aggregate and as individuals and families.

Mr. Speaker, I am including at this time a copy of the bill and a section-by-section summary to be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

A bill to better enable savings and loan associations to serve the public

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "The Consumers Bank Act of 1971".

SEC. 2. Declaration of Purpose. It is the sense of the Congress that the needs of the public for financial services could be better served. Toward that end the following powers are added to those presently possessed by the savings and loan industry.

SEC. 3. Federal Stock Associations.

(a) Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 is amended—

(1) by deleting the word "mutual" both times it appears therein, and

(2) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) An association may be chartered either as a mutual institution or as a corporation having capital stock. Except where otherwise indicated by the context, references in this Act to 'associations' refer to both mutual associations and stock associations.

"(3) In the case of a stock association, the capital stock shall represent the permanent capital of the association, subordinate to all other liabilities and capital of the association. Stock may be issued only in accordance with the regulations of the Board.

"(4) Upon the written application of a mutual association, the Board may permit the association to convert into a stock association if the Board determines that—

"(A) two-thirds of the association's directors have voted in favor of the proposed conversion;

"(B) two-thirds of the votes cast by account holders in person or by proxy have been cast in favor of the conversion at a meeting duly called and held not more than six months prior to the filing of the application with the Board; and

"(C) the conversion will be conducted pursuant to a plan which is approved by the Board as fair and equitable."

(b) Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 5 of said Act is amended by deleting therefrom the parenthetical expression "(except capital stock)".

SEC. 4. Demand Deposits.

(a) Subsection (b) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 is amended by renumbering paragraph (2) as paragraph (3) and by adding thereto the following new paragraph (2):

"(2) An association may also raise capital in the form of demand deposits, as authorized by regulations of the Board, may issue such evidences of such demand deposits as are so authorized and may honor requests for withdrawal of demand deposits in the form of checks or drafts or otherwise as so authorized. Every association that receives demand deposits shall establish and maintain reserve balances equal to not less than 10 per centum and not more than 22 per centum in the case of any association in a reserve city and not less than 7 per centum and not more than 14 per centum in the case of any association not in a reserve city of the aggregate amount of such demand deposits held by it, all as determined from time to time by the Board. Either in individual cases or by regulation the Board, on such basis as it may deem reasonable and appropriate in view of the character of business transacted by the association, may make applicable in reserve cities the reserve ratios prescribed for associations not in reserve cities. Such reserves shall be maintained in one or more of the following forms:

(1) demand deposits in one or more Federal Home Loan Banks.

(2) demand deposits in one or more Federal Reserve Banks.

(3) demand deposits fully insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in one or more commercial banks.

(4) marketable securities having unexpired terms of not more than 7 years, that are issued or guaranteed by a pledge of the full faith and credit of the United States.

(5) items in transit, as defined by the Board, to the extent demand deposits in the association are increased by such items.

(6) coins and currency of the United States.

The Board is authorized for the purposes of this subsection to define the terms "demand deposits" and "reserve city." The Board is further authorized to suspend for a period not exceeding thirty days and from time to time to renew such suspension for periods not exceeding fifteen days, any reserve requirement specified in this subsection. No association shall, directly or indirectly, by any device whatsoever, pay any interest on any demand deposit."

(b) The first paragraph of section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by inserting "or savings and loan association" immediately after "nonmember bank or trust company" both times those words appear therein.

SEC. 5. Trust Powers. Section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act is amended by inserting the following new provisions as subsection (d):

"(d) (1) The Board shall be authorized to grant to any association applying therefor a permit to act as trustee of a trust where the trust res at the time of appointment of the association as trustee does not exceed one hundred thousand dollars in value, and to act as executor, administrator, registrar of securities, guardian of estates, assignee, receiver, committee of estates of lunatics or in any other fiduciary capacity where the amount to be initially administered by the association in any one of such capacities does not exceed one hundred thousand dollars in any individual case.

"(2) Associations exercising any or all of the powers enumerated in this subsection shall segregate all assets held in any fiduciary capacity from the general assets of the association and shall keep a separate set of books and records showing in proper detail all transactions engaged in under authority of this subsection. The State official or body having supervisory authority over State-chartered savings and loan-type associations in the State may have access to reports of examination made by the Board insofar as such reports relate to the trust department of such association, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed as authorizing such State official or body to examine the books, records or assets of such association.

"(3) No association shall receive in its trust department deposits of current funds subject to check or the deposit of checks, drafts, bills of exchange or other items for collection or exchange purposes. Funds deposited or held in trust by the association awaiting investment shall be carried in a separate account and shall not be used by the association in the conduct of its business unless it shall first set aside in the trust department United States bonds or other securities approved by the Board, and the association is hereby authorized so to set aside such bonds or other securities.

"(4) In the event of the failure of such association the owners of the funds held in trust for investment shall have a lien on the bonds or other securities so set apart in addition to their claims against the estate of the association.

"(5) Whenever the laws of a State require corporations acting in a fiduciary capacity to deposit securities with the State authorities for the protection of private or court trusts, associations so acting shall be required to make similar deposits and securities so deposited shall be held for the protection of private or court trusts, as provided by the State law. Associations in such cases shall not be required to execute the bond usually required of individuals if State corporations under similar circumstances are exempt from this requirement. Associations shall have power to execute such bond when so required by the laws of the State.

"(6) In any case in which the laws of a State require that a corporation acting as trustee, executor, administrator, or in any capacity specified in this section, shall take an oath or make an affidavit, the president, vice president, treasurer, or trust officer of such association may take the necessary oath or execute the necessary affidavit.

"(7) It shall be unlawful for any association to lend any officer, director or employee any funds held in trust under the powers conferred by this section. Any officer director or employee making such loan, or to whom such loan is made, may upon conviction be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years or may be both so fined and imprisoned, in the discretion of the court.

"(8) In passing upon applications for permission to exercise the powers enumerated in this subsection, the Board may take into consideration the amount of capital and surplus of the applying association, whether or not such capital and surplus is sufficient under the circumstances of the case, the need of individuals in the community to be served and any other facts and circumstances that seem to it proper, and may grant or refuse the application accordingly.

"(9) Any association desiring to surrender its right to exercise the powers granted under this subsection or to have returned to it any securities which it may have deposited with the State authorities for the protection of private or court trusts or for any other purpose, may file with the Board a certified copy of a resolution of its board of directors signifying such desire. Upon receipt of such resolution, the Board, after satisfying itself

that such association has been relieved in accordance with State law of all duties as trustee, executor, administrator, registrar of stocks and bonds, guardian of estates, assignee, receiver, committee of estates of lunatics or other fiduciary, under court, private or other appointments previously accepted under authority of this subsection may, in its discretion, issue to such association a certificate certifying that such association is no longer authorized to exercise the powers granted by this subsection. Upon the issuance of such a certificate by the Board, such association (A) shall no longer be subject to the provisions of this subsection or the regulations of the Board made pursuant thereto, (B) shall be entitled to have returned to it any securities which it may have deposited with the State authorities for the protection of private or court trusts, and (C) shall not exercise thereafter any of the powers granted by this subsection without first applying for and obtaining a new permit to exercise such powers pursuant to the provisions of this subsection.

"(10) The Board is authorized and empowered to promulgate such regulations as it may deem necessary to enforce compliance with the provisions of this subsection and the proper exercise of the powers granted therein."

Sec. 6. Small Business Loans. Section 5 of said Act is amended by inserting the following new provisions as subsection (e):

"(e) An association may make any loan for a business purpose in a principal amount not exceeding twenty-five thousand dollars; provided, however, that to extend the portion of such a loan in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars has the benefit of insurance by the Small Business Administration, the principal amount may be increased to not exceeding one hundred and fifty thousand dollars."

Sec. 7. Credit Cards. Section 5 of said Act is amended by inserting the following new provisions as subsection (f):

"(f) An association may issue credit cards, either directly or through a corporation in which it has a proprietary interest, under such conditions as shall be provided in regulations to be issued by the Board."

Sec. 8. Insurance. Section 5 of said Act is amended by inserting the following new provisions as subsection (g):

"(g) Insurance. Any association may act as agent for any fire, life or other insurance company of any type authorized by the authorities of the State in which the association is located to do business in said State, by soliciting and selling insurance and collecting premiums on policies issued by such company; and may receive for services so rendered such fees or commissions as may be agreed upon between the association and the insurance company for which it may act as agent."

Sec. 9. Relettering. Section 5 of said Act is amended by relettering subsections (d) to (k) as subsections (h) to (o), respectively.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

A bill to better enable savings and loan associations to serve the public

THE SAVINGS AND LOAN ACT OF 1971

Sec. 2. Declaration of Purpose. More public needs should be served by savings and loan associations, so the following additional powers are granted to such association.

Sec. 3. Federal Stock Associations. Amends section 5(a) and (b) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to authorize the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to charter Federal stock savings and loan associations as well as Federal mutual associations and to authorize that Board to permit conversion of a Federal mutual to a Federal stock association. (Existing statutory provisions continue in effect that authorize a State-chartered mutual association to convert to a

Federal charter which could be either mutual or stock under this bill; and that authorize a Federal association (either mutual or stock under this bill) to convert to a State-chartered association. See section 5(1), Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933.)

Sec. 4. Demand Deposits. Amends section 5(b) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to authorize Federal savings and loan associations to accept demand deposits. Parallels the Federal Reserve Act in allowing Federal Home Loan Bank Board to require reserves against such deposits in the range of 10 to 22% in reserve cities and 7 to 14% in non-reserve cities. Allows Federal Home Loan Bank Board to define reserve city and demand deposits and allows it to let non-reserve requirements apply to associations in reserve cities on basis of the character of business transacted. Lists 6 classes of media in which reserves can be held; namely, demand deposits in Federal Home Loan Banks, Federal Reserve Banks or FDIC-insured banks, full faith Federal obligations maturing within 7 years, items in transit and U.S. coins and currency. Prohibits payment of interest on demand deposits. Allow Federal Reserve Banks to receive from associations checks and other paper for exchange or collection.

Sec. 5. Trust Powers. Amends section 5 of Home Owners' Loan Act to authorize the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to permit Federal savings and loan associations to exercise full trust powers for trusts originated for not over \$100,000. In acting upon applications for trust powers, Board must follow same criteria used by Comptroller of the Currency in acting on applications for trust powers submitted by national banks. These include sufficiency of capital and surplus and needs of the community to be served. Other requirements parallel those applicable to national banks, with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board serving as the regulatory agency for Federal savings and loan associations.

Sec. 6. Small Business Loans. Amends section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to authorize Federal savings and loan associations to make loans for business purposes up to \$25,000 each (or up to \$150,000 each if the excess over \$25,000 is insured by the Small Business Administration).

Sec. 7. Credit Cards. Amends section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to authorize Federal Savings and loan associations to issue credit cards under Federal Home Loan Bank Board regulations. Issuance may be by the association directly or through a corporation in which it has an ownership interest. This parallels the similar authority extended to national banks by regulations issued by the Comptroller of the Currency.

Sec. 8. Insurance. Amends section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to authorize Federal savings and loan associations to act as agents for any insurance company authorized to do business in the State where the association is located. The associations could solicit and sell insurance, collect premiums and receive fees from the company for its services.

Sec. 9. This is a technical provision to accomplish relettering of subsection numbers made necessary by the amendments the bill makes to section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

PRESIDENT'S 1972 BUDGET

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the 1,112 pages of the appendix to the President's budget which is the size of the Cleveland telephone book, I have found it to be a document containing elements of surprise and mystery.

We have been advised that the budget provides an \$11.6 billion deficit. If the estimate of the 1972 deficit is as erroneous as the nonexpansionary deficit estimate of 1971, the real deficit spending should be in the area of \$20 to \$25 billion.

Every American must be concerned with the manner in which a planned deficit is spent. Our experience has shown that deficit spending can lead to full employment and recovery—a desirable goal—or it may lead to accelerated inflation, depression, and vastly increased unemployment and the resultant erosion of savings.

The question which this budget poses is—which shall it be and where will it lead?

It has always been my belief that unemployment could be best challenged by stimulating consumer spending to bring factories up to their capacities. At present, factories are at 75-percent capacity while unemployment is at 6 percent.

Just before submitting this budget, the President—by a single stroke of his pen—gave all industries and corporations an additional \$3.5 to \$4 billion annual tax writeoff in depreciation, in an effort to stimulate the increase in productive capacity which was already 25-percent idle.

DOES THE NIXON BUDGET FOR 1972 STIMULATE DEMAND?

For example, the President recommends a 6 percent increase in social security benefits. This recommendation completely ignores the added inflationary impact of 1970—a year in which there was no new social security legislation. The elderly have a decreased spending and support capacity. Administration policies have forced new millions of our elderly into poverty.

Last year Congress passed a \$9.2 billion manpower training program to provide jobs in the public service. This was a clear congressional mandate resulting in gainful employment for millions of people. The allocation for this program would have provided a multiplier effect many times the Federal investment. Although the President vetoed this approach, there appears to be no alternative approach in the expansionary budget to reach the large number of unemployed.

The budget approach increases defense spending by about \$3 billion.

Obviously there is no peace dividend from our reduced combat force and disengagement. There are indications that the savings in reduced American combat forces are being utilized to pay our way out of Vietnam. For the second year, we are paying \$2.5 billion to: First, support Vietnamese and other free-world forces in support of Vietnamese forces; second, local forces in Laos and Thailand.

A detailed examination of military procurement shows case after case of increased requests:

Modification of combat aircraft—\$269.3 million to \$439 million.

Navy auxiliaries—\$382 million to \$1.017 billion.

Air Force ballistic missiles—\$587.2 million to \$842 million.

Increased spending is outlined in almost all categories in page after page of the budget. It seems that every office in the Department of Defense is asking for an increase at a time when we are supposed to be deescalating the war in Southeast Asia.

There are some encouraging proposals in the budget. For example, the Public Health Service Act provides for a substantial increase—almost doubling previous allocations. The commitment of \$100 million to cancer research is helpful—even though only one-third will be committed in fiscal year 1972. Headstart allocations are increased—although this is difficult to reconcile with reduced and terminated programs of Headstart and day care in my own community.

The start-up costs for welfare reform are estimated at \$580.7 million—probably for a half year—with no projection for future costs.

One of the budget mysteries is how medicaid can be reduced by \$495 million by providing a proposed preventive medical program with no price tag.

In addition, the budget provides a medicare saving of \$450 million through a cost control program suggesting use of most efficient providers of service. It is my hope that this bill will not result in an increased assumption of the cost of medical care to patients.

This budget anticipates an extensive sell-off of Federal property as a means of providing a one-time credit to the budget. For example, the budget proposes a sale of National and Dulles Airports and the Alaska Railroad at their depreciated value—\$205 million will buy these three items. For the sake of this credit to the budget, the taxpayers of America stand to lose as much as \$400 million. In addition, the budget contemplates the sale of \$635 million in surplus property—an event which many of us in Congress have long demanded, if the sale price and terms are fair to the taxpayer.

One touchy economy in the budget is the elimination of the free milk program which provides some nutrition to all children.

I am, of course, pleased that the President's budget maintains the levels of the school lunch program, the school breakfast program, and the nonschool lunch program which I authored. That program served 100 million meals to more

than 500,000 children in America during the last year.

I am, of course, pleased that the budget terminates the helium procurement program which saves the taxpayer \$42 million per year for the duration of the contracts—thus estimated to save a total of \$436 million during the life of the contracts.

There appears to be substantial increases in allocations for capital facilities grants for mass transit—\$129.4 million to \$381.3 million. The total capital obligation has been increased from \$246 million to \$600 million. After long years of struggle, the President is asking for \$2 billion per year for pollution control and the construction of waste treatment plants. This is \$500 million less than the proposal which I supported in Congress.

In recapitulating the budget, my fears remain that the higher deficit expenditures will not achieve the goals of recovery.

Higher spending without direction does not necessarily increase employment. Misdirected spending can wreck the economy by fueling inflation while joblessness continues. At this reading of the budget, the thrust of the President's budget program must be subject to serious question.

NATIONAL WEEK OF CONCERN FOR PRISONERS OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to introduce a resolution which has received wide, bipartisan support for Members of the House of Representatives, designating the week of March 21 to 27 as a "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action."

In the last Congress, I stood before this body in support of a concurrent resolution expressing our strong concern at the lack of compliance with the requirements of the Geneva Convention relating to the treatment of our captured men. I am glad to recall that both the House and the Senate overwhelmingly approved the resolution. Seemingly, public opinion has at least stirred up North Vietnam to the extent that there have been some unofficial communications regarding certain of our POW's. These actions fall far short of the requirements that should be met. However, it is indicative of the force that public opinion can have.

Accordingly, I wholeheartedly support focusing both public and political concern for the present situation. I am sure that the 18 families in the San Antonio area part of which I represent, and their 31 children, join me today in urging that we swiftly consider and pass this resolution. I am sure that the relatives and friends of the over 1,600 Americans listed as prisoners of war/missing in action in Southeast Asia earnestly welcome our support for this resolution. Let us reassert our commitment that we have not forgotten our POW/MIA's.

BENIGN NEGLECT

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the "White House Negro" is no longer with the President—but Mr. Nixon, in his hour-long discussion with four newsmen recently, left no doubt that the policy of benign neglect of black Americans shall prevail through this new year and new Congress.

The President said Daniel P. Moynihan, who coined the phrase "benign neglect" in his most public memo on race relations, got a "bad rap" for his recommendation that the administration not "react" to racial "violence" or to "extremists"—but act. And then Mr. Nixon asserted that Mr. Moynihan was so committed to racial justice that he was called the White House Negro by fellow staff members.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we never did misunderstand the recommendation—which is why we took issue with it. Certainly, the observation that Nixon turned "benign" neglect into "malignant" neglect of black Americans can be made. And it should be pointed out that whether any policy or move made by the Federal Government constitutes an "action" or "reaction" is a matter for academic debate.

What would we term the new environmental protection laws and regulations—if not a reaction? The coal mine safety law, the postal reform law, the new consumer protection laws, aid to Cambodia and Israel—do these laws and policies constitute "acts" or "reaction." The Federal Government, in each case, was responding to a need it deemed legitimate and critical.

Quibbling over whether this administration will "react or act" in behalf of racial justice is pointless. Defense or discussion of the Moynihan memo is a similar waste. Obvious in all this and in the President's comments on fair housing and school desegregation enforcement is that black Americans can look forward to more of the same from this administration—call it a punitive backlash or call it pure racism.

The President has refused audience to the black Members of Congress as we have repeatedly requested—on the grounds that we, the elected and legitimate representatives of 25 million Americans, are "extremists." And in every area of our most critical needs—housing, education, employment, and job training—the President has either vetoed or cut funds and programs.

An extremist to this administration is anyone who voices views opposed to those of the President—and that puts the black populace on the shelf alongside the Kerner Commission report—to collect dust. The belief held by this administration that black Americans can be dismissed because "they" know what is best for us is not only pathetic, but a dangerous contributor to the potential for violence which exists in the black communities of the Nation.

The President proclaimed that 1971 will be a "good year," second only to 1972 which he claims will be a "very good year." If one is white, educated, able, and free, he might put some stock in the President's words. But if you are black, jobless, and raising a family in a slum housing infested by rats, the turnover in the calendar year will go unnoticed.

The current leadership of this Nation has engineered a time machine for black Americans, like a treadmill. Racial justice to this President means doing what Federal civil rights laws passed before his term absolutely require—giving strict interpretations to the limits of fair housing and desegregation laws—and strict adherence to the minimums necessary.

NATIONAL FARMERS ORGANIZATION

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, recently my colleague, Senator HAROLD E. HUGHES, addressed the annual convention of the National Farmers Organization in Louisville, Ky. His remarks called needed attention to the frequently overlooked problem of the family farmer in an increasingly urbanized society. Moreover, I believe the Senator's address deals with some of the basic challenges facing institutions and individuals in American society today, and I welcome the opportunity to share his perceptive observations with the Members of the Congress. I insert it in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HAROLD E. HUGHES, NATIONAL FARMERS ORGANIZATION ANNUAL CONVENTION, LOUISVILLE, KY., DECEMBER 17, 1970

You know—some of my friends keep saying:

"We've got to get Hughes off the drugs!" They think I've concentrated so much on the subject of drug and alcohol abuse, since I went to the Senate 23 months ago, that I'm in danger of becoming a one-issue Senator.

I am a one issue Senator. And I see no danger in it. For there is only one issue.

The survival of America. The real tragedy about drug and alcohol abuse in America is not that it is a problem. The tragedy is that—for increasing millions of Americans—drug and alcohol abuse is the answer.

The evidence is everywhere—in broken minds and bodies and lives—that it is a sad and lonely and unhappy answer.

The wrong answer. But it is the only answer for millions. So confused and so leaderless have we become that the answer has been mistaken for the problem; and the answer, being the wrong answer, has been added to the problem.

The challenge for America's leadership—whether in the rural areas of our country or in the great cities, in the Congress or in the White House—the challenge is to identify the real problems in America today, and to seek the real answers.

And to do this with understanding, faith, and feeling—not with meanness and divisiveness.

What are the real problems?

What are the best answers?

It would be better for you to tell me, than for me to try to tell you.

The only justification for a United States Senator to go criss-crossing the country, as I have been doing for nearly two years, is not to preach to the people, but to listen to them.

To gather strength from people like you. From people who care.

Former Secretary Hickel was asked on national TV the other day whether President Nixon was a man who cared.

Hickel replied in effect that the President did care—insofar as he was able to care—considering the limited input of compassion from those around him.

The implication of that statement—that the President is surrounded and isolated by those who keep him from caring—is as chilling as anything I have heard in the long months of hearings by my Subcommittee into the loneliness and suffering and alienation that turns people to the abuse of drugs and alcohol.

The tendency toward isolation is an inbuilt hazard of high office. This applies especially to the presidency of the United States, the most powerful office in the world . . . and the loneliest.

Only by reaching out with powerful compassion can the Commander-in-Chief surmount the isolation and feel the problems that people have. Knowing the awesome burdens of the office, we can only pray that every President will, at some point, find the way to pierce the walls of his high office and communicate with the people on the level of personal feeling. This is what our nation needs desperately now. In the midst of old and new anxieties, we, the people, are lonely and isolated too . . . reaching for leadership that cares.

And no group in our country is pleading more passionately for leadership and for a fair understanding of their real problems than the American farmers. Unfortunately, the pleas of the farmers often fall on deaf ears in Washington, these days.

They should build a statue to the fellow who dreamed up the new bumper sticker that reads: "The Majority Is Not Silent—The Government Is Just Deaf."

It was just one hundred years ago—in 1871—that the first rumblings of discontent began to be heard across the American hinterland.

These were rumblings about the growing concentration of wealth and power accumulating in the hands of industrial giants—rumblings about government institutions that were growing increasingly unresponsive to the needs of the individual.

These rumblings were to intensify over the following twenty years into a full-scale uprising by the American farmer—a farmer-revolution—a revolution against powerful interests that were abusing their power and, in the process, strangling the farmer.

The victories won in that first farmer-revolution are well-known: control over the railroads, political reforms that made government more responsive to the individual, economic reforms that enabled the farmer—for a while at least—to prosper.

One hundred years later—as we enter 1971—the American farmer faces a similar crisis. But unfortunately, this time he does not have the luxury of twenty or thirty years to achieve the second farmer-revolution. And let us make no mistake, no less than a second farmer-revolution—peaceful but forceful—will be necessary to save the American family farmer.

The farmer-revolution of the last century was accomplished for one reason. The small farmers, faced with extinction, united and organized. Together they constituted a

counter-force, as powerful and effective as the massive conglomeration that they were fighting.

Today, the dangers are just as serious, the opposition just as powerful, and the stakes—survival—just as high. But the odds have shifted. A majority of the population one hundred years ago, the farmer now represents a shrinking minority. And for embattled minorities, even more than for embattled majorities, organization is imperative.

This is the nature of the second farmer-revolution—the one being spearheaded by the National Farmers Organization. "Farmer power" through organization.

The forces which confront the American farmer are not unlike those in that earlier struggle. Buyers, processors, and retailers of farm products are even more concentrated today than before. Perhaps on the surface they show less guts than the moguls of the 1870's, whose attitude was capsulized by Cornelius Vanderbilt's answer to his critics: "What do I care about the law? Ain't I got the power?"

Today, there are better public relations departments.

But the fact remains that farmers are helpless in the marketplace unless they work together. Together, they have a chance to control their own livelihoods, their own destinies. Divided, they will, as Ben Franklin said, all hang separately.

This, I believe, is the fundamental importance of the National Farmers Organization, and the guiding principle of the new farmer-revolution.

This is by no means to say that government does not have a vital role to play. Farmers can only bargain together effectively if government helps in the task of keeping production in balance with consumption.

Government—the federal government specifically—must clearly and unequivocally dedicate itself to the proposition that those who produce our food and fiber have an unquestioned right to economic equality with those who consume it. And government must step in to avoid economic exploitation of the farmer by those who have been able to concentrate economic power in their hands.

But farmers are now learning the lesson that James Madison offered as we launched this nation nearly 200 years ago: "It is in vain to say," he wrote, "that enlightened statesmen will be able to adjust these *clashing interests* and render them all subservient to the public good. *Enlightened statesmen will not always be at the helm.*"

Yes, the second farmer-revolution needs the assistance of government. It's foolish to junk the old car until you have a new one in the driveway. But farmers are now realizing that—as the current phrase has it—they must "get themselves together," because as Madison said—and we have discovered—enlightened statesmen are not always at the helm.

Let there be no illusions about what is at stake—no less than the survival of the family farmer in this country.

Now, some say—and others quietly believe without saying—that there is no room in this country for the family farmer. That is a proposition which I totally reject.

Some would say that the family farmer must be sacrificed on the altar of some "higher economics." From some corners comes the notion that in the name of Efficiency, we should return to the jungle of a modern-day survival of the fittest. And one of the bitter ironies is that such notions are advanced by those who claim to speak on behalf of farmers. Our society has come too far to retreat so fully.

It is simply untrue that efficiency is increased when family farmers are "adjusted" out of business. It is *decreased*. And when

the farmer folds, he is often forced to leave rural America for the city, taking with him other rural nonfarmers who depend upon him for their livelihood.

Our cities are already sinking. And you cannot bail out a sinking ship if it has a hole in its bottom. Eighty percent of the nation's population *already* lives on 10 percent of our land, suffering from innumerable pollutions, personal tensions, and deteriorating living conditions. There are eleven acres of land for every man, woman, and child in this country, but most people exist on only a few square yards.

A recent Gallup poll showed that six of every ten people living in our metropolitan areas would rather live in the country. But how can we reverse that flow unless, as a nation, we can save the livelihoods of those who are already living in our rural areas, the working farmers, and make their economic situation prosperous enough to keep young people from leaving?

We must save the family farmer, then, because we must save our rural areas and save our cities. But there is a deeper reason, a reason that goes to the essential fiber of American life.

The basic question which we face in the 1970's is whether individuals can retain control of the kind of lives they wish to live.

The farmers forced off their land do not want to leave. I have never seen a happy farmer boarding up his barns. The struggle is for no less than self-determination, the right of each man to choose the kind of life he wishes to lead—on the farm if that is his choice; or in the city, but *only if that is his choice*.

This is the challenge we face: Can we save America for Americans? It is the *same* question posed by those who wish to drive in safe automobiles and therefore fight to make our large corporations responsive to their customers' desires. It is the *same* question posed by those who wish to breathe clean air and drink clean water and therefore fight against giant industrial entities who would disregard the human costs of irresponsible practices.

We have spent the lives of 50,000 American boys and 170 billion American dollars for the principle—we are told—of establishing self-determination for the *Vietnamese* people. We face in the 70's the challenge of establishing that right for the *American* people. This is why we must save the family farmer in this country.

The plight of the small farmer reminds me in some ways of the famous legend of Sisyphus. You remember that Sisyphus was fated to the task of pushing a giant rock to the top of a very steep mountain. But each time he almost reached the top, the weight of the rock overpowered him and pushed him down to the bottom again.

In the case of the American farmer, unfortunately, *some* farm people seem to be sitting on the rock instead of pushing.

The National Farmers Organization has begun to get farmers together for the long push. It is a vital one, one that I fully endorse, and one to which I pledge my continued support.

When I first came to Washington, some of my new Eastern friends had hopes that I might turn out to be the best of the West.

When they found that I wouldn't reform my rough ways, they concluded that I had become the Beast of the East.

Seriously, I believe it is time for people to speak bluntly, using the right words.

It is true that this nation is faced with critical, overpowering problems today—some of which, like the drug epidemic, we have not faced before.

It is equally true that this nation has the resources to meet those problems—and meet them we will. I am convinced.

The sun will come up ten years from today

over Paducah, Kentucky, and Corning, Iowa, just as it came up today.

This nation will experience declines—it's in a beauty right now—but it is not going to fall like the Roman Empire.

Why?

Because we may act like fools a good share of the time, but in the long run we have the strength of heart and hand to pull ourselves out of it.

Early in this Administration, President Nixon made what I considered one of the greatest statements made by any President—that he was going to raise the *quality* of living for all Americans.

Unfortunately, that pledge seems to have been forgotten, but the concept is still great.

For in this land, founded on concepts of freedom and equality, it is the *quality* of life that has made us a great people—not the bigness or the power.

I thought of this yesterday when I read the morning headlines telling of President Nixon's announcement that the Gross National Product had passed the trillion dollar figure.

With pomp and circumstance, Mr. Nixon hailed "the first trillion-dollar economy for any nation in the history of the world."

It is ironic that this lavish announcement came at a time when industrial production had dropped for the fourth straight month to the lowest level since the 1960-61 recession; when unemployment is nearing six per cent; when farm prices are at their lowest parity level since the depression years of the 1930's; when farm debt is at an all time high; when the human value programs of education, health care, medical research, equal opportunity, and pollution control are being cut back so that we can sink billions into such foolish luxuries as the supersonic transport.

As Edward Abbey put it, "Growth for the sake of growth is the ideology of the cancer cell."

The real priority is not magnitude or power or splendor . . . but quality of living for all Americans.

I have no doubt that we can and will get back on the mainline again toward fulfilling that dream of this special kind of greatness that is in the hearts of all Americans.

I am encouraged by this great meeting here.

If I am any judge, you did not come here to participate in the surrender of America's future.

OPERATION LIFELINE

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise in support of the bill presented by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL), H.R. 100, to provide grants-in-aid to assist in building needed municipal facilities.

Mr. McFALL's bill will begin to do something that I have long suggested as a remedy for the ills of our economy—stimulate the economy by investing public funds in building vitally needed facilities. I can think of no nobler way for Congress to invest money than to build the pollution control facilities that could be aided by this bill. Let us continue to do

as this bill provides—put our money where our real needs are.

Restoring an active economy is the sincere desire of both parties. I sincerely hope, therefore, that Members on both sides of the aisle will join me and Mr. McFALL in supporting this meaningful bill. Let us give the unemployed workers in America a chance to engage in work that will build things of lasting value—and a chance to have a firsthand pride in themselves and America again.

ALCOHOLICS ANONYMOUS FOUNDER DIES

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent article in the Washington Post by Mr. Donald E. Graham concerning the passing of Mr. William G. Wilson. Known to thousands of thankful admirers and followers as Bill W., Mr. Wilson was the cofounder of Alcoholics Anonymous, the organization which has provided guidance, hope, and a new start to those individuals striving to rid themselves and their families of the crushing burden of alcoholism.

Bill W., himself an alcoholic, dedicated the final 36 years of his life to helping others deal with their alcohol problems. Perhaps the greatest tribute that can be paid to Mr. Wilson lies in the outstanding success of Alcoholics Anonymous. Presently the organization has half a million members, a shining example of the worthiness of the program Bill W. founded and of the faith individuals place in its methods.

Mr. Wilson, however, was not one to think his success was total. His humility and his concern for the number of alcoholics not reached by Alcoholics Anonymous was demonstrated at a Senate hearing in 1969. He stated that his organization had just made "a scratch on the surface" in attacking the problem of alcoholism.

The Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 was recognition of the seriousness of the alcoholic problem. It was Bill W.'s fervent wish that this bill and the focusing of Government attention on the problem of alcoholism will greatly aid those individuals suffering from the hardships of alcoholism.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans owe a debt of gratitude to the dedication and concern of Bill W. Congress has recognized the extent of the problem and I sincerely hope that we continue to work to solve the problem that Mr. Wilson recognized and strove to conquer. I am inserting Mr. Graham's article in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues:

KNOWN TO THOUSANDS AS BILL W.: ALCOHOLICS ANONYMOUS FOUNDER DIES

(By Donald E. Graham)

Scores of thousands of people learned for the first time the name of the man who helped them recover from alcoholism when William Griffith Wilson died of pneumonia in a Miami Hospital Sunday night.

The New York headquarters of Alcoholics Anonymous announced that Mr. Wilson, a retired securities analyst, was the man known as Bill W., who co-founded the AA in 1935.

Mr. Wilson lived in Bedford Hills, N.Y. He was 75.

Thirty-six years ago, Mr. Wilson took his last drink, ending a career of alcoholism that dated back to his days as an officer in the First World War.

Mr. Wilson went into a New York City hospital and was detoxified—but fell into a severe depression:

"Finally it seemed to me as though I were at the very bottom of the pit," he later wrote. "All at once I found myself crying out, 'If there is a God, let him show himself! I am ready to do anything, anything!'"

"Suddenly the room lit up with a great white light. It seemed to me, in the mind's eye, that I was on a mountain and that a wind, not of air, but of spirit was blowing. And then it burst upon me that I was a free man.

"I thought to myself, 'So this is the God of the preachers.'"

Bill W. did not wait long before sharing his experience with a friend, AA's other cofounder, Dr. Robert Holbrook Smith of Akron, Ohio. Once Smith stopped drinking, the two men felt they knew that alcoholics could help each other recover.

They went to an Akron hospital and met a patient who had come in suffering from delirium tremens. He too got off and stayed off, and helping fellow alcoholics recover became the AA tradition.

"They started a chain reaction, one drunk helping another," Nancy O., a congressional assistant, said yesterday. "The hand that reached out to me when I appealed for help was a link in the chain going back to Bill W. and Dr. Bob."

Bill A., an Arlington businessman, recalled that in December, 1939, when Alcoholics Anonymous was a small, little-known group, he went to New York to meet Mr. Wilson. The next month Mr. Wilson helped start an AA chapter here, the fourth in the country.

"He came here many times to help us with our problems," Bill A. said, and later, when the national AA organization faced a financial crisis, the Washington chapter came up with the funds to rescue it.

Alcoholics Anonymous now has half a million members worldwide. "It's by far the most successful resource of help in terms of the number of people they've treated," said Augustus Hewlett, executive secretary of the North American Association of Alcoholism Programs.

Mr. Wilson retired as director of the organization in 1962.

His first book, "Alcoholics Anonymous," written when the group had only 100 members, has sold more than 800,000 copies since it was first printed in 1939. His other books were "Twelve Steps and Twelve Traditions," "Alcoholics Anonymous Comes of Age," and "The A.A. Way of Life."

Mr. Wilson went to great lengths to preserve his anonymity. When he testified in 1969 before a congressional committee investigating alcoholism, television cameras were barred and photographs were permitted only from behind.

He turned down honorary degrees and refused to have his picture on the cover of

Time magazine in order to preserve his group's tradition of avoiding publicity as individuals.

Mr. Wilson never gave up his efforts at helping alcoholics recover. One desperate alcoholic once committed suicide in Mr. Wilson's home. Thousands of others stopped drinking and resumed the lives that alcoholism had interrupted.

Mr. Wilson was not boastful about his successes. "When you consider the enormous ramifications of this disease, we have just made a scratch on the surface," he told a Senate committee in 1969.

He was pleased by the increased government attention to alcoholism that followed the election of Harold Hughes, a recovered alcoholic, as senator from Iowa. "This is splashdown day for Apollo," he said when Hughes first held hearings on alcoholism. "The impossible is happening."

One Washington member of AA said yesterday, "I don't think there's a person in AA, from Harold Hughes to the man on the Bowery, who doesn't know that if it wasn't for Bill W. and what he started, we'd all be dead."

Mr. Wilson is survived by his wife Lois, who remained with him during his period of drunkenness and helped start the "Al-Anon" program for families of alcoholics.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSED CLOSING OF U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITALS A SERIOUS MISTAKE

HON. PAUL S. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed to see in the Federal budget submitted today by the President that it is proposed to close the Nation's Public Health Service hospitals. These facilities, which are located in eight cities—Boston, New York, Baltimore, Norfolk, New Orleans, Galveston, San Francisco, and Seattle—have consistently provided first-class medical care to seamen, active and retired personnel of the uniformed services—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and Environmental Science Services Administration—and dependents of such personnel. In addition, the Public Health Service hospitals have increasingly played a significant role in meeting the other health-care needs of the communities in which they are located.

For a number of weeks there have been rumors, confirmed today with submission of the budget, that the administration was planning to close the Public Health Service hospitals. Upon first hearing these reports I sent the following letter to Secretary Richardson of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare expressing my concern about this matter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 23, 1970.
HON. ELLIOTT L. RICHARDSON,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As a Congressman-elect, I am writing this letter to follow up conversations I have had with members of

your staff over the last few days concerning the rumors that the Department intends to close the nation's Public Health Service hospitals. In response to my expressions of grave concern about such a step, I was assured by your departmental representatives that no decision has yet been made in this matter. This "no-decision" status was, of course, confirmed by you yesterday morning in your telegram to Chairman Garmatz of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

In that telegram you also stated a willingness to discuss this matter with Chairman Garmatz—and I assume other members of the Congress—before proceeding to take any action. In light of this undertaking and the fact that no decision has been made I should like to bring to your attention certain information concerning the activities of the Baltimore Public Health Service Hospital and the medical care situation generally in the Baltimore area.

The Public Health Service Hospital in Baltimore was built in 1932 and provides, pursuant to law, services for the classes of people for whom the Federal Government has assumed medical care responsibility. These include seamen (the original beneficiaries of the public health service), personnel—both active and retired—of the Uniformed Services (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast Guard, Public Health Service and Environmental Science Services Administration), and dependents of such personnel. Since Baltimore is one of the nation's major ports and since this area has a great number of facilities involving the Uniformed Services, e.g. Coast Guard station, military establishments, etc., the number of people entitled to Public Health Service care under existing Federal law is quite large. Last year approximately 4200 people were admitted to the Hospital and there were over 108,000 clinic visits. The Maryland Hospital Association in telegrams to the Administration has clearly stated that private hospitals in the Baltimore area would be unable to absorb the caseload of the P.H.S. hospital should it be closed. Furthermore, any thought of shifting such a caseload to the Veterans Hospital is illusory because that hospital is already confronted with severe problems in meeting its current responsibilities.

Perhaps of greater importance in considering the role of the Baltimore P.H.S. hospital is that it has been one of the most innovative hospitals in the state. The Department hardly needs reminding that the provision of medical care is one of the primary issues facing the country. The P.H.S. hospital in Baltimore is an outstanding facility which has taken the lead and initiative in a number of respects:

1. The Hospital has been involved in planning with community groups for the establishment of comprehensive prepaid health program in an inner city area where the availability of private medical services is almost non-existent. This area, Homestead-Montebello, is a changing neighborhood (now 75% black) and the Hospital, in cooperation with the community, has evolved a plan which is now ready for implementation. A newspaper article describing this important development is enclosed herewith. Closing of the hospital would terminate this breakthrough in medical care delivery, dash the hopes and expectations of neighborhood people who have worked hard to evolve the program, and intensify already severe health care problems.

2. Early this year the Hospital established a Health Evaluation Center which gives patients comprehensive health examinations, including an evaluation by a physician, in just two and one-half hours. Through the use of automated procedures the Health Evaluation Center is able to provide health examinations and evaluations in a fraction of the time and with fewer personnel than

would be required in a conventional clinic. This Center makes use during evening hours of the Hospital's general clinic space, thereby maximizing the use of existing hospital facilities. I am certain you will agree that this emphasis on preventive medicine is one very important way by which the cost of medical care can be reduced.

3. The only school for Medical Record Librarians in Maryland is at the Public Health Service Hospital and I believe it is the only such school under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. The program is generally acknowledged to be of outstanding quality and again represents a significant contribution to an improved health care delivery system.

4. The Hospital has close working relations with the schools in the area, including not only the medical schools but also the community colleges. Such efforts to develop health care personnel through community college programs is generally viewed as a significant way to meet the critical shortage of personnel in the field. Furthermore the Hospital in cooperation with the Baltimore City Department of Education under a grant pursuant to the Manpower Development and Training Act has trained over 150 hard-core unemployed poverty people as nurses aides, all of whom were subsequently placed in jobs.

5. The Baltimore Cancer Research Center which is financed by the National Institutes of Health is located at the Hospital and is jointly administered by N.I.H. and the Hospital. Closing of the Hospital would terminate this major research center into one of the major sources of death and illness confronting our population.

There are a number of other important activities in which the Hospital is engaged but I will forbear adding to the length of this letter. It should be noted that the Hospital employs 661 persons and, more importantly, that over 40% of the civilian employees are minority group members. The Hospital has had a very active equal employment opportunity program which has achieved very significant results. Employee morale at the Hospital is extremely high in large part, I believe, because of the recognition by the Baltimore community of the Hospital's high quality.

Given the medical care problems facing the nation today the closing of the Public Health Service hospitals, as typified by the one in Baltimore, would be a most short-sighted and regrettable step backwards. It would mean that Baltimore would lose a dynamic forward-looking medical institution which is playing a major role in facing and meeting the health care problem. Furthermore, to the extent that economy reasons are advanced for the proposed closing, the reasons are spurious for there would merely be a shifting of health costs elsewhere at greater total expense.

Before the Department proceeds any further in this matter I request that responsible officials of the Department, including Dr. Vernon E. Wilson, Administrator of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, Dr. Jesse Steinfeld, Surgeon General, and a personal representative of yours (the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs or some other appropriate designee) meet with responsible local public and private representatives including the medical community and consumers of health care to discuss the Department's reasoning and in order to bring clearly to the attention of the Department the contribution being made here by the Public Health Service Hospital. I would be glad to undertake responsibility for arranging locally for such a meeting.

There has been no independent public study recommending the closing of the Baltimore Public Health Service Hospital. In fact, the last such study, some five years ago, recommended that the facility be improved and

modernized and that its programs be strengthened and extended. Surely if the Department decision now rumored to be in the offing has merit it can withstand public scrutiny and examination. I strongly urge that any decision in this matter be deferred until such scrutiny and examination can take place.

Sincerely,

PAUL S. SARBANES,
Congressman-Elect, Maryland Fourth
Congressional District.

The President's state of the Union address with its emphasis on health care as one of the administration's great goals offered the prospect that the rumored closings would not be carried out. Unfortunately, the budget submitted today proposes actions which run counter to the objectives enunciated by the President a week ago. Consequently, I have sent the following letter to the President:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 29, 1971.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to express my deep concern over the closing of the U.S. Public Health Hospitals proposed in the budget submitted today to the Congress. As I understand it, the Administration intends to close out the eight Public Health Service Hospitals and the thirty outpatient clinics in Fiscal 1972 and will seek to shift the burden of furnishing health care now being met by these facilities to other providers of medical services.

While I can only speak in detail about the activities of the Public Health Service Hospitals in Baltimore, I do believe, based on the Baltimore situation, that the proposed closings are an action directly contradicting in many respects your State of the Union address on January 22, 1971. In that address you set forth the improving of America's health care as your fourth great goal and specifically mentioned the need to get more medical care resources into those areas that have not been adequately served.

The Baltimore Public Health Service Hospital, in addition to providing medical services for those classes of people for whom the Federal Government has assumed medical care responsibility, has been involved in planning with community groups for the establishment of a comprehensive prepaid health program in an inner city area where the availability of private medical services is almost non-existent. Furthermore, the hospital has been actively engaged in training medical personnel and has been carrying out your admonition for new programs to encourage better preventive medicine by establishing a unique Health Evaluation Center. All of these activities are described in greater detail in the enclosed letter which was sent some weeks ago to Secretary Richardson when rumors about the proposed closings first became public.

In your State of the Union address you also indicated that you would ask for an extra \$100 million to launch an intensive campaign to find a cure for cancer. The Baltimore Cancer Research Center, a clinical facility of the National Cancer Institute, is located at the Public Health Service Hospital in Baltimore. This research center has been doing outstanding work in the chemotherapy treatment of cancer and is an integral part of the research effort being carried on by the National Cancer Institute. Over a period of time outstanding research facilities and, more importantly, an outstanding research team have been developed, all of which are now jeopardized by the proposed action concerning the Hospital. Surely a total national commitment to

achieve the goal of conquering the dread disease of cancer requires keeping his major cancer research unit in being.

Finally, I am particularly disturbed by the lack of in-depth study by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Office of Management and Budget which seems to lie behind this decision to close the Public Health Service Hospitals. Only after the decision had apparently been reached did the Department send out fact-finding teams to look into and evaluate the particular situation in each area. At no time has there been consultation by the Department with local health planning agencies who are charged with responsibility for comprehensive health planning under the "partnership for health" concept contained in Federal legislation.

The proposed closings raise, I believe, very substantial questions as to how the Federal Government shall proceed in achieving the highly desirable goal of improving America's health care. I very much hope the Administration will recognize these questions and re-evaluate the position it has taken on the Public Health Service Hospitals.

Respectfully,

PAUL S. SARBANES,
Fourth, Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, we are told in the budget documents that the sick and disabled who have traditionally used the Public Health Service hospitals will be serviced at private and Veteran's Administration hospitals through "service agreements." Yet, it is well known that in many areas, including Baltimore, the VA hospitals are facing difficulties in meeting their present responsibilities and the private hospital sector is in no position to assume this additional burden. Consequently, it may well be the beneficiaries for whom the Federal Government has medical care responsibility who will suffer.

Furthermore, the proposed budgetary action would terminate the many innovative activities in community health care and in medical education which Public Health Service hospitals across the country have undertaken. It undercuts the expanded role for the Public Health Service envisioned by the Emergency Health Personnel Act of 1970 which was signed into law by the President on December 31, 1970. It makes more difficult the achieving of the great national goal of improving America's health care. I trust that the Congress will not allow this Executive decision to stand.

HARVEY CANAL INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION FIGHTS FOR LOUISIANA

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Second Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have the honor of representing, includes a remarkable waterway known as the Harvey Canal.

This canal, which provides a vital link in the Intracoastal Waterway, is an important factor in the economy of our region, for its banks are lined with a rich variety of industries, principally related to the petroleum industry.

Serving this area is an outstanding organization known as the Harvey Canal Industrial Association. A recent edition of Oil magazine was entirely devoted to the membership and work of this fine industrial association. I am inserting an article from that issue which describes the Harvey Canal Industrial Association, and calling it to the attention of my colleagues:

HARVEY CANAL INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION
FIGHTS FOR LOUISIANA

The Harvey Canal Industrial Association is a service organization aimed at promoting the development of business and industry in the Harvey Canal area, a prime service center for the Louisiana offshore-onshore oil industry.

Its members comprise a cross section of companies providing service and supplies to the oil patch. These services include drill pipe, drilling mud, geophysical, engineering and architectural services, transportation via rail, barge, truck and plane. It includes construction companies, both marine and onshore; suppliers of pumps, generators and a multitude of other equipment.

New officers serving the association are: Lowell Reeves, Gautier Towing Co., president; George Douglas, Loumiet Enterprises, Inc., first vice-president; Smiley Whittington, Wall Shipyard, second vice-president; Gene Bowen, Louisiana Gas Service, Inc., secretary; and Phil De Amore, Phil's Place, treasurer. Lowell Reeves succeeds John Hooper, Intracoastal Terminals, as president.

Committee chairman are: Lowell Reeves, Steering Committee; George Neilson, Drainage Comm.; Bob Becker, Roads and Bridges Comm.; George Douglas, Membership Comm.; Victor Baker, Legislative Comm.; and John Hooper, Scholarship Comm.

The drainage committee's function is to assist the members through its contacts with parish officials responsible for good drainage around the businesses in the area. The Roads and Bridges Committee seeks improved access to the expressway from service roads on either side of the Harvey Canal Tunnel and keeps in touch with state and local highway and bridge authorities. Legislative matters including the recent demands of the Louisiana oil industry to the U.S. Department of the Interior to reopen lease sales is a concern of the members handled by the Legislative Committee. Selection of the outstanding West Jefferson High male student planning to attend college will be conducted in the spring and the Scholarship Committee will award the student with a \$1200 plus scholarship.

DEFICITS AND INFLATION

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, many people would like to paraphrase Charles Dudley Warner's famous remarks, "Everybody talks about the weather, but nobody does anything about it," by substituting "inflation" for "the weather," but this would not be correct. Some of us in the Congress have tried to do something about the serious problem of inflation.

If we are just a bit patient, the weather will ameliorate. Today's lightning and thunder will be followed by the rainbow and tomorrow's sunny skies. Unfortunately, the control of inflationary

forces will not be brought about automatically, but will require a tremendous amount of self-discipline. It is up to each and every one of us to do his or her part if we want to avoid another catastrophic economic depression such as the one that continued from 1929 to 1940.

The major cause of inflation has been the irresponsible manner in which the Congress has voted for bloated authorizations and appropriations year after year, thus creating annual deficits. Those of us who worked, spoke, or voted for economy in an effort to achieve balanced budgets were severely criticized in many quarters and particularly by the left-wing news media.

It is an ironic paradox that, when the chickens have come home to roost, those who are the most vociferous in denouncing inflation are the same individuals who were the most ardent supporters of the deficit spending that inevitably led to inflation. Let us hope that they will not limit their opposition to inflation to loud and empty rhetoric. Let them instead give encouragement and support to those of us who will be laboring throughout this Congress for fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, one of the best items that I have read in a long time on the subject of inflation appeared in the December 3 issue of Iron Age. This editorial, which came from the pen of the publication's able editor-in-chief, Gene Beaudet, is so full of commonsense that I want to make it available to my colleagues:

WHO SAYS IT CANNOT HAPPEN HERE?

(By Gene Beaudet)

It is slowly dawning on the American people that the Tooth Fairy is not going to save them from inflation.

When they wake up tomorrow, they will still see their savings dwindling and their jobs gone. They'll be less secure and even the best laid plans for old age will be going up in smoke.

We are not talking only about the current inflation situation. The grim fact is that inflation in this country occurs more often, lasts longer and hits harder every time it appears.

Who's to blame?

Everybody in government is—from the county seat to the nation's capital. Party lines don't mean a thing.

Everyone is pushing his own projects. Budget restraint is left to the other guy.

No pet cause, project or boondoggle is left unsupported or without funds as the value of the dollar goes down the drain. This, more than anything else, is what causes inflation.

Still, sadly enough, many people in and out of government have gotten the idea that inflation will somehow be overcome. And it is not really a long-term problem at all.

The future will always be better, they believe. The dollar will always be sound. Devaluation will never occur.

But is this true?

History is studded with examples of countries brought to their knees by spending beyond their means. Spending more than you take in, after all, is what inflation is all about.

With chronic overspending, it is only a matter of time until inflation runs wild and currency is devalued. Chaos, revolution and changes of government often follow.

What makes this country think it can defy history? No country that persisted in living beyond its means has escaped this grim, final outcome.

Yet what do we see in the United States today?

Inflation seems to be getting worse, and no

one seems willing to join in common cause to fight it.

The Administration, the Senators and Representatives of 50 states are simply not united in their thinking and efforts to defeat this most serious of all threats to our national security.

Everyone in government has his own ideas how to beat inflation—as long as they don't conflict with the furthering of his special interests.

Fences are mended while the house is burning down.

This all adds up to spending by the billions for "very important" causes—spending beyond our ability to pay.

Where does the nation's welfare come in? How can this kind of selfish thinking cure inflation?

It hasn't. It isn't. And it won't.

What can cure inflation is a higher level of personal integrity and dedication by all the men who run the country—no matter what the political cost.

NAVY'S "DOLPHIN"—A PRODUCT OF GOOD WORKMANSHIP

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have previously reported to this body on the deep-diving submarine *Dolphin*, AGSS 555, which was designed and built by the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and is the most sophisticated deep submergence vehicle to date. Forerunner of the very deep diving combat submarine, the *Dolphin* will be able to make explorations in ocean areas where acoustic conditions are favorable for listening, ranging and detection, and collect scientific data in these hithertofore deep unexplored waters for the development of an appropriate weapons system.

The outstanding performance of this small but important ship is set forth in excerpts from a letter from the commanding officer who describes a recent voyage from Portsmouth, N.H., to San Diego, Calif.:

"DOLPHIN" SUBMARINERS REPORT ON SHIP'S PERFORMANCE ON TRIP FROM PORTSMOUTH TO SAN DIEGO

The Portsmouth-built submarine *Dolphin* (AGSS555) is assigned to Submarine Development Group One and now operates out of the Naval Underseas Research and Development Center, San Diego, Calif. *Dolphin* sailed from Portsmouth September 10, 1970 after completion of post shakedown availability. "Although we have successfully completed sea trials, a real test of the ship will be our transit to San Diego. You will hear from us upon our arrival in San Diego on the performance of *Dolphin* during the trip," stated Commander John R. Seesholtz, Commanding Officer, in a letter received by Captain Donald H. Kern, Shipyard Commander, just before *Dolphin* headed for sea.

Commander Seesholtz and the submariners who operate *Dolphin* rated work performance by Shipyard craftsmen "outstanding" before sailing and sent back another "outstanding" in the following excerpts from a letter just received by Captain Kern:

"The route selected was via Bermuda, San Juan, Panama, Acapulco and Mazatlan, Mexico. Ocean currents and prevailing winds were the primary reasons for selecting this

route as *Dolphin* is a relatively slow speed ship. Staying close to the East Coast would have meant fighting the Gulf Stream and would have lengthened the trip by at least several days.

"As *Dolphin* has many unique systems and limited storage aboard, unusual supply problems were anticipated and encountered. To provide some additional logistic support an escort, the USS Apache (ATF-67), accompanied *Dolphin* from Panama to San Diego, since no Naval Support Facilities were available to assist the ship in the ports visited on the Pacific part of the trip. In the Atlantic, some support was available in each port.

"Considering *Dolphin's* design characteristics and intended mission, the crew felt the *Dolphin* performed generally very well throughout the trip and know the ship will be prepared to carry out her mission in the Pacific very capably. She is now assigned to Submarine Development Group One and is doing sonar and oceanographic work under technical direction of the Naval Underseas Research and Development Center."

RICHARD N. GARDNER'S "FREE TRADE BY 2030"?

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Richard N. Gardner, Henry L. Moses, Professor of Law and International Organization at Columbia University, has written in the January 18, New York Times of the overwhelming challenges facing U.S. world trade worldwide:

FREE TRADE BY 2000 A.D.?

(By Richard N. Gardner)¹

We are in deep trouble in our foreign trade policy. Faced with high rates of unemployment and inflation, key sectors of American labor and industry are clamoring for import quotas. Our competitive position has deteriorated. The internationalist constituency, which once supported liberal trade initiatives necessary for America's world leadership, has been demoralized and divided by Vietnam. Many young people and intellectuals, looking inward, see free trade as a threat to disadvantage groups and social goals.

Across the Atlantic, a new economic superpower challenges what was once a U.S.-dominated trading system. Britain and three of its partners in the European Free Trade Area are likely to join the Common Market by 1973, bringing membership in the European Community from six to ten. The common external tariff and highly protectionist Common Agricultural Policy will then embrace a Community of 260 million people. And this is not all. In the process of enlargement the Common Market, which has already made preferential arrangements with more than 20 countries of the Mediterranean and Africa, is likely to make additional arrangements of this kind with the European neutrals and Commonwealth countries in Africa and the Caribbean. Thus the United States may well face a discriminatory trading bloc of fifty nations by the middle of this decade.

To complicate matters further, our trade relations have been deteriorating or at least

¹ Richard N. Gardner, Moses Professor of Law at Columbia, is the author of "Sterling-Dollar Diplomacy: The Origins and the Prospects of Our International Economic Order."

stagnating with other key elements in the world economy. We have pressured Japan to limit her exports of woolen and manmade textiles, while we have made only modest progress in our efforts to get this new economic giant to dismantle her own restrictions on imports and foreign investment. We have made scant progress in eliminating our barriers to the primary products and light manufactures of the developing countries, and the Administration's modest legislative package of tariff preferences for these countries faces an uncertain future in Congress. In our trade relations with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, we remain locked in attitudes and restrictions of the Cold War era while the Europeans get the business.

These and other challenges to our trade policy seemed to overwhelm us in 1970. The Executive branch was in an unprecedented state of disarray, with no strong leadership from the White House. Into this policy vacuum came the Mills Bill, which would have legislated quotas on textiles and shoes and paved the way for restrictions on many other products. Mercifully, the Bill did not pass, but we face similar legislation in 1971 unless there is a strong lead from the President.

There are two hopeful developments on the trade front which could help him give this lead. One is the imminent establishment of a new Foreign Economic Policy Council in the White House to develop a unified U.S. policy in place of the frequently contradictory and piecemeal efforts of the major executive agencies. The second is the report of the President's Commission on International Trade and Investment Policy which is due May 31. The findings of this group of economists, businessmen and labor leaders is designed to help the Administration develop a new trade policy for the 1970s.

What are the alternatives? Essentially, there are three main directions we can take.

The first approach is to give way to protectionist demands and adopt restrictions on a wide range of products. Internationally, this would provoke foreign restrictions against our exports—most of them quite legal—and possibly against our foreign investment. It would exacerbate the present trend toward trading blocs and disrupt the world-wide economic links which have made possible the impressive postwar growth of living standards. It would isolate us politically, as well as economically, from our friends. Domestically, it would mean that all of us as consumers would be paying higher prices to subsidize a privileged few. Our domestic inflation would be aggravated, our international competitiveness further reduced. Any gain in the relatively low-wage jobs in our import-competing industries would be offset by the loss of relatively high-wage jobs in our export industries resulting from foreign retaliation. We would have less real wealth with which to solve our pressing social problems.

The second approach, which is the one the Executive branch has followed since 1967, would be to seek authority from the Congress for very small steps forward while buying off the most insistent demands for protection with "voluntary" quotas or other special deals. This may have something to be said for it as a temporary device. But in trade policy, as in other fields, you can die from an overdose of "pragmatism." For one thing, this approach leads to arbitrary and inequitable results, since decisions tend to be made not on the merits but on the basis of political "clout." Moreover, history suggests that without some kind of "grand design" with political as well as economic appeal, it is difficult to contain protectionist pressures, much less make significant progress.

The third approach would be to establish a bold objective attached to a target date sufficiently distant to be realistic, with a program of inter-related measures to move us

irresistibly forward toward this goal in stages over the years ahead. Without underestimating the difficulties involved, I believe that objective can only be free trade among the industrialized countries, the benefits to be available without reciprocity to the developing countries on an accelerated timetable and to the Communist countries in return for appropriate economic concessions from them.

When the Kennedy round tariff cuts are completed in 1972, the majority of tariffs in Europe and the United States will be 10% or less. A free trade treaty could provide for the dismantling of these in annual installments over a period of up to ten years and the elimination of the higher tariffs over a period of up to twenty. In a very limited number of politically sensitive areas the beginning of the reductions might be delayed until 1980, but all barriers would have to be eliminated by the end of the century. With this very gradual approach, severe displacement of labor and capital would be avoided, yet there would be an irrevocable movement toward trade freedom on the basis of which people could plan.

Tariffs, of course, are now only a small part of the trade problem. A free trade program would have to include the systematic dismantling of such non-tariff barriers as quotas, subsidies, and government procurement favoring domestic producers. It would also have to deal with a type of non-tariff barrier whose importance seems destined to grow in the next few years—restrictions on imports designed to protect health, consumer safety, or the environment. Progress here will require an unprecedented degree of harmonization of domestic policies so that the countries with the lowest environmental standards do not get more than their share of trade and investment. The elimination of non-tariff barriers will be an extraordinarily complex and difficult business, but it would be facilitated if it were done pursuant to an overall free trade program.

Agriculture presents the most difficult problem of all, but one that is unavoidable since the United States and other countries will not be able to move very far toward free trade in industrial products without concessions on the agricultural side. Although prospects at the moment may seem dim, pressures are building up in the U.K. and this European Community for major reforms in the Common Agricultural Policy. We should aim for an international negotiation within the next few years to reduce the level of domestic price supports and eventually phase out agricultural protection.

To make such a bold program possible would require bold moves in other areas—a greatly expanded program of assistance for workers, communities and firms adjusting to international competition; new international rules covering the rights and responsibilities of multi-national companies and the conflicting efforts of governments to regulate them; and improvements in the international monetary system providing sufficient liquidity and some greater flexibility in exchange rates.

For a free trade program of this dimension to succeed would also require a substantial strengthening of international institutions. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, now in a sadly undernourished state, needs new rules on non-tariff barriers, faster procedures, new voting arrangements, and conciliation machinery with teeth. The International Monetary Fund and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development will have to become forums, not merely for consultation, but for the negotiation of "adjustment packages" in which surplus and deficit countries take firm commitments to modify undesirable internal and external policies.

Such a program will be called "impractical". It is—except when compared with the alternatives. I do not see any other ap-

proach that can contain protectionist forces here and abroad, reconcile European integration with the interests of the United States and other outsiders, and provide the open trading world essential to economic and social progress.

This "grand design" for free trade cannot get underway until we throw off the economic and psychological burdens of Vietnam and restore reasonable health to our domestic economy. It will probably have to wait also until the Kennedy round cuts are completed and the European Community completes its negotiations with the U.K. Thus it is a program for 1973, not 1971. Nevertheless, its endorsement now by political and business leaders around the world could transform the present grim climate of economic diplomacy.

The interdependence of nations has outpaced the development of economic policy. We must find economic policies to match the facts of interdependence if the benefits of interdependence are not to be sacrificed. This is an assignment for the century second only to the search for lasting peace.

CAMBODIA

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, 6 years of tragic history have apparently taught this administration no lesson. More than 50,000 dead American servicemen, hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese dead, 8 million Asian refugees, have apparently taught no lesson. The location now is Cambodia, but the plot line is a familiar one—we have seen it wrung out on our television sets and in our newspaper headlines for 6 long years now.

Last June 30, the President, announcing the end of the U.S. incursion into Cambodia, told the American public that "there will be no U.S. air or logistics support" for South Vietnamese forces in Cambodia. Nor would there "be U.S. advisers on these operations." At the same time, he said there would be "air interdiction" missions.

Congress, mindful of the past contortions of rhetoric, subsequently adopted the modified Cooper-Church amendment in the Supplemental Foreign Assistance Authorization Act, Public Law 91-652. This provides, in section 6:

(a) In line with the expressed intention of the President of the United States, none of the funds authorized or appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act may be used to finance the introduction of United States ground combat troops into Cambodia, or to provide United States advisers to or for Cambodian military forces in Cambodia.

(b) Military and economic assistance provided by the United States to Cambodia and authorized or appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act shall not be construed as a commitment by the United States to Cambodia for its defense.

Now, the Secretary of Defense has a new line. He disdains "semantics" and pronounces that "as far as Cambodia is concerned—we will use air power, and as long as I am serving in this job, I will recommend that we use air power to supplement the South Vietnamese forces." This he said just last week.

The line becomes even grimmer. On Tuesday, January 26, the Secretary released a statement prior to his appearance before the Senate Armed Services Committee in which he maintained:

Under the Nixon Doctrine, we have, we will maintain, and will use as necessary sea and air resources to supplement the efforts and the armed forces of our friends and allies who are determined to resist aggression, as the Cambodians are valiantly trying to do.

If we did know that this scenario only means deeper involvement in a dead end war, we might think we were reading lines from a comedy—a comedy of errors.

We must end the war. The administration extends it. We must stop the death and destruction. The administration increases it. We must spare the people of Southeast Asia added misery. The administration promises more.

On the opening day of Congress I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 50, calling for an immediate halt to U.S. offensive operations, and complete withdrawal of American forces from Southeast Asia by June 30, 1971. Its passage will end the war; Congress must exercise its full powers to achieve this end.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials, one from the January 25 edition of the Buffalo, N.Y. Courier Express and one from the January 27 edition of the Washington Post. They are apt; they are compelling. I commend them to my colleagues:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier Express, Jan. 25, 1971]

WAR POLICY: CONGRESS HURT AGAIN

The latest example of Defense Department trickery, in expanding military operations in Indochina, should teach Congress once and for all that it cannot take anything for granted in its efforts to halt escalation of the war. The leaders of the House and Senate will be tragically remiss if they do not at once launch full-scale enquiries into the obvious policy shift involving tactical air strikes in Laos and Cambodia.

A tentative start in the right direction has been made by 64 House members who have petitioned for specific legislation curbing funds for such air attacks as the use of American helicopter gunships to support friendly Cambodian, or Laotian, or Thai, troops of offensive missions. But many congressmen, and others, thought this curb was accomplished in the Cooper-Church resolution last year which banned funds for the use of American combat troops or advisers in Cambodia.

Now Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird claims that since Congress did not specifically ban the air support when it voted a \$1-billion military-aid bill, in effect Congress sanctioned the attacks. Laird also contends this shift from "interdiction" of North Vietnamese supply lines to full-scale air support of ground troops is in line with the Nixon Doctrine outlined at Guam in 1969. But others insist that policy statement warned that we should not let ourselves get drawn into step-by-step war involvements as we did in Vietnam. Yet that's what has happened in Cambodia.

Last June, President Nixon promised, after our troops had ended Mr. Nixon's invasion of Cambodia that there would be "No United States air or logistics support" for further South Vietnamese operations in Cambodia. That seemed clear enough. Now, Secretary Laird, not wanting to get involved, he says, in the "semantics" of the issue, blandly vows he'll use all facets of U.S. air power

in both Cambodia and Laos. In tandem with renewed bombing strikes against North Vietnam, this does not spell de-escalation of the war.

It seems that "assurances" from the president means very little; it is naive to rely on such assurances. Or to plead for more of them. We need more than pious assurances; we need some legal safeguards. Only Congress can supply those. When the apparent intent and spirit of an act such as the Cooper-Church resolution can be so callously perverted, then this administration has erected a credibility gap as frightening as anything preceding it, then the executive branch has reached the stage when solemn treaties can be shrugged off as mere scraps of paper.

American "liaison" soldiers (not advisers?) have been photographed with our gunships on the ground in Cambodia. The excuses used by the Pentagon to try to justify the new policy are incredible inversions of logic and reason. There is no justification, so far, that is acceptable for resuming the bombings of North Vietnam. We think the administration wrong if it believes the public and Congress will swallow, without question, the latest escalation of the war in Indochina under the illusion that it really means withdrawal from that war.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 27, 1971]

CAMBODIA: TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES

At the top of the right hand column on this page today we are printing, For the Record, some pertinent excerpts from President Nixon's definitive speech on Cambodia last June and we suggest you glance at them before reading on. What you will discover, in comparing what Mr. Nixon promised with recent reports of official briefings in Saigon and Phnom Penh and recent pronouncements by the White House and the Secretary of Defense, is that the administration is not doing what it said it was going to do in Cambodia or is doing what it plainly promised it would not—even while steadfastly denying that it is doing anything of the sort.

One way or the other, we are once again not being told the truth about this war. And once again we are—all of us—suffering the consequences of dissembling—the disquiet which breeds dissent which prompts the congressional hearings which feed administration defensiveness; the breakdown of public trust and the imputations of disloyalty which fan debate; the political division which robs our efforts of their force by conveying irresolution to the enemy. The Nixon administration would have us believe that this is all the fault of the war critics but those who have been around this vicious circle more than once in recent years are in little doubt about where the process begins. It begins with solemn pledges from the highest government officials which are not fulfilled. Then comes the fine print and the fancy rhetoric and the political finagling which cannot quite be put down—and probably shouldn't be—as lies or even calculated deceit, but yet have that look. And so the value of the next pledge depreciates.

What is a senator or a citizen to make, for example, of today's reassurances of a strictly limited American role in Cambodia. Only seven months ago the President told us there would be "no U.S. ground personnel in Cambodia except for the regular staff of our embassy in Phnom Penh" and yet, a day or so ago, an Associated Press photographer caught on film an American in combat dress running to a helicopter. The President tells us in June that there will be no U.S. advisers with Cambodian ground troops; in January they are discovered hovering just overhead in helicopters, calling in air strikes, and there are reports of "military equipment delivery teams" at work.

In June, Mr. Nixon drew a careful distinction between U.S. air interdiction missions

specifically aimed against efforts to reestablish the Cambodian sanctuaries along the South Vietnam frontier and U.S. air support for South Vietnamese incursions into Cambodia. "There will be no U.S. air or logistics support," for these South Vietnamese operations, he declared emphatically. Yet, in January the Secretary of Defense disdains "semantics" and taunts the Congress with the promise that "as far as Cambodia is concerned . . . we will use air power, and as long as I am serving in this job, I will recommend that we use air power to supplement the South Vietnamese forces . . ." The simple fact of the matter seems to be that we are using air power, including close-in support from helicopter gunships, not just in support of the South Vietnamese in Cambodia, but in support of embattled Cambodians as well, anywhere local American commanders see a need to help the Cambodians with their own defense. And American military aid, of course, is no longer talked of in terms of \$5 million dollars for "small arms and relatively unsophisticated weapons"; already, it has ballooned into a mammoth, across-the-board, \$250 million affair.

The administration has an easy answer to all this, of course, which is that it is not violating any laws or exceeding the letter of congressional restraints and while this may be technically true, it is also beside the point. For if the President chooses to determine on his own that the fate of "Vietnamization" runs with the fate of Cambodia and that it all somehow relates to buying time for the safe withdrawal of American troops—if that is where we are now, by contrast with where we were in June—then he can probably get away with it, legally. But there is some fairly recent history that suggests this is an exceedingly dangerous business politically—and even militarily. The experience of the early days of President Johnson's stealthy expansion of our Vietnam effort surely tells us this. Yet Mr. Laird airily refuses to deal in "semantics" and lets it go at that.

We doubt, somehow, that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will let it go at that when hearings on Cambodia get under way tomorrow. But we also hope that those proceedings do not bog down in raucous debate over congressional-vs-presidential prerogatives. What we need to know now is what happened between June and January and how we got where we are in Cambodia and why, and where we are headed. If this administration has learned nothing else about Vietnam, it should have learned by now that the truth, whatever it is, will be easier to live with than the consequences of not telling it.

OPPOSE BILL TO ALLOW ABORTION ON DEMAND

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1971, I presented testimony to the Maryland State Legislature opposing a proposed bill which would allow abortion on demand.

This is an issue of such great import on the National, State, and local levels that I insert the testimony I presented on that occasion at this point in the Record for the information of all Members.

I hope that Marylanders will rise up in righteous indignation and let their representatives in the State legislature know their opposition to this bill.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF U.S. CONGRESSMAN LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

My name is Lawrence J. Hogan. I live in Landover, Maryland, and represent the 5th District of Maryland in the U. S. House of Representatives.

I thank you for this opportunity to testify in opposition to H.B. 100, which is an "abortion-on-demand" bill. We are all aware of the tremendous public interest in this topic and of its very serious nature. Undoubtedly, this will be the most important piece of legislation before this Committee during the current session—and may well be the most important legislation before the entire legislature. If this bill passes, abortion in the State of Maryland will be practically unrestricted and a public policy stated that is permeated with serious social, economic, and moral problems.

One hundred and ninety-five years ago, Marylanders and other Americans joined hands and declared themselves a free people. In so doing, they set forth in writing a statement of the principles and attitudes which joined them together and which have ever since expressed the common philosophy of our Nation. The first of these principles, they wrote, is self-evident: all men are created equal. Early drafts of the Declaration of Independence had used the phrase "all men are born equal," but after considerable discussion, the framers of the document decided that they wanted to go on record as accepting that human beings possessed personal dignity, individual worth, and inalienable rights from the time of their creation—from the time of conception. This is history.

Today, in Maryland as elsewhere, that principle is under attack. I rise to defend it. In so doing, I do not mean to question the motives of those who disagree with me, or to demean their deep concern about personal and social problems.

The issues raised by H.B. 100 are no less important than those raised by the Declaration of Independence itself. H.B. 100 reflects its proponents' concern about the rights and health and comfort of pregnant girls and women. It does not, unhappily, treat the rights and health and comfort of other interested parties—most basically, the living unborn child within the womb. Nor does it treat the rights of the father of this new life . . . nor does it treat the concerns of the parents of the pregnant girl where she is a minor child. These omissions would not matter, however, if we could be certain that the life inside the womb was somehow not fully human. But the contrary is true! Scientific evidence is overwhelming that from a very few days after conception, the fetus is a full human person. His circulatory and digestive systems are his own. His genetic make-up is complete—and, incidentally, unique. It can never be duplicated. He is in no way a part of his mother and hence cannot or should not be treated as if he were, regardless of the intensity of his mother's wishes.

Of course, this fetus is tiny, and therefore vulnerable. He lacks full physical development, and may, in the eyes of some, be unattractive. His personality does not express itself in ways intelligible to most adults of his species, and so he may seem to have none. Are feebleness, unattractiveness, helplessness valid reasons for attack, rather than for defense?

Who among us can say this his conception was planned? That the news of his beginning was welcomed by his parents without question? Who can say for certain that he would even exist if it had not been for the protection of our customs and laws which have revered life at all its stages? The pages of human history are filled with contribu-

tions and accomplishments of unwanted, illegitimate children.

Because the fetus is a human being, he should be accorded the same rights that other human beings enjoy. Maryland's current law already accommodates the real concerns for the health of the mother of an unborn child; the present bill would give her the power of life or death over another member of our society, one who lives within her and depends on her for defense. Such power would be given to any pregnant girl or woman by this proposed bill.

H.B. 100 allows abortion upon the request of the mother up to twenty weeks after conception, and thereafter only if it "is deemed necessary in the judgment of the treating physician." This is a distinction without a difference. Any time requirement is illusory rather than real. Rarely does a girl know exactly when she became pregnant and, even if she does, what's to prevent her from lying about when she got pregnant? What it boils down to is this: any pregnant female may obtain an abortion if she finds a doctor who will agree to do it. Is this something our consciences can live with?

You and I share in the privilege and responsibility of formulating public policy and making laws for our fellow men. Without trying to be exhaustive about good lawmaking, I wish to criticize this bill from the point of view of what must go into a good law. It seems to me a law dealing with such a complex social, biological, economic and moral issue ought to have these characteristics:

First, it should reflect the best medical and scientific judgment available. We deal with human life at its beginning. If the physicians and scientists tell us—as they do—that the fetus, at say, 15 weeks, is definitely a human person, how can we kill that human person without guilt? This is the hardest question to answer in the abortion argument, but one we must face up to: if biological science declares that a 15-week-old fetus is a person, then our law can allow intentionally killing such an innocent person only when another human life is at stake. This bill, by permitting abortion up to twenty weeks would make legal the killing of fetuses which science tells us are undoubtedly human persons, and which, in many cases, would even be viable. There are numerous instances when such aborted children have lived.

Second, a good law does not help solve one social problem by creating others. Besides the problem of the unborn, unwanted child, we have the problem of "back-alley" abortions and the problem of death or injury to the aborting mother through improper surgical techniques. The New York experience since last July indicates that a so-called "liberalized" abortion bill does not solve these: it creates an "abortion mentality" which fosters thousands of unnecessary abortions and it appears there have been more deaths than before, rather than fewer. We should not go down New York's road until we have time to study their experience and see where that road leads.

Another problem in Maryland is the increasing difficulty of adoption. The "demand" by would-be adopting parents, I understand, far surpasses the "supply" of babies. Instead of encouraging and legalizing unnecessary abortions, perhaps we should by tax credits or subsidies during pregnancy, help the woman to carry her child to term and then put him up for adoption. We should also adopt a more compassionate attitude toward the unwed mother.

Third, a good law should harmonize the rights of all interested parties. Here the proposed bill completely overlooks the uncontroverted fact that the child in the womb is not just a growth in someone's body, like tonsils or an appendix, but is a real human being who, in my opinion, has the right to life. According to inheritance law and tort law, that child has legal rights and should

have the right to not be deprived of life and liberty without due process of law. The father also has rights in this matter; indeed, the bill before you creates the anomaly that the father might have to pay, involuntarily, a \$500 medical fee to a doctor for killing his child. Your bill does not even require his written consent. The parents of the unwed, minor mother have similar interests, but they are not even mentioned in the proposed bill.

Fourth, a good law should not foster crimes or put honest people into impossible crises of conscience. Under similar laws in other states and in England, frequently an intended abortion results in the birth of a living child. Nurses are told to put him into a bucket and toss him into the incinerator. Thus the public policy of the given jurisdiction actually promotes what its laws define as manslaughter—and requires conscientious hospital personnel to witness or even help in the killing of a living human being, contrary to all their training, instincts, and moral convictions.

Fifth, a good law respects the common morality of a pluralistic community. We are not talking about contraception here; we are talking about killing—not just "obtaining," as the Act euphemistically puts it—a baby after conception. A large segment of the people of Maryland—and I am included in that group—believe this proposed law would legitimize the killing of other human beings. To allow this "on demand," is to depart from the common law tradition which allowed the killing of other persons only in self-defense situations; or, more recently, in the strict therapeutic-abortion situations where the actual physical life of the mother was certain to be jeopardized by the pregnancy's continuance.

This Act would change that common morality and require a good portion of our population to collaborate, indirectly through their taxes, in what our criminal code punishes as the worst of all possible crimes.

Sixth, the right to live is as basic a right as one could imagine. How far will we go? As a result of the abortion mentality arising in this country, I am told a bill has been introduced in Florida to permit the euthanasia of the elderly under certain conditions. The arguments of population-control, in many people's minds, apply to anyone "unfit to live." We are close to Huxley's *Brave New World*—a very dangerous and inhumane place to live—when we declare by statute that two persons in a doctor's office can decide who shall live and who shall die, with often the sole motive being only the personal convenience of one of them.

Seventh, and finally, a good law emerges out of sound common sense and not emotionalism. At the outset I acknowledged the sincerity of this bill's proponents and I reiterate that acknowledgement now; but it is common knowledge that emotionalism plays a good part in the pressure for this bill. One aspect of it is the population-control argument; yet demographers tell us that our population growth, probably because of contraception, is practically stable. And in any event, in the U.S. the problem is not numbers of people but distribution of those people. Two-thirds of this country is practically empty of people, while they leave the farms and small towns and pile into the cities. We need an incentive policy to encourage the repopulation of the rural areas—not abortion-on-demand. . . . Another argument is women's rights—but, appealing as it is, it is unrealistic to make this point in a vacuum, without considering biological and legal truths which remind us that the unborn child also has rights. Yes, let's be attentive to women's rights, but what about baby's rights? Who speaks for those unborn constituents? In a very real sense I am here today testifying for that unrepresented group of humanity who has no lobby group, who

can't write you letters. They ask nothing more from you than what is their basic right—the most cherished right that any of us possess—the right to life.

Some time ago, we were all shocked to see on television pictures of grown men killing baby seals by beating them to death with clubs. Our shock and disgust were justified. But what about the destruction of human babies? Haven't they more worth than baby seals? It is sad that we cannot get the conservationists aroused over destruction of human life. The burning by saline solution, the dismembering, the torture and agony of the tiny, but sensitive, fetus are so real and so revolting that one hesitates to describe them. But the scientists assure us that the cry of an unborn infant is still a shriek of pain even if it is muffled, and it should be on the consciences of the legislators and citizens as much as it is on the ears of the nurses and doctors who hear these shrieks.

Can you treat life so recklessly, so callously? Can you give legal sanction to those who would disregard the dignity and very life of one human being for the convenience of another?

This legislation is not worthy of our past and is a disservice to our future.

I urge you, I plead with you, in the name of humanity, in the name of those unborn innocents whose death warrant you would be signing, to defeat this bill.

CUBA—SOVIET LAUNCHING PLATFORM

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following two articles concerning the Soviet presence in Cuba should be of great interest to everyone who is interested in such things as Soviet presence.

Cuba becomes a substantial strategic threat to the people of the United States when integrated into the Soviet psychopolitical and nuclear military warfare operations plan. One well-informed commentator has aptly termed Cuba a "900-mile-long launching platform."

Allowing the Soviets to acquire significant military and political advantages is not going to lead to the reduction of tensions as some sources would have us believe. Tensions arise directly from Soviet goals and activities directed toward achieving these goals to which all Americans who are in favor of national sovereignty and a free society are in absolute opposition. To permit the Soviets to obtain operational bases off the coast of Florida, which increases the scope and intensity of their tension-producing activity, is contrary to the entire concept of reducing tensions.

For those interested in preventing a nuclear war, especially one which introduces the North American Continent into the strategic equation as the primary battlefield, it should be quite clear that failing to oppose Soviet advances in the Caribbean is not particularly conducive toward this end.

The SALT talks will hardly become more productive if we allow the Soviets to maintain and fortify bases in Cuba which increase their strength. If Soviet unimpeded advance in the Caribbean can

be achieved by talks in Europe then it is quite likely that the Soviets will drag out the talks in order to increase their real and material advance in this area.

The first article is by investigative reporter Paul Scott and appeared in Review of the News magazine of January 27, 1971, and the second was written by three well-known experts in the field of Latin American affairs, Dr. Manolo Reyes, Dr. Herman Portell-Villa, and Dr. Guillermo Belt, and appeared in the American Security Council's "Washington Report" for January 25, 1971.

The articles follow:

THE COMING CUBAN CRISIS

(By Paul Scott)

There is a difference as great as night and day between that highly reassuring public statement of President Nixon on Soviet naval activities in and around Cuba and the information gathered by U.S. Naval Intelligence.

While the President sees no Russian naval base in Cuba, our Navy is privately warning that for all intent and purpose the Soviets now have a base at Cienfuegos, Cuba, capable of handling missile-firing, nuclear submarines. The U.S. Navy also gathered hard evidence that the Cienfuegos base is partly operational and was used recently to service Russian submarines operating in the Caribbean.

This is the ominous conclusion of the latest Naval Intelligence estimate of Soviet naval capabilities and intentions in Cuba waters now being circulated at the highest levels of the Nixon Administration.

The highly classified document was prepared before President Nixon made his astonishing statement over nationwide TV while being interviewed by four network correspondents. In discussing Cuba and Soviet naval activities in the area, the President stated:

"Well, I can tell you everything our Intelligence tells us, and we think it's very good in that area because as you know, we have surveillance from the air, which in this case is foolproof, we believe.

"First, let's look at what the understanding is. President Kennedy worked out an understanding in 1962 that the Russians would not put any offensive missiles into Cuba. That understanding was expanded on October 11, this year, by the Russians when they said that it would include a military base in Cuba and a military Naval base. They, in effect, said that they would not put a military Naval base into Cuba on October the 11th.

"Now in the event that nuclear submarines were serviced either in Cuba or from Cuba, that would be a violation of the understanding. That has not happened yet. We are watching the situation closely. The Soviet Union is aware of the fact that we are watching closely. We expect them to abide by the understanding. I believe they will.

"I don't believe that they want a crisis in the Caribbean and I don't believe that one is going to occur, particularly since the understanding has been clearly laid out and has been so clearly relied on by us, as I stated here today."

In sharp contrast to this Presidential "fig leaf," the highly classified Naval Intelligence document reveals that late in December a Soviet submarine tender operating from Cienfuegos, Cuba, carried out "servicing exercises" with three Russian submarines. The operational rendezvous of the Soviet surface ship with the submarines, including one nuclear powered sub, was the first of its kind for the Russians in Cuban waters. The bold "servicing exercises," photographed by U.S. reconnaissance aircraft, took approximately

two hours and included the loading of supplies from the Soviet tender to one of the three submarines.

At least a dozen members of the submarine crew were exchanged during the operation. Those leaving the submarine were taken to Cienfuegos for "rest and recreation" or flown from Cuba back to the Soviet Union. Several high-ranking Soviet naval officers who had been flown to Cuba from the Soviet Union took part in the exercise.

Naval submarine analysts who studied the Intelligence estimate say the "servicing exercises" definitely show that the Soviets can and are planning to use Cienfuegos as a submarine operating base.

Although the actual rendezvous took place outside of Cienfuegos Harbor, all supplies transferred to the submarine from the Russian tender were first picked up at the Cuban port. This clearly indicates that the Kremlin plans to use Cuba as a major supply base in the Western Hemisphere. Soviet naval crews housed in barracks at Cienfuegos Harbor were used to load the supplies on the Soviet submarine tender. Several members of the Soviet land-based crew went aboard the tender and took part in the "servicing exercises."

In addition to the carefully planned supply operation, the submarine tender and the submarines were in direct radio contact with a newly built naval communication center at Cienfuegos. Cuban refugees report that the center is completely manned by Russians. The high-powered radio at Cienfuegos is already being used to transmit weather and coded messages to Soviet missile-firing submarines now believed to be stationed off the Atlantic Coast as well as in the Caribbean and Gulf of Mexico.

The original copy of this Naval Intelligence estimate was forwarded to the White House during the recent holidays where Dr. Henry Kissinger, the President's National Security Advisor, indicated that it would be carefully used in the formation of any Cuban action deemed necessary. Yet, while the Intelligence finding leaves no doubt that the Russians are using the Port of Cienfuegos as a submarine base, there has been no official determination of this at the White House policy-making level. All Naval officials involved in the drafting of the estimate have been able to learn is that the estimate is now in the hands of Kissinger's foreign policy staff in the White House for "further analysis and study." *No National Security Council meeting has been called to discuss its ominous implications.*

President Nixon's unexpected TV statement on Cuba not only surprised and shocked Naval Intelligence officials, but they had no inkling that the President would discount the Soviet naval activities in the Cuba area, nor could they fathom his reasons for doing so. The President's statement highlights the often frightening gap that exists at times between those who have responsibility for gathering the facts and those who interpret them for use in policy-making.

The position the President is taking has been interpreted by these Naval officials as an indication that President Nixon and his policy-makers haven't been able to agree on what to do about the new Soviet threat. If they accept the hard facts of the Naval Intelligence estimate, it is pointed out, the President and his advisors must conclude that the Russians have double-crossed them and violated the "understanding" not to use Cuban ports or bases for their submarines. That finding might trigger a new U.S.-Soviet "confrontation" over the use of Cuba as a base for offensive weapons—a "confrontation" that the Nixon Administration apparently is not willing or ready to face at this time, or which it wants delayed for reasons that are only known at the White House level.

Significantly, Mr. Kissinger recently asked Secretary of State Rogers again to sound out the Soviets on whether the submarine tender now operating in Cuba's waters will permanently use Cuban ports. Naval intelligence officials say the answer is clear by the fact that the submarine tender has been operating out of Cuban ports for the past three months and another is en route to replace it.

Two other parts of President Nixon's statement on Cuba also bother officials at Naval Intelligence. One was his pronouncement that he believed the Russians would keep the "understanding" not to put a naval military base in Cuba. In effect, the President by saying this publicly was accepting the private assurances of Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko and Ambassador Dobrynin over the hard facts gathered by the Navy. Yet, Gromyko and Dobrynin are both known to have lied to the late President Kennedy during the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. At the time the Russians were sneaking I.R.B.M.s and medium-range bombers into Cuba, Gromyko and Dobrynin were assuring Kennedy that the Soviets had no intention of putting offensive weapons on the island.

To most military Intelligence experts it is a little frightening that President Nixon would even consider discussing Cuba with the two Soviet diplomats after their earlier deceptions. And to accept their word now, as the President says he has, is considered folly of the most dangerous kind. Especially in light of the Intelligence that the President has access to on Soviet activities in Cuba.

The other disturbing statement by the President was his contention that U.S. surveillance of Cuba from the air is foolproof. None of the Intelligence services have claimed that. For months, Defense Intelligence officials have been urging that more use be made of Cuban refugees so that the government wouldn't be caught "off guard" as it was before the 1962 Cuban crisis. Despite the high degree of accuracy of new U.S. reconnaissance cameras and devices, they still can't determine what is hidden under camouflage facilities and in storage areas. It is pointed out that daily reconnaissance flights would be needed over Cuban ports to determine if any Soviet submarines were using them. Now, if there are two reconnaissance flights a week this is considered high. And still unknown to U.S. officials is what the Russians have succeeded in hiding in the hundreds of caves being used as military storage areas on the island.

This lack of vital intelligence about Soviet activities in Cuba is privately admitted by rank and file American Intelligence officers. They claim it is the result of policy restrictions placed on the methods they can use to gather information on Cuba. An example of these restrictions is the White House bar against financing Cuban refugee operations to gather firsthand data on Soviet activities on the island. White House aides take the position that this type of intelligence gathering is prohibited by the 1962 "understanding" on Cuba reached by U.S. and Soviet officials.

The only sure way that the U.S. can learn the full Soviet capability in Cuba, these Intelligence officials say, is to use anti-Castro refugees to do the spying. "As long as the policy-makers have the preconceived idea that Russia has no plans to use Cuba as a military base," stated one military Intelligence officer, "it is impossible to convince them that a round-the-clock surveillance of Cuba is needed."

There are increasing signs that the President's handling of Cuba is closely tied to his strategy for the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (S.A.L.T.) with the Russians. Drafted by Presidential Aide Kissinger, the S.A.L.T. strategy calls for the U.S. to avoid

any direct confrontation with the Soviets until it can be determined if the Russians are serious about curbing defensive and offensive weapons delivery systems. Kissinger privately takes the position that a U.S. admission that the Russians now have an operational naval base in Cuba could trigger demands in Congress that immediate action be taken to force the Soviets out of Cuba.

Such a U.S.-Soviet confrontation in turn would force a complete breakdown of the S.A.L.T. negotiations, which have been given the Administration's highest foreign policy priority. President Nixon is counting on reaching a missile agreement with the Soviets before the 1972 Presidential campaign.

During the recent Helsinki round of the S.A.L.T. negotiations (November 2 to December 19), the Soviet delegation showed its diplomatic interest in Cuba. The Soviet negotiators noted that Russia had every right to put a military base in Cuba if she so desired. They contrasted a Soviet base in Cuba to U.S. bases in Europe or the Mediterranean. The inference was that the Russians would be willing to forego any Cuban base if the U.S. pulled its aircraft carriers out of the Mediterranean or gave up its air and naval bases in Spain. The Soviet negotiators' argument is in line with the main Russian S.A.L.T. demand. It states that the U.S. must include its aircraft bases in Europe and aircraft carriers in the Mediterranean in any overall agreement covering both offensive and defensive weapons.

This use of Cuba as a S.A.L.T. bargaining weapon clearly highlights the importance that the Kremlin attaches to its naval activities on that strategic Caribbean island. In light of this use of Cuba, Intelligence officials would like to see President Nixon adopt a more realistic view of what the Russians are up to in the Caribbean. Unless the President acts quickly, they see the Kremlin using Cuba to blackmail this country into either pulling its Naval forces out of the Mediterranean area or forcing the U.S. to make other concessions.

The American Intelligence community sees the Soviet naval base in Cuba as part of a network of naval bases the Russians are now establishing around the world. These include Mersa Matruh, and Alexandria, in Egypt; the Socotra Islands at the mouth of the Red Sea; and, a former French base in Algeria. The expanding Soviet navy also has acquired the right to use the Port of Modisio in Somaliland, Trincomalee in Ceylon, the Mauritius Islands in the Indian Ocean, and one or more ports in Nigeria.

The establishment of this network of bases by the Soviets is being cited by Intelligence officials as evidence that the Kremlin has adopted a forward military strategy designed to control the strategic waterways of the world. This forward strategy also will permit the Soviet's missile-firing nuclear submarines to remain on stations constantly within the defenses of the U.S. and other N.A.T.O. nations. Its potential for blackmail, alone, is enormous!

If viewed in this light, the construction of the Cienfuegos base in Cuba is an even more ominous development than the attempted deployment of Soviet nuclear missiles on Cuban bases in 1962.

The Cienfuegos base would be needed if really large numbers of nuclear submarines were to be continuously off the coast of the United States. That is the true threat of the base. Which suggests in turn that the Soviets are now planning continuous deployment of very large numbers of "Yankee" class and other nuclear submarines in the Caribbean and along the American coast. The Cienfuegos operation reveals an undoubted Soviet intention to gain a solid "capability" to knock out the Panama Canal and the entire land-based bomber component of the U.S. deterrent, plus the controls of the "Safeguard" A.B.M. system.

The most horrifying single aspect of the story of the Cienfuegos base is still the response with which the bad news was met at the White House and in Congress. Consider a simple comparison. In 1962, the Congress was in flames over reports of Soviet missiles in Cuba, even before the presence of those missiles was confirmed by U-2 reconnaissance photographs. Contrast this with the near Congressional silence that has engulfed the news from Cienfuegos ever since it first came out that the Russians were building a base there.

And then think of the Nixon Administration's response to *this* news, that is even more alarming! Consider President Nixon's reassuring statement that the Russians have no plans of doing what our Intelligence people say they are doing.

The obvious intent was, and is, to prevent the American public from growing alarmed, when we should be deeply alarmed. The question each of us should personally ask the White House and our Representatives in Congress is: Why is the full story of Soviet activities in Cuba being withheld from the public?

If enough of us raise our voices, we can force the Nixon Administration to take the necessary measures to dismantle the Soviet nuclear submarine base in Cuba before it is used as a serious *blackmail* threat!

One wonders what the outcome of the first Cuban missile crisis would have been if the late President Kennedy had delayed the Naval blockade of Cuba and warning to the Russians until after the Soviets had their missiles operational. How serious would Soviet blackmail have become? Intelligence leaks, some of them by the same sources that provided information for this article, forced Kennedy to act sooner than he originally had planned. Many involved in the first Cuban missile crisis believed that had Mr. Kennedy delayed his blockade decision a week or ten days the outcome would have been different.

What does Mr. Nixon's procrastination mean? Certainly no answer comforting to those concerned about American security is possible!

CIENFUEGOS: THE TIP OF THE SOVIET ICEBERG IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

(A Report by the Cuban Watch Committee on Cuba)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This analysis which assesses the strategic implications of the stepped-up level of Soviet activity in Cuba, has been released by three respected members of the growing Cuban community of 600,000 persons who have been forced into exile in the United States by Castro's Communist government. It takes into account numerous intelligence reports, including those reaching them from various Cuban underground sources which in the past have proven reliable, and evaluates them against the broad background of their own personal experience in the fields of diplomacy, international law, politics, education, economics, and public affairs.)

SOVIET MILITARY ACTIVITY NOT CONFINED TO CIENFUEGOS

Since mid-1968 Cuban underground sources have been reporting regularly on Russian progress in converting Cienfuegos, on the southern coast of Cuba, into a key Soviet naval base in the Caribbean.¹ However, this did not come to the attention of the American public until a Soviet naval flotilla visited there on September 9-12, 1970. This event forced the White House to remind the USSR of the 1962 agreement between President Kennedy and Premier Krushchev that peace in the Caribbean could only be assured if Soviet nuclear missiles and bomb-

ers were not reintroduced into the Hemisphere. This incident itself is but one aspect of the greatly accelerated over-all Russian military program in Cuba. Reports from the underground which underline its alarming scope include.

The Soviet plan to develop the island of Cuba into a major naval operating base. This involves the modernization of the harbors of Nipe, Caribarien (Cayo Frances), Matanzas, Havana, Mariel, Cabanas, and Bha Honda, all on the northern coast, and Santiago de Cuba and Cienfuegos on the southern coast. Mariel, 20 miles west of Havana, already has submarine pens that are operational; construction crews are working day and night at Calbarien and at Cayo Alcatraz in Cienfuegos Bay. Two Soviet admirals and three high-ranking civilian engineers were flown there non-stop from Russia in the long-range Soviet TU-95 Bear aircraft the first week of December, 1970, to supervise the naval construction program.

In accordance with an agreement reached on January 8, 1969, between the USSR and Communist Cuba, the Nuclear Institute in Managua reportedly is now staffed with some 760 Soviet technicians. One noncritical nuclear plant is said to be already in operation and a second, capable of producing military quality fissionable material, is expected to become operational during this year.²

As of September, 1970, the Soviet Army strength in Cuba was estimated by the Cuban underground to be between 20,000 and 22,000 soldiers. They conduct regular maneuvers in Pinar Del Rio province, in the mountains near Candelaria, San Cristobal and San Diego on the Rosario Sierra.

An important Soviet Army military complex is being developed in the mountains at La Cubilla, near the towns of Cumanayagua and Seibabo, complete with electrified wire fences, pill-boxes, trenches, artillery emplacements and mysterious mounds covering entrances to underground installations. No Cuban is allowed to enter this area; the construction has been carried out entirely by Russian troops.

Soviet Army engineers have constructed a modern, eight-lane military highway from Havana and San Antonio de los Baños to Cienfuegos and are maintaining and improving the 400 mile stretch of strategic road from Cienfuegos to Santiago.

SOVIET MILITARY INSTALLATIONS GOING UNDERGROUND TO AVOID U.S. AERIAL SURVEILLANCE

Having learned a lesson in 1962 when the U-2 photographs foiled their effort to smuggle nuclear missiles into Cuba, all Soviet military installations, except those naval facilities which cannot be placed underground, are being built in caves or tunnels interconnecting the caves. Cuba has more than 3,000 natural or man-made caves which the Russians have already inventoried and explored. Marshal Grechko, the Soviet Defense Minister, visited many of these caves himself during his visit to Cuba in November, 1969. These provide the Soviets' answer to U.S. photographic surveillance of the island.

Ninety percent of the fuel reserves in Cuba are underground as are the major ammunition depots. Underground hospitals have been built at the Sierra de Cristal, near the Nipe and Levisa Bays in Oriente province, and in la Loma de San Vincente just off the road which runs between Santiago de Cuba and Guantanamo. Of particular importance are the various underground complexes lying within the quadrangle formed by Minas de Bajurayabo, Jaruco, Herradura and Mariel. Included in this area is the Nuclear Institute at Managua. Other locations where caves have been reinforced with concrete linings of up to six feet are the Sierra de Lupe, Oriente province; the Altura Central on the Isle of

¹ Broadcast by Radio Free America of the American Security Council, July 11, 1968.

² See "Washington Report" No. 69-6, February 10, 1969.

Pines which contains a number of large marble caves ideally suited for underground installations.

Underground missile bases are reported in the mountains of the Gobernadora, near Mariel; in Manicaragua, Las Villas province, at a place the Russian soldiers call "La Campana"; at San Cristobal and in the Sierra de los Organos in Pinal del Rio province. The latter has been of considerable interest to the Russians for some time. In April, 1969, eight extremely heavy, square wooden boxes were unloaded at night from Soviet ships at the Casablanca Arsenal docks under maximum security precautions, placed on large, 20-wheel flatbed trucks and driven off in a Soviet Army convoy in the direction of the Sierra de los Organos. This operation was repeated the last week in January, 1970, when another eight boxes, each 32 by 9½ by 13 feet, with a peaked, roof-like construction running lengthwise, were loaded on large trailers and conveyed by Soviet troops toward the same destination.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of our analysis of these reports, the "Watch Committee on Cuba" has reached several significant conclusions:

1. Soviet activities in Cuba suggest a sense of urgency which prompts them to accept increasing tensions with the US in order to achieve their goals.

2. The importance of Cuba as the prime Soviet base for directing Communist activities in the Western Hemisphere has increased and justifies a higher level of Soviet military investment.

3. While recognizing that their increased level of military activity in Cuba cannot be completely concealed, the Soviets are making every effort to hide the full scope of their program from the U.S.

4. As "hard" intelligence becomes more difficult to acquire, greater attention must be given to reports from the Cuban underground and to developing a more realistic assessment of Soviet revolutionary strategy for Latin America.

5. There are signs that the Soviets, emboldened by their greatly increased strategic nuclear capabilities since 1922, including their newly acquired, but fast growing Polaris-type submarine fleet may be preparing for a new test of will with the US involving another experiment in *fait accompli* nuclear power politics.

6. Should the President of the United States be confronted with a new Cuban missile crisis, he will find that the stakes are even higher, the hard photographic evidence of Soviet military capabilities will not be available, and his room for maneuver considerably reduced by the new balance of strategic power.

BOLDNESS, THE KEY TO SOVIET POLICY TOWARD LATIN AMERICA

Although Khrushchev takes credit for conceiving the missile gambit and for presenting it, as Premier, to the Politbureau, he emphasizes that the decision to pursue this dangerous course was an act of collective leadership. This is borne out by his candid admission (made to Dr. A. McGehee Harvey in 1969) that after the U-2 crisis in the spring of 1960, he was no longer "calling the shots"; that after Powers was shot down, his own ascendancy during the next four years was over. Thus the policies followed by the USSR during this perilous period were not in any sense imposed by Khrushchev upon his colleagues in the Kremlin as Stalin might have done, but were indeed a coldly calculated collective acceptance of the risks inherent in his proposal.

CHANGES AFFECTING THE POLITBUREAU'S ASSESSMENT OF THE CUBAN SITUATION IN 1971

While undoubtedly there are wider considerations affecting Soviet foreign policy than

those cited below—for example, intellectual unrest at home, economic unrest within the European satellites, and the continuing possibility of a war with Communist China—the Watch Committee believes the following changes which have occurred since 1962 have an important bearing on the Politbureau's assessment of the Cuban situation today:

The balance of strategic nuclear power in the world has shifted, just as Khrushchev had predicted, in favor of the Soviet Union. Consequently the U.S. would be even less likely than before to risk nuclear war with the USSR.

Communism now has a base on the continent of South America—Chile. But, like Castro, Allende's government faces attack by enemies from within and without.

The Castro regime, unable to solve even its own internal economic problems, has lost the support of the overwhelming majority of the Cuban people, including the rank and file of Castro's army. The possibility of internal revolt within the coming year cannot be discounted.

The forces of revolution in Latin America, particularly in Bolivia, Peru and Colombia are ripe for Communist exploitation provided the continental base in Chile can be maintained.

As a result of the protracted Vietnam War, the U.S. public has forced the Administration to announce a policy of non-involvement in local conflicts in the less developed areas of the world.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE FOR POLITBUREAU CONSIDERATION IN 1971

The Watch Committee wishes to emphasize that a Soviet policy of boldness paid off in 1962 and that today's balance of power would tend to encourage rather than inhibit new Russian adventures in brinkmanship. The expanded Soviet military program for Cuba clearly involves improving the USSR's nuclear capabilities in the Western Hemisphere.

In the discussions on Cuba between Secretary of State Rogers and Foreign Minister Gromyko on October 19, followed up as they were by the New York meeting between Dr. Kissinger and Foreign Minister Gromyko and Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin on October 22, the Nixon Administration reconfirmed the earlier Kennedy-Khrushchev "understanding". To many Latin Americans these talks, in effect, regularized the Soviet military presence on a Communist base in the Caribbean. Certainly they have not resulted in a permanent reduction of Soviet naval power in the Caribbean. The Russians are still standing behind their Tass statement that they have not been, and are not building their "own" military base in Cuba.

The Watch Committee recalls that the original Kennedy-Khrushchev "understanding" called for international inspection in Cuba to confirm the withdrawal of the Soviet missiles. This never took place because the Communist government in Cuba refused to allow inspection teams into the country. Taking into account the changes that have occurred since 1962, particularly the United States' loss of clear-cut strategic superiority over the USSR; the fact that on site inspection is still not permitted by Castro; and the great number of reports from members of the Cuban resistance that the Soviets are secretly installing nuclear missiles in underground installations; the Watch Committee believes that in the interest of national security prudent U.S. policymakers have little choice but to presume the worst. The Committee suggests, therefore, that appropriate preparations should be made to deal with any of the following possible Soviet courses of action:

The clandestine deployment of nuclear weapons systems into Cuba.

The overt use of Cuba as a nuclear sub-

marine base (thus doubling the on-station time in the Western Atlantic for these subs) but maintaining the fiction that Russian Polaris-type submarines are merely observing their international port-of-call rights by visiting Castro's naval base at Cienfuegos whenever necessary to meet their operational requirements.

Emphasizing Cuba's role as the political and military base for all Soviet revolutionary expansion in Latin America by letting it be known that the nuclear weapons deployed to Cuba will be used, if need be, in direct support of Chile or any other Communist regime that may come to power in the Hemisphere if they are invaded by external armed forces, whether these forces are acting unilaterally or as members of the Organization of American States.

From the Cuban Watch Committee on Cuba:

DR. MANOLO REYES,
DR. HERMINIO PORTELL-VILA,
Editor, *Radio Free America*.
DR. GUILLERMO BELT,
Former Ambassador to the United States, the United Nations, and the Organization of American States.

GROWING DRUG PROBLEM IN ALLEGHENY COUNTY CITED BY REPRESENTATIVE MOORHEAD

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a Senate panel recently completed a series of drug hearings in Pittsburgh.

The panel heard from many experts and community spokesmen about the evils of drugs and their debilitating nature on all community life. But the missing factors in the hearings were the drug users and addicts themselves.

Reporter Al Donalson, writing in the January 24 Pittsburgh Press, takes a look at Pittsburgh's, and Allegheny County's, drug dilemma, noting last week's hearings.

We all have heard that drugs are now everybody's problem, no longer just another scourge in the ghetto.

The latest drug death figures from Allegheny County points that up with surprising equality.

The racial and sexual breakdown of Allegheny County's 38 drug deaths last year was: 19 whites, 16 male and three female; and 19 nonwhites, 16 male and three female.

These fatalities represent more than a 100-percent increase on 1969's figures. There is small doubt that the drug problem in our area is growing at a rapid rate.

As one of those interviewed in Mr. Donalson's article says, the only way the problem is going to be licked is through more money for research and technology.

At this time I would like to put Mr. Donalson's article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

HERE'S REAL DRUGS STORY MISSED BY PROBERS HERE

(By Al Donalson)

A team of Senate probers headed by U.S. Sen. Richard S. Schweiker, R-Pa., came to town last week and got this word:

Drug abuse here has reached epidemic proportions, and more federal money is needed to curb an alarming increase in the number of drug addicts in Allegheny County.

The word came from a procession of witnesses representing government, industry, law enforcement and public health agencies.

However, with the exception of an 18-year-old Ross Twp. drug user, the U.S. Senate subcommittee members didn't hear any testimony from addicts or those who have been victimized by addicts.

Schweiker said the panel tried to get drug users to testify but was "regrettably unsuccessful."

TRAGEDY ILLUSTRATED

There are hundreds of tales available which illustrate the tragedy and despair of the local drug scene.

Item. "Hoss," a Hill District jitney driver, picked up two passengers and took them to Homewood.

When his passengers reached their destination, Hoss didn't get his fare. His payoff was having the pair rob him of his wallet, car and clothes.

"They was junkies, man," said Hoss.

"And I felt stupid walking three or four blocks damn near naked in broad daylight to get to the fire station in Homewood.

"People out there was staring at me like I was crazy," he said.

CAR SURROUNDED

Item. On a recent weekday afternoon, a white Cadillac stopped on Centre Avenue in the Hill District, and was surrounded immediately by scores of addicts.

They clustered around the car with money clutched in their hands.

The driver of the car was selling heroin. One bag for \$7, two bags at a bargain rate—\$13.

One of the buyers ripped open one of his bags and dabbed a bit of the white substance on his thumb. He then licked the powder off his thumb and told his partner: "Yeah man, this is some good stuff, let's split."

They hurried up Centre Avenue like two kids with a new Christmas toy, leaving dozens of other buyers crowded around the car trying to place their orders before the supply ran out.

Item. A numbers writer watching this scene slowly shook his head and said:

"Man, I don't understand it with these young dudes. Can't nobody tell them nothin'.

"Like, dig, I know a young brother named Blood who's about 19. Heavy (brainy) young dude, too. The cat was going to college. But he got kicked out when he was caught mainlining.

"Like, man, the cat's habit is \$300 a day now. Square business, \$300 a day.

ALWAYS HUSTLIN'

"The dude can't even afford to sleep because he's always got to be hustlin' to get his bread (money) together for his habit.

"His Jones (urge for drugs) came down last week and he went to Oakland on a tip. He busted an old gray (white) dude in the head and took about \$1,000 from him.

"Man, Blood was hell on wheels for about three days with that grand. But his main man who was selling him good stuff got busted. So, like, Blood got some bad stuff from another pusher.

"It had a lot of flour mixed up in it. Blood damn near died behind that stuff," said the numbers writer.

Item. A Hill District businesswoman takes a pistol out of her purse and clicks off the safety when leaving her store in the evening.

There is usually a group of at least 15 to 20 junkies hanging around the outside of her door.

"When they see the gun and hear the safety click off, they know I mean business and don't bother me," she said.

"I know it's like the Wild West to pull out a gun. But that's what it's like down here—a jungle."

Similar tales, originating in wealthy suburbs as well as the inner city ghettos, can be told.

Drug abuse is now no respecter of person. It cuts across racial and class lines in rural areas as well as the cities and suburbs.

123,000 USING IN HIGH SCHOOL

A recent survey published in a Pennsylvania Department of Health journal revealed that at least 123,000 high school students in the state are regularly using drugs.

This number, which represents about 11 per cent of the total high school student population, does not include those who only occasionally use drugs.

It was also discovered that 70 per cent of the regular users come from "upper socioeconomic" families, and that 25 per cent live in rural areas.

County Coroner Cyril Wecht's 1970 report shows 19 of the 38 narcotics deaths last year in Allegheny County were suffered by whites.

In 1969, when there were 17 narcotics deaths, only three of the victims were white.

This shift of drug abuse from the ghetto to the suburbs is thought to be one of the main reasons for the increased interest in combating addiction.

Many in the black community are bitter about this late interest exhibited by whites. Their sentiments are articulated by Charles Mikell, a specialist on alcoholism and drug abuse for Community Action Pittsburgh.

"As long as the junkies were those niggers in the Hill District, no one paid any attention to the problem. But now that drugs have spread to the lily white suburbs, everyone now is very upset and wants to know why something isn't being done," Mikell, himself black, says.

"The only way the problem is going to be licked is through more money for research and rehabilitation."

ANSWERS STILL IN FUTURE

Mikell's plea for more funds for research and rehabilitation was shared by every witness who testified this week during the hearings.

However, any answers through research are probably a year or two away. The federal Harrison Act of 1914 stifled drug research in the United States.

Designed then to stem a rising flow of narcotics, the statute proved to be punitive to any physician who attempted to treat an addict. Hundreds of doctors were jailed as a result of the act.

Although the law isn't as vigorously enforced as in the past, its influence can still be felt.

IRS OKAY REQUIRED

Any scientist who wishes to do research on marijuana must be approved as a researcher by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS).

To be eligible, a researcher must be legally authorized by state law. Physicians with unrevoked licenses and state universities are eligible by state law.

But others, like pharmacologists, chemists and private universities must go through a tangle of bureaucratic red tape to become registered.

Once registration has been granted, the researcher then must purchase marijuana, through IRS, from the National Institute of Mental Health.

If the researcher intends to use human subjects, he must then deal with the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in addition to the other two agencies.

SECURITY MEASURES PRESCRIBED

The researcher must also adopt a carefully prescribed set of security measures. If any marijuana is lost, the researcher must docu-

ment the circumstances surrounding the loss.

At all times, the researcher must maintain exact records of the amount of marijuana used, and for what purpose.

Some of these restrictions will be loosened when the recently enacted Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 becomes effective May 1.

Section I of the act guarantees protection from prosecution to certified researchers and subjects who use marijuana and other drugs in legitimate scientific research.

THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the desire for the improvement in the delivery of health services is universal. The number of legislative proposals already introduced in these early days of the 92d Congress is ample evidence of this fact.

And yet, even the most comprehensive proposals, those which deal with the skyrocketing costs of medical care, the distribution of medical personnel, and the Federal role in the delivery of health care including the financing of this program only touch the surface of the problem. As the following article by Mr. Howard Lewis shows, another concern is the laws of the States under which medicine is practiced. Any comprehensive medical program that is enacted by Congress must also deal with the serious legal problems which Mr. Lewis discusses.

Mr. Thomas J. Watson, the chairman of the board of the International Business Machines has also written an excellent article in which he sums up the hard evidence in favor of a comprehensive national health insurance program. As Mr. Watson says:

We need a national health insurance law.

What follows in these two articles are two views on the state of medicine today, both thoughtfully developing proposals and details with which the Congress must deal:

THE PROBLEM DOCTORS

(By Howard Lewis)

(NOTE.—Howard Lewis is a consultant to government agencies and co-author, with his wife, of "The Medical Offenders.")

If you are like most laymen, you take comfort in the belief that doctors of medicine are closely regulated by stringent laws, rigorous government agencies and exacting professional groups.

Of course, the typical physician's own conscience inspires him to practice with competence and honor. He fully deserves the confidence and respect he receives from his patients.

However, the fact is that the privately practicing physician is largely a free agent, scarcely subject to regulation once he secures a license. The laws governing medical practice are shot through with loopholes. Even where restrictions are clear, enforcement is spotty.

It merits pointing out that medicine's disciplinary vacuum creates no problem in regard to the vast majority of M.D.'s. Nonetheless, on at least one ground the typical physi-

cian can be faulted: he seldom enforces among errant colleagues the high standards of conduct he personally upholds. The lack of effective discipline in medicine has produced an anomalous fringe group—licensed M.D.'s who constitute a hazard to patients.

Dr. Harold B. Jervy, past president of the Federation of State Medical Boards, has estimated that between 15,000 and 20,000 physicians in private practice repeatedly commit acts unworthy of the profession. He estimated 2,500 to 7,500 are actually breaking the law through narcotic violations, fraud and other felonies. These offenders account for about fifty million patient visits a year.

The problem doctors include those who are guilty of negligence and incompetence, abandonment of the patient, and assault through unauthorized procedures—the major causes of civil malpractice actions.

There are also physicians who seize upon medical service as a means of exploiting patients: fee gougers who levy unconscionable charges; "over-treaters," who perform unnecessary services; the fee splitters; quacks, who betray the canons of scientific medicine.

Also there are the mentally ill, including the senile. Mental illness is one of medicine's most widespread disciplinary problems, and its handling illustrates the weakness in medical licensing.

In sixteen jurisdictions insanity is not even grounds for suspending a physician's license. In most other states the license can be suspended only if the physician is actually in a mental institution.

I recently came across one doctor who is often incapable of maintaining a rational train of thought, much less a competent medical practice. Other doctors in his community regard him as a psychotic and try to steer patients away from him. He nonetheless sees a large number of patients, and they sustain an alarming number of injuries. The way the law is now, he can continue practicing indefinitely.

I mentioned this doctor while testifying at a New York State Senate committee hearing on medical malpractice. Joseph Jaspán, the committee counsel, added: "We know of a practicing physician who has to spend six months of every year in a mental hospital." The state licensing board has not acted against him, and even if it did it's doubtful that the weak state law would uphold them.

No state law limits a physician to his area of medical competence or requires him to keep up with medicine. Nor does any state check on physicians likely to be incapacitated because of age. One retired doctor in his eighties is nearly blind and has long since lost touch with medicine. He keeps up his medical license by paying an annual registration fee.

The profession as a whole is loath to act on disciplinary matters. In New York State there are conservatively an estimated 1,200 to 2,700 licensed M.D.'s unfit to practice medicine. Last year the New York State Board of Medical Examiners—actually more active than most licensing boards—took a grand total of nine disciplinary actions. The Medical Society of the State of New York took not a single one, an achievement shared by 31 other state societies.

Thus the laws and professional codes that are supposed to protect the patient actually protect the medical offender. There needs to be immediate reform to plug loopholes in the law, to secure more vigorous disciplinary action. In Washington State and in California, this occurred with the cooperation of the state medical societies.

But for the profession to be spurred there first needs to be an outcry from the lay community. Until medical licensing laws are overhauled, selecting a physician can be hazardous for the patient.

THE RIGHT TO LIFE

(By Thomas J. Watson, Jr.)

(NOTE.—Thomas J. Watson Jr. is chairman of the board of International Business Machines. These remarks are excerpted from a speech delivered in Rochester, Minn., on the Mayo Foundation's Industry Day.)

I have become increasingly appalled to read of a country which during the past two decades has dropped from seventh in the world to sixteenth in the prevention of infant mortality; in female life expectancy from sixth to eighth; in male life expectancy from tenth to twenty-fourth; and which has bought itself this unenviable trend by spending more of its gross national product for medical care—\$1 out of every \$14—than any other country on the face of the earth.

The country I am talking about is our own U.S.A., the home of the free, the home of the brave, and the home of the decrepit, inefficient, high-priced system of medical care.

I know experts disagree over our precise international standings. I realize that medical problems here and abroad are not identical. I know American medicine has scored many brilliant triumphs.

But on the evidence, we are clearly moving in the wrong direction; failing to fulfill adequately for all our people the first right set down in the Declaration of Independence—the right to life.

What must we do to restore that right?

First, as the Carnegie Commission said in October, we have to beef up our arsenal: Train more doctors, more nurses, more paramedics; bail our medical and dental schools out of their deep financial troubles; break ground for new hospitals and clinics; in a word, spend more money.

Second, we must have better management, better organization, more efficiency.

I find it shocking to read of legal roadblocks against comprehensive prepaid group practice, which has repeatedly delivered better care at lower costs; of slums without a doctor; of highly trained medical corpsmen who, if they want to enter medicine as a civilian career, find just one job open to them—hospital orderly.

We cannot continue to live with facts like these.

Third, we must put health care within reach of every American.

Under our present system, the poor—especially the non-white poor—suffer by far the most. Non-whites have a life expectancy six years shorter than whites; twice the whites' infant mortality rate; four times the whites' maternal death rate.

How do we extend coverage for medical bills to everyone? By stretching the umbrella of private health insurance which still doesn't come close to covering Americans today? No. We need a far more thoroughgoing reform.

That brings us up against an old taboo, "socialized medicine." I completely believe in the American free enterprise system. But when the system fails to produce I think we should not flinch from looking to some sort of government intervention.

That, in American medicine today, means some new form of national health insurance.

Twenty-one years ago President Truman urged a national health system. In 1949, as a dyed-in-the-wool free enterpriser, I accepted the argument that we didn't need it. But I cannot accept that argument in 1970.

A variety of health insurance bills have been introduced in the Congress. But no comprehensive plan appears to be moving very fast. We do not need national health insurance as a political football in 1972. We need a new national health insurance law. I hope the Administration will put this at the top of its priority list for 1971.

To get that legislation, the partisans of varying plans—in the Congress, the Ameri-

can Medical Association, the A.F.L.-C.I.O.—must get together. To speed such compromise, I believe all of us as citizens should start now to build a bonfire of persuasion—to speak out, to demand change, and not stop until we get the legislation we need.

We can take pride in our system of universal public education, social security, and work laws.

The time has now arrived for us to have a system of universal public medicine to do for us what the Scandinavian and British systems have done for those countries: Put them medically at the top of the world.

We must bring the fullness of American medical care to all the American people. As the greatest nation in the world I believe we can do no less.

JUNTA STRIKES OUT AGAIN

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak on the latest act in the Greek tragedy, and to commend these Washington Post columnists for their continuing efforts to keep the American public informed on the true nature of the regime to which this country is giving its full military and diplomatic support. The handling of Demetracopoulos affair by Ambassador Tasca and the Greek generals was sickening, to say the least, and leads one almost to conclude that with enemies like the Greek generals the Communists who would like to foment true revolution in Greece really do not need any friends. The generals appear to be doing a very adroit job of cutting the ground from beneath their own feet. I only hope U.S. policy in Greece will be redirected before we find ourselves in another "brush fire" conflict in the name of freedom and democracy. With that I submit the Evans-Novak report:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 23, 1970]

ANOTHER GREEK TRAGEDY

In their handling of the death of an old man whose son is a self-exiled leader of the anti-junta resistance movement, the Greek military dictatorship has now demonstrated an arrogant attitude toward the U.S. Senate that has cost it dearly here.

That attitude casts doubt on the wisdom of the Greek colonels and the wisdom of the United States in recently restoring full military aid to Athens. What's more, the event casts shadows on U.S. ambassador to Athens, career diplomat Henry Tasca.

The incident was triggered with the fatal illness of the 81-year-old father of Elias Demetracopoulos, a prominent Greek journalist who fled to the United States in 1967. On Dec. 11, three liberal Democratic senators signed an extraordinary request to Col. George Papadopoulos, Greek prime minister, asking that Demetracopoulos be given 48-hour safe passage to visit his dying father. The message went through the State Department to Tasca.

For nine days there was no answer to the senators. Finally, on Dec. 20, four days after Demetracopoulos's father died, alone and untended, the three senators—Mike Gravel,

of Alaska, Frank Moss of Utah, and Quentin Burdick of North Dakota—received a telegram from the Greek Embassy here.

That response, incredibly enough, said Demetracopoulos should have routinely applied to the Embassy for his "safe conduct" pass. Had he done so, say those familiar with his role as a major anti-junta resistance leader, he might have been held in the Embassy on trumped-up charges, a Greek citizen with no recourse to U.S. assistance.

Five days earlier, on Dec. 15, Tasca cabled the State Department echoing the Greek Embassy's message to the three senators—that the Greek Embassy had been instructed to handle Demetracopoulos's appeal. But when high State Department officials asked the Embassy to elaborate on Tasca's bland cable, they were informed no message had been received from Athens.

Accordingly, on the evening of Dec. 15, the department wired Tasca again, this time instructing him to see Prime Minister Papadopoulos and to cable back *yes* or *no* on the safe-conduct request. To that message, there apparently was no answer at all.

Thus, on Dec. 16, the day the old man died, the three senators wrote President Nixon asking his personal investigation. They wanted to know whether Tasca and the Greek government deliberately stalled until the case had become moot with the death of the father. As we write this, there has been no reply from the White House.

In the background of this miserable affair, two circumstances bear deeper scrutiny.

First, Demetracopoulos personally prevailed on many anti-junta senators to postpone the confirmation of Tasca in 1969. His argument: Filling that post, vacant since January 1969, would place the United States fully behind the junta despite its grossly anti-democratic practices. That might have influenced the Council of Europe not to expel Greece.

The long Senate delay in Tasca's confirmation scarcely endeared Demetracopoulos to him. Some State Department officials believe Tasca dragged his heels in handling the safe-conduct request.

Far more important to U.S. diplomats is what the affair reveals about the colonels' inability to understand their powerful opposition in the United States. The request was a rare opportunity for Papadopoulos to make a dramatic gesture proving his boast that the junta is moving toward democratic procedures. As one top diplomatic operative told us: "If that government had any sense of security, they would have given Demetracopoulos red-carpet treatment, but they didn't have the nerve."

Instead, they apparently feared political trouble from the arrival of a resistance leader under the emotional circumstances of his father's death. Papadopoulos promised over television last weekend that all political prisoners would be freed next spring—if peace and order prevail. The return, if only for two days, of an exiled resistance leader to Athens might have brought new outbreaks.

Whatever the reason, the squalid handling of the affair is raising new questions in the Senate about the junta and its full backing by the U.S. government.

THE NEED FOR ACTION ON CONVERSION

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the gravest problems facing my district, the Commonwealth of Massachu-

setts and many other sections of this Nation is economic instability caused by a decrease in Federal expenditures on certain space and defense activities.

Without prompt congressional attention, it will be only a short time until many persons will face unemployment because of current efforts to reorder national priorities and to move from a military-oriented to a civilian-oriented economy.

I have filed two economic conversion proposals which will launch a broad-based, comprehensive effort to ease this transition. These bills will provide immediate relief for the highly skilled worker by retraining scientists and providing technical assistance to small businesses to achieve conversion. Funding is earmarked for State and regional conversion planning commissions so that action on the local level can get underway. In addition, Federal funds will be provided for conversion research, subsidies to industry, and direct aids for recruitment of unemployed scientists and engineers into the Government. Legislation similar to this has been filed in the Senate.

It is imperative that conversion legislation be passed this year if we are to check the steadily increasing unemployment among the highly skilled scientific, engineering, and technical professions.

Rapid action on these bills and speedy implementation of these proposals is needed before our technological community is dismantled and the job situation grows even worse.

It is time for Congress to stop theorizing and start acting.

OATH OF OFFICE

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Arita Van Rensselaer, one of my constituents and an experienced hand on Capitol Hill, has written a poem in honor of my taking the oath of office as a U.S. Congressman and in honor of the 92d Congress. I would like to commend Mrs. Van Rensselaer for her originality and honesty in her poem and thank her for her loyalty and devote patriotism. The citizens of Keedysville, Md., can be proud of such a distinguished citizen.

The poem is as follows:

OATH OF OFFICE

(By Mrs. Arita Van Rensselaer)

Across the plaza—and beneath the dome
The new ones come—they have just left
home.
They glance toward Freedom, as she stands
on high
Towering in the sunlight, against the cold
wintry sky.
They know at first they must enter her
school
And learn to legislate democracy rule by rule.
They stand up tall, to hear the opening
prayer
For family and friends, watch from the
gallery there.
It is a moment of awe when the gavel falls

And a great thrill when the new name he
calls.
After the oath a stir and commotion reflects
in the faces
So many, so very many from all the strange
places,
As well as close by—some were known before
But all have entered by that one open door—
The choice of the people—the chosen ones
in the land
Only these may enter the chamber, at the
Speaker's well to stand.
It is thrilling—yet appalling and mingled
with fear
For this is a term that lasts only to the
second year.
Now the ordeal descends, each vote must be
right
To please all the factions, and bring Peace
in sight.
Yet, what about conscience, what about the
balance of trade,
What about international relations, and the
enemies we have made?
What to do about poverty, misplaced persons,
young people and things
They all want to be happy, carefree and en-
joy privileges of kings.
The impossible right now is the imperative
demand
From marchers and demonstrators on every
hand.
How do we tell parents that citizens must be
trained from birth
If we want to create a paradise of equality
on this earth
That citizenship is a challenge of self con-
trol with pride
And that the real revolution must take place
inside
The individual, within his heart, and his
very soul.
He alone sets the standards, and must reach
for the goal
Of the general good—the welfare of all.
Let's see what happens, now, comes the first
roll call.
Taxation is a problem we resented in colonial
days
Now, it has become the monster that is before
us always.
Taxes upon taxes, an astronomical sum
Yet the budget will not balance, and so the
protests come.
Committees, Committees, Oh which will it
be?
Try to get on a committee that benefits the
constituency.
"Public Service" is a phrase, that is much
overworked
But who knows what, if some of these duties
are shirked.
There are constituents and clients, and lob-
byists galore
And the only way to dodge them is to be
speaking from the floor.
So, that maiden speech brings forth enthu-
siastic applause
But can it truly help to make and preserve
our laws?
The new session comes in like a Happy New
Year
With a burst of applause, and an exultant
loud cheer.
And all these remarks could be "Revised and
Extended" to many more
But only if there is "Consent" to all that
has gone before.
While the Spirit of Freedom stands high over
all
Unchanging in purpose, all evil to forestall.
All good to the nation her light has inspired
True guidance and faith for the new leaders
acquired.
Congratulations and dreams echo down
through the halls
While plans for real work begin as darkness
falls
The future of the nation only Freedom can
foretell
But, if "In God is our Trust"—all will be well.

**NEIGHBORHOOD HEALTH CENTERS:
BRINGING HEALTH CARE BACK
TO THE PEOPLE**

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, as medical and hospital costs skyrocket, the average American is finding that it's harder than ever to locate high quality health care—particularly if he lives in a central city or a sparsely settled rural area.

Now that the days of the house call are behind us, access to medical care is limited on evenings and weekends even in those communities where doctors are abundant. People who need care after the working day are often forced to resort to overcrowded hospital emergency rooms where admissions have shot up by 250 percent during the past 20 years.

One new approach to health care delivery, the neighborhood clinic, may help reverse this unfortunate trend. Many of these new consumer-oriented health facilities have been established by local public health agencies with the backing of the U.S. Public Health Service and the Office of Economic Opportunity. But Federal aid for a neighborhood-based clinic is not always essential as the residents of the Beltrami neighborhood in Minneapolis have found. In this older but still vital community, residents set up their own part-time clinic staffed by volunteer doctors, nurses, and pharmacists. The following article from the Minneapolis Tribune tells how it was done:

**FREE CLINIC SERVES NORTHEAST RESIDENTS
(By Sam Newlund)**

The Beltrami Health Clinic is a place where you can't tell the medical staff from the patients without asking, and where lab technician Kim Williams wears her blue denim shirttail outside her jeans.

That's enough to make the clinic, at 759 Pierce St. NE., somewhat offbeat.

It's also different because it's free, and because its freewheeling, socialistic approach to community medicine is practiced in a northeast Minneapolis neighborhood more noted for its conservatism than for giveaway programs.

The clinic's rooms are mostly upstairs in a building occupied by Margaret Barry Neighborhood House. Although not nearly as big, the health clinic bears some resemblance to a free community clinic in the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood.

Miss Williams, 25, is one of a number of volunteers—including doctors, nurses, pharmacy students and others—who donate varying amounts of time to the clinic. Her regular job is medical technician (bacteriology) at University of Minnesota Hospitals.

In the free clinic, the medical lab is a kitchen. Coffee simmers on a stove next to a table where Miss Williams examines specimens under a microscope loaned by the university.

While she was doing that one day recently, a doctor down the hall was attending to a squalling infant in one of the offices that have been converted into examining rooms.

Downstairs, in a small room called "the pharmacy," three pharmacy students and a girl volunteer were cataloging donated drugs and filling bottles with pills taken from sample packages distributed by drug firms.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

In a waiting room, community organizer Ed Lambert tossed an indoor Frisbee with a 12-year-old boy.

The clinic was Lambert's brain-child. As head of community organization for the East Side Citizens Community Center, an anti-poverty agency run by Mobilization of Economic Resources (MOER), Lambert began promoting the clinic idea after the failure of an effort to form a citizens lobby to push property tax reform.

Lambert and others surveyed the Beltrami Park Neighborhood and found that an overwhelming majority of those contacted favored a free, non-emergency medical clinic to battle the rising cost of medical care.

Nearly half of those questioned reported transportation problems in getting medical service. Nearly half of the job-holders said they had trouble getting to a doctor when the need arose.

With help from a number of sources—drugs and equipment, for example, from drug firms, private doctors and the university—the clinic has been open since Dec. 8.

But nobody came that first day except the staff.

Since then, roughly half a dozen to 15 or so patients have shown up for each clinic session. The clinic is open from 7 p.m. to 10 p.m. on Tuesdays and 12:30 p.m. to 5 p.m. Saturdays.

The clinic is the city's newest example of a growing interest in community-based public medical care. Pilot City Health Center on the North Side is a more fully developed example.

Advocates of community clinics still hope for "outreach centers" operated as branches of the new Hennepin County General Hospital, although that concept's prognosis is in doubt.

Experimenters like Lambert put great store in "neighborhood-managed" clinics as a means of reaching clients early enough to make use of effective preventive medicine. The belief is that grass-roots involvement and management are more apt to yield greater use by patients.

In the Beltrami Clinic's case, the "neighborhood managers" are a board of directors including members who have been staunch supporters of conservative causes.

One of these is Mrs. Charlotte Capra, president of Concerned Residents of Beltrami, a precinct chairman in Mayor Charles Stenvig's election campaign and a member of the conservative Taxpayers ("T") Party.

Mrs. Capra and her husband helped lead a successful fight last summer to block an urban renewal project in the Beltrami neighborhood.

In an interview, Mrs. Capra said she wants to keep an eye on the clinic "because of the socialistic trend in this type of thing." She said she doesn't want the clinic used by "people who don't need it," although she doesn't believe that has happened yet.

"We are an independent people," Mrs. Capra said of her Beltrami neighbors, "and we're used to paying our own way."

One policy set by the board is not to dispense birth-control pills or contraceptives to unmarried women unless, in consultation with a doctor, they are deemed necessary for medical reasons.

According to Mrs. Gertrude Goodacre, a Stenvig supporter and chairman of the clinic board, the board was influenced in that decision by a neighborhood Roman Catholic priest.

Nobody asks your income when you come to the Beltrami clinic, despite the board's desire to help only the needy.

A recent visitor was Mrs. Ray Barclay, 444 NE. Filmore St. She brought her 8-month-old daughter, Tammy, who was suffering from a severe cold.

Mrs. Barclay said she was pleased with

the service. "I don't have to sit here and wait like you usually do," she said. Before the clinic opened, she took her child to a private medical clinic in Fridley where, she said, a routine examination and shots cost \$17.

Antibiotics were prescribed for Tammy, and although they weren't on hand at the moment, her mother was told they would be brought to her home.

Mrs. Barclay said she plans to make a private donation to the clinic.

THIRD SILVER STAR FOR FARNHAM

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, there is perhaps no greater and more meaningful honor than that any man can receive than the respect and commendation of the citizens of his hometown, the place where he was born and raised.

I am delighted, therefore, to note that on February 19, the Chamber of Commerce of Wilmington, Mass., will honor Maj. Donald W. Farnham for his outstanding gallantry in the Vietnam conflict. A dinner will be held for that purpose, and the Board of Selectmen of Wilmington are to proclaim the day as Maj. Donald W. Farnham Day.

Major Farnham enlisted in the U.S. Army 13 years ago. The recent recipient of his third Silver Star, the Nation's third highest award for valor, the holder of six Purple Hearts for wounds received in action and numerous other awards and medals of commendation, he is said to be the most decorated soldier of the Vietnam war.

The record of his tremendous courage and bravery, and his devotion to his fellow men speaks for itself, and I am happy to be able to share it, as it appeared in the Wilmington Town Crier, with my colleagues in the House:

THIRD SILVER STAR FOR FARNHAM

Major Donald W. Farnham of Wilmington who enlisted in the Army about a dozen years ago, has been awarded his third Silver Star, the nation's third highest award for valor.

The award was made at the Miami Military Academy, in Florida, where Farnham is currently teaching in the ROTC.

His most recent award was for conspicuous gallantry and heroism above and beyond the call of duty, in action against a hostile force, while serving as aircraft commander and armed helicopter unit commander.

He was escorting lift helicopters into a landing zone and the flight came under intense automatic weapons and small arms fire. His aircraft received numerous hits and Farnham was wounded. In spite of the extensive aircraft damage and wounds received, he remained on station, in support of the ground forces, until his aircraft was shot down by enemy ground fire.

Farnham was evacuated from the landing zone and returned to the staging area. He refused medical assistance and insisted on returning to the landing zone. As his aircraft approached the landing area, it again was subjected to a withering fire from the enemy.

After he had expended all his ammunition Farnham attempted to evacuate some of the wounded soldiers from the area. Al-

though the evacuation was successful, his aircraft was hit by automatic weapons fire and Farnham was wounded a second time. He managed to fly his crippled aircraft back to the staging area, where he immediately transferred to a replacement aircraft and returned to the landing zone to continue support of the beleaguered ground forces.

On each pass across the area Farnham's aircraft was subjected to a murderous volume of small arms fire and automatic weapons fire from a village adjacent to the landing zone. Farnham flew his aircraft on a succession of low-level attacks on the heavily entrenched enemy forces.

The North Vietnamese were deployed throughout the area in trenches, buildings and fortified positions and, despite the heavy enemy fire and without regard for his personal welfare, Farnham continued his attack. He made firing passes, flying directly into the mouth of a cross fire from machine gun emplacements set up facing the landing zone.

Throughout the day Farnham flew individual support for the ground forces, unescorted, making low-level firing passes along the perimeter of the landing zone in order to deliberately divert the enemy fire from the ground forces.

By this time the enemy had directed all

his fire toward Farnham's aircraft and automatic weapons fire brought his aircraft down. Due to the enemy situation and the onset of darkness, it was impossible to evacuate Farnham.

Throughout the night Major Farnham organized and lead the ground forces on successive attacks against the enemy and on two occasions was forced to engage in hand-to-hand combat.

Despite what appeared to be insurmountable odds, his unit gained the momentum required to suppress the enemy.

DONALD FARNHAM HAS SIX PURPLE HEARTS

Major Donald W. Farnham, the most decorated soldier of the Vietnam War, has six Purple Hearts, for wounds received in action.

Thirteen years ago the then sixteen-year-old Wilmington boy enlisted in the U.S. Army before graduating from Wilmington High School. He enlisted to become a paratrooper, and the military life appealed to him. He soon attained non-commissioned rank, and became a sergeant, after which he enrolled in an Army Helicopter School.

Farnham was one of the first helicopter pilots to go to Vietnam, and he spent a total of 47 months in active service in that war-stricken country.

It was for him a very interesting experience. He evolved new methods of fighting with helicopters, and was shortly one of the outstanding helicopter pilots in the U.S. Army, always being foremost in combat with the enemy.

"I don't think anyone enjoys killing anybody else", he told the Miami Journal a few weeks ago. "But we are interested in saving our own people. Those who dislike the war the most are the people in the military, because they are the ones who have to fight it".

During the 47 months of combat flying Farnham picked up, in addition to the six Purple Hearts, three Distinguished Flying Crosses, the Bronze Star, the Air Medal with 43 Oakleaf Clusters and two "V" devices, the Joint Services Commendation Medal, two Army Commendation Medals, the Navy Commendation Medal, as well as the three Silver Stars.

Other decorations include the Vietnamese Cross for Gallantry with two palms and two silver star devices, the Presidential Unit Citation, Valorous Unit Citation, Meritorious Unit Citation, Navy Unit Commendation Medal, and the Vietnamese Honor Medal. There are others.

Skydiving was his favorite hobby, until he broke his back in 1967.

SENATE—Monday, February 1, 1971

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 26, 1971)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian on the expiration of the recess and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The Reverend Billy H. Cline, pastor, Merrimon Avenue Baptist Church, Asheville, N.C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, we give thanks for the assurance that Thy ways are steadfast and reliable. We pray that we may be conscious of Thy eternal presence and of our daily need of Thee. Forgive us that we are not always strong in the consciousness of Thy presence.

Bless this Senate that each Member may find strength for every time of need, and help each Member to be aware of the needs, cares, and anxieties of people everywhere. Reveal to them the solutions to the overwhelming problems of our Nation and the world.

Deliver us from animosity, hatred, and prejudice, and help us to establish lines of communication so that we can make our contribution toward the betterment of mankind and peace throughout the world.

Help us to respect ourselves and one another for Thou hast created us.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord we have prayed together. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations,

were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations received today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 29, 1971, be approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 484—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL DESIGNATING LINCOLN BACK COUNTRY IN MONTANA AS A NEW WILDERNESS AREA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, my able colleague, Senator LEE METCALF, and I work together on many projects and problems of interest to the people of the State of Montana. One of the most popular proposals in recent years was our bill which would designate the Lincoln Back Country in Montana as a new wilderness area. The Lincoln Back Country in Montana is one of the finest examples of wilderness—an area of unsurpassed beauty. People of the State, conservationists, and friends from all over the country support this program to preserve the area in its natural condition. This legislation had virtually unanimous support and was passed by the Senate in

1969. Unfortunately, the House of Representatives did not consider the measure because of their insistence that they have a mineral survey completed prior to the enactment of the measure. We are now informed that the mineral survey will be available this spring.

Senator METCALF and I have sent to the desk identical legislation which would authorize the extension of the national wilderness program to the Lincoln Back Country. We are hopeful that the legislation will again receive unanimous support here in the Senate and that our colleagues in the House of Representatives will be able to favorably consider the measure during this first session of the 92d Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this legislation printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 484) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to classify as wilderness the national forest lands known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and Clark and Lolo National Forests, in Montana, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. METCALF), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 484

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to classify as wilderness those national forest lands containing approximately 240,500 acres in the Helena National Forest in Montana, known as the Lincoln Back Country, and parts of the Lewis and