

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REPRESENTATIVE MOORHEAD SUPPORTS STEELWORKERS' ALCOHOLISM REHABILITATION PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, there has been much attention given in the news in the past year to the ever-increasing drug problems in our country.

This is as it should be. However, in this new attack on drug addiction and drug use, let us not forget that the Nation still has a massive alcoholism problem.

Alcoholism is an illness. Knowledgeable people do not look upon it as anything else. Illnesses should be treated just like other diseases by trained physicians in hospitals.

The United Steelworkers of America have taken a very enlightened view toward alcoholism. In many of their recent contracts worked out with industry, this union has inserted a clause that binds the company and the union into a cooperative plant-level program on alcoholism rehabilitation. I think the Steelworkers deserve praise for their progressive work in this area.

At this time, I would like to introduce into the RECORD the testimony of William George, the USWA mental health and addiction coordinator, presented in Pittsburgh before the Senate Special Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics:

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM L. GEORGE

I sometimes wonder why man has allowed himself to reach these complexities of life, and what motivates him to escape into alcoholism, which detracts him from facing reality? Is it his spouse, family, friends or pressures brought upon him in his home, on the job or society in itself? I hope someday this question may be answered, but as of today the only important question is: what can be done for, or how can we help the alcoholic and his family? We must not forget that alcoholism is not only an individual illness, but is also a family and social sickness.

I think one of the answers is to broaden the public's understanding through the news media and educational programs, and ask for a more sophisticated identity of the alcoholic.

The United Steelworkers of America, which I represent, regards alcoholism as an illness. At our last two International Conventions (August 1968, in Chicago, Illinois and September 1970, in Atlantic City, New Jersey) we had an exhibit booth expressively for the education of our members about the illness of alcoholism and the drug problems facing our nation today.

During negotiations in 1968 with the basic steel companies, an alcoholism clause was negotiated under safety and health, in most basic steel contracts, which reads as follows: "Without detracting from the existing rights and obligations of the parties recognized in other provisions of this agreement, the Company and the Union agree to cooperate at the plant level in encouraging employees afflicted with alcoholism to enter under a Coordinated Program directed to the objective of their rehabilitation." The clause I have just men-

tioned has also been negotiated in a number of other agreements.

During 1971, the United Steelworkers of America will be negotiating contracts with Can, Aluminum, Non-ferrous, Basic Steel and many fabricating companies. Our negotiating committees will seek the following clause into each contract, which reads as follows: "Without detracting from the existing rights and obligations of the parties recognized in other provisions of this Agreement, the Company and the Union agree to cooperate in the development of a sound policy and procedure at the plant level in encouraging employees afflicted with the illness of alcoholism to undergo a coordinated program directed to the objective of their rehabilitation."

With all the contracts and programs that can be agreed upon, there still is the need for the improvement of community treatment facilities. For without the proper facilities to help the alcoholic, then all the agreements and programs are meaningless.

I think it is about time that labor takes a good look at the myth of the so-called "Six Billion Dollar Industrial Hangover." For years leading organizations in the field of alcohol behavior that deal in education, prevention and treatment of alcoholism have had the same hang-ups about this so-called hangover, and the monies lost due to alcohol-related drinking problems in industry.

If we take a realistic approach to this problem we will find that first labor, then the general public pay the high price for this so-called hangover.

During collective bargaining with a company, labor uses the fiscal profit as one of the margins in negotiating a contract for the betterment of our members.

We know that alcoholism is one of the cost factors which decreases the profit that is used to negotiate with. This cost includes absenteeism, tardiness, sick leave, fringe benefits, accidents, inefficiency, poor work performance, loss of trained manpower, etc. This means that the package negotiated is smaller due to alcoholism.

After signing the contract with the Union, in many cases the Company increases the cost of its product, which is handed down to the consumer. In reality, instead of calling alcoholism an industrial hangover, we should say that alcoholism is an inflationary cost to this nation.

In one way or another we're going to pay for alcoholism. It can be paid for in dollars and cents, or we can pay for it by working together in combating this dreaded illness.

Industry speaks of their financial losses due through alcoholism; and labor speaks of their energies lost through grievance of disciplinary cases, involving those suffering from alcoholism. At a meeting with grievance-men of a large local union, I made a statement that 60 percent of all disciplinary grievances were caused because of alcoholism, and I was told by the chairman of the grievance committee that I used a conservative figure. I feel, personally, that the most important thing is not the dollars that industry loses nor is it the energy labor expends, but what is important is the man who is suffering from alcoholism. Alcoholism is a disease that may take his life; and not only does the alcoholic suffer, but those close to him, his family, his close friends, and his community.

It is here where we must start to establish a better understanding so that jointly labor, management and community can sit down and establish a workable program that will not only help rehabilitate or rehabilitate those suffering from alcoholism, but will also be a stepping stone for better communications for all other community problems.

The problem of alcoholism is multiplex; its eventual control demands a multilateral approach. To work with the alcoholic is to realize the complexity and variety of its causes, and, in too many cases, to experience the frustration that comes with the absence or inadequacy of community facilities and services.

To admit that this major health problem is multiplex and its resolution depends on multi-dimensional treatment programs, is to underscore the necessity for joint labor-management programs. More than this, both labor and management must relate their efforts to the broader community. The work behavior and job performance of the problem drinker is the immediate concern of labor and management. This is the starting point, but their concerns for the alcoholic employee will usually take them into the community. Both labor and management must be concerned with availability, accessibility and the quality of community treatment facilities, services, and personnel.

Looking back over the past decade we can view with feelings of deep satisfaction the enormous strides that have been made to see and treat alcoholism as a medical problem. A measure of that progress is this very series of Senate Sub-committee hearings. Twenty-five years ago the only relationship between government and alcoholism involved the police and the courts.

However, despite these advancements, I would like to underscore that our biggest task in the area of employment is to reach and sensitize the spokesmen of both labor and management as to the problem and the fact that there are things they can do together. There have been attempts to establish programs for the rehabilitation, or habilitation of the alcoholic by labor and industry, and some of these programs are successful today. From our experience, the success of these alcoholism programs established in industry depends upon the personalities involved.

But it is also true that there are many more plants and firms without such programs. We read about a few case histories in such magazines as *Fortune* or a report by the *National Industrial Conference Board* and believe that such enlightened policies on alcoholism are the rule rather than the exception. It would appear that the opposite is true. Our first job is to convince more firms to adopt forward-looking policies and programs. The educational phase of our work is far from over. In fact, this must be a continuing activity.

Labor must stand united with management, and the community in establishing a joint program for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism. Without the total cooperation of all, I do not see how a successful program can be developed.

The Labor-Management Committee of the National Council on Alcoholism, of which I am a member, has developed a Cooperative Labor-Management Approach to Employee Alcoholism Programs. This program was developed for the pre-treatment phase of alcoholism instead of treatment itself.

As we all know with adequate treatment facilities, then all that is needed is the motivation of the alcoholic on problem drinkers to treatment, the pre-treatment that I referred to in the N.C.A. program.

We feel that Labor and Management can strive forward with the new N.C.A. program, since this program was developed with the coordination of both leaders of Labor and Management.

We need to realize that all the pamphlets, guides and conferences cannot substitute for

our own motivation, observation, and experience. There is still much to be learned about the work situation and alcoholism.

If there is one aspect of the trade union movement which has survived several generations of social, economic and political change in this country, it is the maxim that in unity there is strength. Many of our older members are not reluctant to use the term solidarity, and now many of our new and younger members have come to know the practical meaning of the word. And it is this which we have sought to apply to the acceptance of alcoholism as a disease by the medical and social service communities, with a positive extension of this assessment to our union concept that in numbers and in a bond of fraternity, difficult objectives become attainable.

The alcoholic does not share the respectful regard for statistics and charts which many of us do in our zeal to depersonalize the problem as it involves our various sectors of concern. He knows only that he is faced with a terrible, overpowering burden, and the worst of this may be the realization—however without foundation—that he is *alone*. And this we know may be the worst of all negative human experiences. More than others, he is in need of others. The alcoholic actively *requires* companionship, understanding and love of his fellow man. And it is this recognition by our union, and the tradition of fraternity which is involved in the trade union perspective which provides a basis for a unique strength in this area; the knowledge of those affected by this disease that they are *not alone*.

LULAC WEEK

HON. ABRAHAM KAZEN, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a joint resolution which requests and authorizes the President of the United States to proclaim February 14-21, 1971, as "LULAC Week."

This resolution proposes recognition of the League of United Latin American Citizens, a nonprofit organization with two major goals. LULAC seeks to relate the full meaning of citizenship to all Americans of Spanish-speaking backgrounds, and also to assure to these citizens full access to the rights of American citizenship.

The organization was founded February 17, 1929, in south Texas, and in the past 42 years has developed councils in 19 States, with important influence in the fields of education, civil rights, manpower training, and community action. It has enabled people of a proud heritage to make economic and social contributions to our Nation. Indeed, our country's headstart program was largely adopted from a LULAC program in my State called The Little School of 400. In association with the American GI Forum, LULAC organized Jobs for Progress, Inc., an important and innovative manpower program.

We in the Congress will do well to honor the proud past and the promising future of this organization. I am pleased that the distinguished junior Senator from Texas, LLOYD BENTSEN, is offering this same resolution in the other body. I urge prompt action so that the President may issue this proclamation.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE ISSUE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are aware of a request for home rule for the occupants of Washington, D.C., nerve center of the United States. Many are sympathetic because they have been conditioned to so believe by emotional propaganda movements.

The present promotion of home rule for the District of Columbia is generated by two basic forces—the right to vote, and local self-government.

On the other hand, the only reason for the creation of, and therefore necessity for, a Federal City, Washington, D.C., was as a neutral, nonpolitical sanctuary as the seat of our Government where Federal representation from every State and of every political persuasion could meet in safety to legislate the laws of our Republic.

The framers of the Constitution were aware of the threat to republican government which existed in Philadelphia when the Continental Congress was surrounded and imperiled by a mob from which it was powerless to protect itself. The Constitution, therefore, provided for the creation of a Federal district, the District of Columbia, over which the Congress should have plenary and exclusive legislative power. This requirement was simply to make us masters in our own house. The men who wrote our Constitution knew what they were doing. They had seen Congress, sitting where it did not rule, surrounded and besieged by a mob demanding back military pay.

In the very same sentence our Constitution requires us to "exercise like authority over all forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings."

The framers of the Constitution recognized that the Nation's Capital belonged in the same category as these other essential properties. It serves the people of the Nation, is supported and maintained by the people of the Nation, and must be controlled and governed by the people of the Nation. The District of Columbia never has been self-supporting, it is not now able to pay its own way, and it never will be able to do so. It has no more entitlement in logic or in morality to "home rule" than do Fort Polk, Redstone Arsenal, the Brooklyn Navy Yard or the Chicago Post Office.

Learning nothing from the failures of the radicals who made the same mistakes a hundred years ago, we again experiment with "home rule."

Unfortunately, Congress in its wisdom never saw fit to proclaim the District a reservation granting residency as a privilege limited solely to people in Government and those having legitimate business with the agencies of the Government or its facilities.

Such shibboleths as "home rule," "democracy," and "government by the people" have caused us to forget this lesson and to relinquish step by step our responsibility and authority over the

Nation's Capital to residents whose inability to operate a city of this size and complexity has made Washington an international laughing stock.

We would not be surprised to find that the capitals of certain undeveloped or emerging nations were regarded as hazardous posts by civilized foreign service people. It is a little disturbing to find that our own Capital—the seat of government of the foremost nation in the world—is regarded as a hazardous duty station by the personnel of many of the foreign embassies resident here.

It is pointless to recite again the weekly report of armed robberies, assault, and other crimes of violence which have occurred within the city.

It is important for us to take note of the fact that the so-called government of the District of Columbia is obviously unable to do anything to reduce this shameful toll.

The recent announcement of a slight crime drop in the District of Columbia is unimpressive and nonconvincing. There is no decrease in crime, but rather the victims of crime are not reporting the incidents. The victims have learned that reporting crime accomplishes nothing but to compile statistics for the local authorities, while they in turn are intimidated and harassed, and the judicial establishment does not punish the offenders.

No legislator can say that the District of Columbia is an independent, impartial community, nor a safe place to work in the interests of his constituents. Nor is the District any model city nor is it indicative of a cross-section of the American society since it is overwhelmingly disproportionately out of racial balance.

Washington, D.C., no longer qualifies as a neutral sanctuary for those about the business of our country.

Therefore, the purpose for it being an open city, detached from a State, no longer exists.

The pending issues of home rule and voting rights can easily be disposed of by retroceding that portion of Washington, D.C., back to Maryland from whence it came. District of Columbia citizens will then be able to vote and as a city of Maryland will enjoy home rule just as exercised by the citizens of Maryland, Virginia, and any other State.

I include my bill, H.R. 355, to retrocede a portion of the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland and also include a newsclipping at this point:

H.R. 355

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all of that portion of the District of Columbia ceded to the United States by the State of Maryland and not included within the Federal area described in section 3 of this Act, and all the rights and jurisdiction ceded to the United States by the State of Maryland in connection therewith, are hereby retroceded and relinquished to the State of Maryland effective as of the date of the acceptance thereof by the State of Maryland.

Sec. 2. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to vest in the State of Maryland any property right in any real or personal property situated in that portion of the District of Columbia retroceded to the State of Maryland under the first section of this Act and held by the United States or by any person, except as such property may be trans-

ferred to the State of Maryland by the United States or by such person, as the case may be.

(b) The jurisdiction of the United States and of the government of the District of Columbia, and the laws in effect in the District of Columbia as of the date of acceptance by the State of Maryland of the retrocession provided for by the first section of this Act, shall remain in full force and effect until the State of Maryland shall provide by law for the extension of its jurisdiction and judicial system over that portion of the District of Columbia retroceded to the State of Maryland under the first section of his Act.

(c) The United States shall retain jurisdiction over the real and personal property held by it, and situated within that portion of the District of Columbia retroceded to the State of Maryland under the first section of this Act, in the same manner and to the same extent as the United States exercises jurisdiction over property held by it situated within the various States.

SEC. 3. (a) The Federal area referred to in the first section of this Act is more particularly described as that portion of the District of Columbia situated within the boundary line described as follows:

Beginning on the east side of Rock Creek where it meets the Potomac River and running generally north and east to a point where P Street Northwest intersects Rock Creek;

thence east on P Street Northwest to Florida Avenue;

thence following Florida Avenue to Fifteenth Street Northeast;

thence south of Fifteenth Street Northeast to C Street Northeast;

thence east on C Street Northeast to the East Capitol Street Bridge;

thence east on the East Capitol Street Bridge to the point where it intersects the middle of the Anacostia River channel;

thence generally south and west down the midchannel of the Anacostia River to that point in the channel that is due south of Hains Point;

thence due west to the present Virginia-District of Columbia boundary at the shoreline of Washington National Airport;

thence generally north and east up the Potomac River along the Virginia-District of Columbia boundary to a point parallel to the northernmost projection of Theodore Roosevelt Island;

thence east to the confluence of Rock Creek and the Potomac River.

(b) Where the Federal area described in subsection (a) is bounded by streets such streets shall be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal City and the Federal jurisdiction shall extend to the sidewalks of the distant side of the street.

SEC. 4. Effective as of the date of the acceptance by the State of Maryland of the Federal area retroceded to it under this Act, the State of Maryland shall be entitled to one Representative in addition to the number of Representatives to which it is otherwise entitled, until the taking effect of the next reapportionment, and such Representative shall be in addition to the membership of the House of Representatives, as now prescribed by law. Until otherwise provided by the State of Maryland, such additional Representative shall be elected from the Federal area retroceded under this Act. Such temporary increase in the membership shall not operate to either increase or decrease the permanent membership of the House of Representatives as prescribed in the Act of August 8, 1911 (37 Stat. 13) nor shall such temporary increase affect the basis of apportionment established by the Act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat. 761; 2 U.S.C. 2a), for the Eighty-third Congress and each Congress thereafter.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 28, 1971]
D.C. POPULATION 71 PERCENT BLACK, 1970
CENSUS FIGURES SHOW

The black population of the District rose from 54 to 71 percent between 1960 and 1970, according to preliminary Census figures.

In the suburbs, the black population rose by more than 80,000, from 6.4 to 7.9 percent.

The rise is small compared to the over-all suburban population here, but more substantial than increases in other cities throughout the country.

The white population in the District dropped by 133,427 during the 1960s and grew by 709,287 in the suburbs. The suburban population growth in the decade was 9 to 1 white.

The over-all suburban population rose from 705,670 in 1950 to 2,104,613 in 1970. The District's population dropped from 763,956 to 756,510, but the number of black residents went from 411,737 to 537,712.

THE SOVIET THREAT

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, we have seen the passing of two great Americans, Congressman L. Mendel Rivers and Senator Richard Russell. Here were two men who realized the importance of maintaining a strong national defense at a time when we are seeing our defense posture come under heavy attack. Let me hasten to say that I concur with many of my colleagues that wasteful Government spending, particularly in the Department of Defense, must stop. Under the Nixon administration, there have been some great strides made in this area, but at the same time some politicians, for reasons unknown, have sought to criticize necessary military programs. Therefore, I wish to present the words of our late colleague, Mr. Rivers of South Carolina, who had the occasion to address this distinguished body on September 28 of last year regarding the Soviet threat. I believe it would be beneficial for all of us to seriously consider his remarks again:

THE SOVIET THREAT

Mr. Speaker: Never before in the 30 years of my membership in this body have I stepped into the well of this House with greater concern for the future of this nation.

The fears that I have are those that must be shared by every American regardless of his political or social philosophy or his economic status.

All Americans have been given the blessed and priceless heritage of freedom—a freedom which I am convinced is in terrible jeopardy.

My critics, who are legion, will attempt to dismiss what I say today by categorizing them as the shrill cries of a hawk who is suffering the agonies of reduced defense expenditures.

If this occurs, I will have failed my purpose since I believe that these critics, who love America no less than I, will, if they assess my words carefully, find that we not only have a common concern, but a common and frightening peril.

The Congress is now engaged in a great and protracted debate over foreign policy and the defense budget.

Unfortunately, the debate in the other body has again distinguished itself by its indecisiveness and, regrettably, its apparent sense of hopelessness. Thank God that this body, despite its uninhibited free swinging debate, continues to be capable of making clear cut and courageous decisions when our nation's security is at stake.

My words today are therefore intended as much for the members of the other body as they are for you and, perhaps even more importantly, they are intended for the American people. For in the last analysis, it is the American people who stand to lose everything if we fail to discharge our awesome responsibilities in respect to our national defense.

Consideration of the defense budget, contrary to what some would have us believe, is not a question of assigning relative priorities between defense and domestic programs.

Decisions on the defense budget should be based on the simple question of national survival—and nothing more.

The issue should be "what is required to survive?"; and not "how should we allocate the national budget between defense and domestic programs?"

The final measure of our ability to survive as a nation in a hostile world will not be how well we have managed our domestic resources and domestic programs, but whether or not we have avoided and frustrated the forces of evil which would draw us into the crucible of war with the Soviet Union.

If we fall in that endeavor, we will have failed in everything.

It is this circumstance which demands that we maintain a level of strategic and conventional military capability that will ensure against any misunderstanding by the leaders in the Kremlin of our intentions to survive.

Regrettably, the leaders in the Kremlin are now evidently unimpressed by both our military capability and our national determination to survive.

That our determination to survive is suspect requires no elaboration. The dissident voices in our nation who would destroy the very fabric of our society are being interpreted by the leaders in the Kremlin as the voices of the American people. This fact together with our evident unwillingness to support a defense establishment geared to national survival has created a very dangerous atmosphere in which the Soviet Union may be tempted into actions which can only ultimately result in a nuclear holocaust.

Since the deterioration of our military capability vis-a-vis the Soviet Union is no secret to the Kremlin, I believe it is high time that we tell the American people the facts of life. I plan on doing that today.

First, since we all recognize the vital importance of being a maritime nation, and because of our dependence on the free use of the seas, let me tell you some sobering facts about Soviet naval strength.

The Soviet Union is now one of the world's two leading sea powers—and possibly the leading power. When Admiral Gorshkov assumed command of the Navy in 1956, it was largely a water-borne adjunct of the ground forces. Today, it is a well balanced modern force which is equally at home on the high seas as it is in coastal waters.

Soviet naval units now frequent waters which only a few years ago were considered the private preserve of Western naval forces.

It was only in 1964 that the Soviet Navy began continuous deployments in the Mediterranean; now, since the Arab-Israeli war of 1967, a flotilla of nuclear submarines and missile-armed surface ships have been continuously operating there.

This Mediterranean presence has at times attained a flotilla strength of 65 naval vessels, including submarines and support ships.

As a consequence, today Soviet naval forces constitute a major political and military presence in the Mediterranean.

This naval presence has also been extended into the Indian Ocean, and the farthest reaches of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Soviet submarines and warships equipped with missiles now operate off the coast of the United States, as well as the Caribbean and off the coast of Africa and Southeast Asia.

The world-wide Soviet naval operation "Ocean" which was conducted during April of this year involved more than 200 ships and submarines, and was their announcement to the world that they have developed and intend to flex their naval muscle simultaneously in the four corners of the world.

The Soviet surface fleet now includes two helicopter carriers, about 24 cruisers, 35 guided missile destroyers, 50 gun-armed destroyers, more than 100 destroyer escorts, and literally thousands of smaller ships, minesweepers, coastal escorts, support craft, and intelligence collectors.

The greatest Soviet naval strength is in its submarine force—the largest ever created in the history of the world. The fleet presently has approximately 350 submarines, 80 of which are nuclear-powered.

The new Soviet Polaris-type submarine can fire 16 ballistic missiles to a range of at least 1300 miles; at least 13 units of this class are already operational, and these units are being produced at the rate of 8 to 10 each year. They are testing a new submarine ballistic missile estimated to have a range of 3000 miles. This missile will probably be back fitted into the existing Soviet submarine fleet.

At the present rate of construction, the Soviet fleet of these Y-class ballistic missile submarines will surpass the United States fleet of 41 Polaris submarines by 1973 or 1974.

In addition to the Y-class ballistic missile submarine, the Soviet navy has approximately 40 older ballistic missile submarines which carry three launchers each.

Nine of these submarines are nuclear-powered, and are probably targeted against European or Asian targets, whereas the more modern Y-class missile submarines are, for the most part, targeted against the United States.

The Soviet navy also has about 65 submarines, 35 of which are nuclear powered, equipped with supersonic cruise missiles, some having ranges up to 400 miles. These submarines are designed to attack both naval and merchant ships. In addition, the Soviet Union has about 240 other submarines which are designed for torpedo attack mission against surface ships or other submarines. Twenty-two of these are nuclear-powered.

In evaluating the Soviet submarine fleet, it must be remembered that the German submarine fleet which almost won the battle of the Atlantic, included only 57 diesel submarines in the early months of World War II.

The Soviet nuclear submarine construction capability now is about 20 units a year based on working one work shift a day; by working 3 shifts a day they have the ability to produce 35 nuclear submarines a year. Today they are building at a rate of from 10 to 14 per year. One Soviet yard alone has several times the area and facilities of all the United States submarine yards combined.

The Soviet Union is expanding its production of Y-class nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines, and I estimate that approximately 50 units of this new missile class will have been completed by as early as mid-1974.

By contrast to Soviet submarine strength, the United States today has only 147 operational submarines of which 88 are nuclear-powered, and of which only 47 are configured as submarines primarily designed to combat the Soviet submarine threat. The other 41 nuclears are our Polaris missile firing submarines.

Despite the 47 United States nuclear attack submarines designed and available to combat the Soviet submarine threat, the latest Soviet nuclear submarines have a submerged speed which is significantly higher than anything we previously contemplated or expected.

It is this chilling fact that has compelled the Committee on Armed Services to insist that we go forward immediately on the construction of the new nuclear-powered 688-class submarine which we hope will be able to cope with this significant and deadly Soviet capability. However, regardless of how rapidly we proceed on the construction of this new class of submarines, it will be years before they become operational in significant numbers, and in the meantime Soviet technology will undoubtedly strive to maximize this almost unbridgeable gap in our defensive response to this Soviet submarine threat.

This existing and ever-widening gap in our defensive capability to meet the Soviet submarine threat is simply a current reflection of the past unwillingness of defense budgeters to provide for a modern Navy.

Practically every surface ship in the Soviet fleet has the Styx missile. Now for you who don't know what the Styx missile is, let me tell you a few shocking facts. This is a short-range missile which travels at approximately sonic speed and can be carried on almost the smallest type of naval craft. It has tremendous reliability and, most unfortunately, we have little in the way of a reliable defense against this type of missile attack.

These surface-to-surface missiles enable small torpedo boats to duel with cruisers and large combatant surface vessels by out-ranging the conventional naval artillery on these ships.

Unfortunately, we again do not have a missile of this capability in our own operational inventory.

The surface naval vessels of the United States are, as compared to the Soviet Union, if anything, in worse condition than those of the undersea fleet. No purpose would be served in attempting to detail these deficiencies except to point out that the Comptroller General of the United States recently submitted a secret report to the President of the United States and the Congress on the impaired combat readiness of the Navy's Atlantic and Sixth Fleets.

In that report, the Comptroller General in commenting on the readiness of these naval vessels stated, and I quote:

"Approximately 80% of the major ships in the Atlantic Fleet are over ten years old, and 50% are over 20 years. In April 1969, the average age of the ships of the Sixth Fleet was 18.3 years."

The Comptroller General, in commenting on the relationship of the age of our naval vessels and their inability to maintain combat readiness pointed out that "prior to 1964 engineering casualties" represented approximately one-quarter of the circumstances which required immobilizing a ship, but because of the advancing age of the vessels "in 1964 the engineering casualties began to increase, and by the end of 1968, they accounted for about 50% of the total casualties."

The Comptroller General went on to say that "this trend was evidence of the fact that the ship's platforms and associated propulsion systems were being affected by excessive age, plus a lack of parts for equipment, which in some instances, was no longer being manufactured."

The sum total of the General Accounting Office's secret report is that under current conditions fleet readiness for sustained war-time operations is, "at best, marginal due to the lack of qualified personnel, poor logistical support and the need for modern ships. The fleets are capable of handling a contingency but are only marginally capable of

maintaining a high level of sustained operations."

Without revealing information which would give aid and comfort to the Soviet Union, I also feel compelled to tell this House that not very long ago I was told that the combat condition of our cruisers and destroyers in the Atlantic Fleet was so bad, both from a materiel breakdown and personnel shortage viewpoint, that more than half of them were in a condition that would have seriously affected their combat capability. As a matter of fact, some of these ships could not have engaged in any kind of naval confrontation.

I cannot over-emphasize the seriousness of this situation. Yet, I know that there are people in the Congress of the United States who will say "so what?" I can only warn the Members of this House that we are on the brink of disaster and I have never before been so concerned in all the years I have served in the Congress of the United States.

We must therefore acknowledge the fact that our naval vessels are today simply not capable of discharging their war-time mission requirements if called upon to do so.

I believe these facts are as close to proof positive as I can make available to the American people that if we are not already a second-rate naval power, we are perilously close to becoming so.

I needn't emphasize that in a war with the Soviet Union there will be little solace in being in second place.

As sure as I stand before this House, there will be a confrontation in the Mediterranean between the Soviets and ourselves. They will create the incident to suit their convenience. And how will we respond? At the rate we are going now, considering the condition of the Sixth Fleet, in fact the entire Atlantic Fleet and the tremendous strides made by the Soviet naval forces, we would be forced to back down. Why do I say this? What did we do recently when a Russian trawler came within 200 yards of the nuclear submarine James Madison, off Cape Kennedy? We postponed the test launching of a Poseidon missile—and this in our own backyard! Moreover, when we finally made the test launch of the Poseidon missile, the Russians literally moved into the test area and attempted to preempt our recovery of important fragments of the missile launch.

For years the Navy, in particular, has been accused of reporting Soviet submarines off our coasts just about the time the Defense Appropriation bill is debated on the Floor. While these sightings have invariably turned out to be accurate, nevertheless those who oppose appropriations for the Navy always found it convenient to ridicule these intelligence reports which coincided with the consideration of appropriations for the Navy.

So now I would like to say to the doubting Thomases, if there are any remaining in the House, that if you would care to see for yourself a Soviet Task Force in the Caribbean, all you have to do is fly around the Caribbean area and you will see a Kresta-class guided missile light cruiser, with surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles; a Kanin-class guided missile destroyer, with surface-to-air missiles; a Soviet tanker and a Soviet submarine tender. I need not tell you that a submarine tender tends submarines. There are three other Soviet surface vessels in the Caribbean area: an LST; a salvage ship and a rescue ocean tug.

For those of you who have scoffed at the constant warnings that have been issued by the House Committee on Armed Services with respect to the rise of Soviet sea power, let me remind you that the Soviets deployed combatant ships to the Caribbean area in July and August of 1969, and again in May of this year.

In 1969, the Soviet Task Force consisted of three guided missile ships (a cruiser, a frig-

ate, and a destroyer); two attack submarines, one nuclear powered attack submarine; a submarine tender, and two tankers.

In May of this year, the Soviets deployed a guided missile light cruiser, a guided missile destroyer, two attack submarines, a nuclear powered cruise missile, a submarine tender and a merchant tanker.

All of these ships have conducted operations in the Caribbean area.

The deliberate and calculated offensive plans of the Soviet Union are now becoming crystal clear with the release of information by the Administration of evidence of new Soviet activity in Cuba. I have no doubt that the Soviets are now building a missile-launching nuclear submarine naval base in Cuba.

We, as a nation and a free people, can not ignore or accept this latest military action of the Soviet Union.

On October 23, 1962, President Kennedy issued a proclamation which reasserted the principle of the Monroe Doctrine as it applied to the Western Hemisphere and the introduction of nuclear weapons by a foreign power.

At that time, President Kennedy delivered an ultimatum to the Soviet Union to remove their nuclear offensive weapons capability from Cuba, or in the alternative such weapons would be removed forcibly by our military forces.

Regrettably, we are once again confronted with a crisis of the same gravity despite the waffled rhetoric which we may hear on the subject.

We can not live with this new Soviet threat at our very doorstep.

We can not permit the cities of the eastern seaboard to become hostages of the Soviet Union.

We must take every diplomatic, and if necessary military, step to excise this cancer from the body of the Western Hemisphere.

We must do it quickly and decisively if we are to maintain some shred of credibility as a world power—and the American people are willing to accept any action to accomplish this end.

You are eye-witnesses to the rise of Soviet sea power which is inexorably pushing us out of the Mediterranean; is firmly entrenched in the Indian Ocean; and is now established in the Caribbean.

And yet there may still be some among you who would deny additional funds to rebuild our Navy, which is fast becoming a secondary naval power. The Soviets learned their lesson from the blockade that we threw around Cuba. Why is it that they have learned their lesson so well while our memories remain so short?

Mark my words well—one of these fine mornings we are going to be told by the Russians, in the most unmistakable terms, to get out of the Mediterranean.

In 1962 we had the power and the Soviet Union knew it, to reject such a challenge—I can tell you that today we don't have that superiority—the Soviets know it—and it's high time the American people know this bitter fact of life, and start worrying about its implications.

Do not be misled into believing we can make up for this frightening loss of naval superiority by relying upon a superior strategic nuclear capability, vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. Since 1965 the Soviet Union has engaged in a major effort to change the balance of power in this area of military capability. In that period it has more than tripled its inventory of strategic offensive nuclear weapon launchers from about 500 to 1700, including some 200 nuclear heavy bombers in both.

In the same period, the United States has made no increase in its established level of 1710 strategic nuclear missile launchers, and has reduced its heavy bomber strength from 780 to less than 600.

In 1965, the Soviets had none of the monster SS-9 missiles operational. Today, the USSR has more than 200 SS-9s operational, with an ultimate total of approximately 300 when current construction effort is completed.

Although the 300 SS-9s will represent considerably less than half of the total inventory of the Soviet land-based ICBMs, this portion of the Soviet ICBM inventory will alone be capable of delivering a megatonnage in nuclear weaponry which exceeds the combined total nuclear weapon megatonnage delivery capability of all of our existing strategic delivery systems, including not only our ICBM force, but our Polaris force, as well as our heavy bomber force. Certainly this fact alone ought to raise serious questions concerning the alleged "defensive" posture of the Soviet Union.

We have no counterpart for this huge Soviet nuclear weapon delivery system.

A few weeks ago an article appeared in a prominent weekly news magazine in which the writer dismissed U.S. concern over the SS-9 missile by saying that "comparison of the Soviet SS-9 and the U.S. Minuteman is misleading; they are different weapons systems designed for different purposes . . ." The clear inference which the writer attempted to establish was that the Soviet SS-9 would only be used by the Soviets as a defensive missile against our Minuteman strike capability; whereas our Minuteman is designed to attack cities, and consequently this tremendous difference in the megatonnage of the two weapons really was unimportant.

It is this type of wishful thinking with which some of our so-called "civilian military experts" in the news media confuse the American public. The fundamental fact remains that the Russian options on utilization of their nuclear capability has been immeasurably increased by the addition of the SS-9 to their operational inventory. The real and deadly threat to United States security therefore remains regardless of how we may temporize or sugar coat this simple but unpalatable fact.

In 1965 neither the Soviet Union nor the United States had a depressed trajectory ICBM or a fractional orbital bombardment system (FOBS). Today, the Soviet Union has tested both, and could very well have operational versions of these weapons systems already deployed. Both of these developments have far-reaching implications on our defense capability.

Unfortunately, we have nothing like these, and to the best of my knowledge, none on our drawing boards.

Today the Soviets can launch over 200 ballistic missiles from their nuclear-powered submarines. Two years from now 400 to 500 of these Polaris-type missile launchers are expected to be operational, and by early 1974, this Soviet submarine-launched ballistic missile force will inevitably exceed the constant U.S. force we now have of 656 Polaris launchers. Further, most of our major cities are close to our coasts within short range of their potential submarine stations. Thus they can launch their attacks with little time for us to react before being hit.

Up to the present time, the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans have served to protect us from foreign attack. Today these very same oceans afford the Russians a ready means of surreptitiously bringing their missile launching submarines close to our cities from whence they can launch a deadly attack.

Our tactical air capability, when compared to the Soviet capability, also raises serious questions as to our ability to cope with the Soviet Union in a conventional confrontation. For example, since 1954 the Soviets have designed and produced 18 new types of fighter planes—13 of these models we have actually photographed in flight. In the same time frame, the United States has not produced a single new air superiority fighter, and actu-

ally we have not had one on order until this year.

Now, after an unforgivable delay, we have two fighters underway—the F-14 and the F-15, but they will not be a part of our inventory for several years.

We have dilly-dallied for years until the Soviets now have an air superiority capability which we will be hard pressed to match. Yet, there are those in and out of Congress who would stop the production of our F-14s and F-15s.

The Soviet Union has at least three VSTOL fighter aircraft that have flown successfully. These are aircraft with a vertical and short takeoff capability. We are just now in the process of acquiring some Harriers which will give us this VSTOL capability. The Harrier is the only operational aircraft of its type in the free world.

Yet, there are those who would create roadblocks for the purchase of these aircraft, one group opposing their procurement on the theory that it is a British aircraft, and the other opposed on the grounds that it will be manufactured in the United States at a higher price than it could be purchased from the British. Obviously, we can't please everyone.

And yet, procurement of this aircraft is essential if we are going to revolutionize naval air operations in the years ahead.

There are only two areas in our whole national security program in which we may have a superiority as yet unchallenged. We are the only nation that is building attack aircraft carriers. So the argument is made that since the Soviets do not have carriers we should not build any more or we should lay up those that we have.

To some, it is a crime for the United States to be ahead of the Soviets in any area.

Then, there is the Multiple Independently Targeted Re-entry Vehicle (MIRV). We are now deploying the MIRV and in this area we appear to be ahead of the Soviets. For this very reason, there are those who would eliminate any further deployment of MIRVs and even remove those already deployed. The rationale is that this would appease the Soviets and would lead them to the conclusion that we have no aggressive plans.

And while this type of specious reasoning is being propagandized throughout the United States, the Soviets continue to increase their deployment of the most powerful ICBM ever constructed, the SS-9.

I say to this House that the future of this nation hangs by a thread.

We are in a far more serious situation than many would have you believe. Our way of life is not only being challenged from within, it is being very definitely threatened from without.

Yet sincere, conscientious people of good will will look you straight in the eye and say, "We must solve all of our domestic problems with the money we are using for national defense because we are really not threatened from without, or the threat from without is far less serious than the threat from within."

Scoff if you will; laugh if you wish, but it is your children and grandchildren who will pay the penalty for your timidity or your naivete!

You may well ask "Why, with a defense budget in recent years which has exceeded \$70-billion do we find ourselves in this position with the Soviet Union?" The answer, very simply stated, is that the Soviet Union is spending relatively more on its military effort than are we.

Let me give you some of the facts:

In 1955 defense-related research and development effort in the United States was \$3-billion; within the USSR it was \$2-billion.

In 1960, the U.S. spent \$7-billion; the USSR spent \$5-billion.

In 1965, the U.S. spent \$13-billion; the USSR \$10-billion.

In 1968, the U.S. spent \$14-billion; the USSR \$14-billion.

In 1969, the U.S. spent \$14-billion; the USSR \$15-billion.

In 1970, the U.S. will have spent \$13 to \$14-billion, while the USSR will have spent \$16 to \$17-billion.

These figures in the R&D area alone reflect Soviet determination to match and pass the United States in the incorporation of advanced technology into military hardware.

Despite the increased effort expended by the Soviet Union in defense related R&D, there has been no corresponding reduction in the resources the Soviet Union has allocated towards the R&D effort in the civil industrial base.

Thus, contrary to the effort in the United States of reducing the Defense Department's R&D effort and allocating it to civilian agencies, the Soviet Union continues to fund both efforts at progressively increasing levels.

The significance of the greater R&D effort being made in the Soviet Union is that technological advances developed by this greater R&D effort will only be evident 4, 5, and 10 years from now, but at a time when we will be incapable of catching up to match these technological improvements and advancements.

Stated another way, if we permit the Soviet Union to create hardware which will negate our existing technological capability in offensive and defensive weapons, the Soviets will so exceed us in power as to preempt any possible influence we may in the future hope to exert among the family of nations.

The deterioration in our military capability as contrasted to that of the Soviet Union has resulted from a combination of the Vietnam war, inflation, and the pressures of new and increased costs of our domestic programs.

In order to place this matter in better perspective, let me provide you with a few facts on this matter:

Since FY 1968 the Department of Defense has attempted to combat inflationary forces with DOD reductions, totaling \$17.3 billion in constant dollars.

In this same period, a reordering of national priorities has resulted in a re-allocation of federal resources from defense to other programs in amounts greater than the DoD reductions.

The FY 1971 defense program in constant dollars is only \$5 billion above the pre-war FY 1964 level. Yet, the incremental cost of the war in FY 1971 is undoubtedly more than double the \$5-billion budget increase. Thus, what has occurred is that the difference in funding of the Vietnam War has been accomplished by *deferring weapons modernization, plant maintenance, and by reductions in operational readiness.*

The impact on these factors is actually greater than these figures indicate since with inflation and a combination of pay and price increases, personnel costs have increased tremendously, wiping out even the most intensive economies achieved by the Defense Establishment.

For example, in 1965 with a military manpower level at 2.6 million, military pay cost \$13.9-billion.

Under today's higher costs and with projected pay increases, if we had 2.6 million men in FY 1971 and we now have in excess of 3 million, the personnel costs for FY 1971 would be approximately \$29-billion. Thus, personnel costs alone will have more than doubled since 1965, without regard to manpower levels. This gives one an idea of how severely manpower costs and the effort to reduce defense costs have detracted from our ability to maintain a modern technologically advanced military capability.

Let me hasten to add that these military pay increases which have been and will continue to be provided by the Congress are absolutely necessary. Moreover, additional compensation increases will, in the future, be necessary if we hope to reduce reliance on the draft, or keep any semblance of a career force which is absolutely essential as our weapons systems become more and more complex.

In terms of gross national product, our defense budget has gone from 9.7% in 1968 to 7% in 1971, while at the same time the domestic parts of our national budget have increased their share of the gross national product from 12.8% to well over 13.4% in the same time-frame.

The 7% portion of the gross national product which is allocated to our national defense represents the smallest allocation of our gross national product to national defense purposes in 20 years. Surely no American would argue that we can put a price tag on the lives of our people. I'd rather be alive at 10% than dead at 7.

Now let me summarize for a moment. I have outlined to you that our former 5 to 1 margin in nuclear strategic weapons has in a few short years vanished. The Soviet Union now has a nuclear strategic weapon capability in excess of ours, and this superiority will continue to increase if we do not take dramatic action to stem the tide. We can no longer look upon our threat of nuclear war as a satisfactory deterrent to aggression with conventional arms, as we could in the two decades past. From here on if we threaten nuclear war in response to aggression, we risk our own destruction.

Moreover, I pointed out that the Soviet Union has within a few short years negated our naval superiority. This same accomplishment is evident in other areas of conventional warfare, including our ground and air capabilities.

As a matter of fact, while Congress is still debating the necessity for building an advanced manned strategic bomber, the B-1, we now know that the Soviet Union has already built such an aircraft, and it should be coming into their operational inventory at least 3 to 4 years before we can hope to have our B-1 operational.

The circumstances of the B-1 bomber debate in this country illustrate the reasons why we seem hell-bent on national suicide. While we debate the question of maintaining our military capability, the Soviet Union quietly but openly forges ahead.

It may be that the gap which has now been created in our defense capability can never be bridged. The Soviets have the bit in their teeth, and make no mistake about it, are both capable and determined to maintain this newly-developed superiority.

Perhaps I can best put into perspective the determined accelerated effort being made by the Soviet Union to eclipse the United States in strategic capability, both offensive and defensive, by giving you a concrete measure of this effort.

In calendar year 1969, the United States spent a total of \$7.5-billion on strategic offensive and defensive weaponry. During that same period, the Soviet Union expended approximately \$13-billion for the same effort. Thus, it is evident that the Soviet Union in a single calendar year has spent approximately \$5.5-billion more for increased strategic capability than did the United States.

I recognize that a \$5.5-billion added effort is somewhat difficult for laymen to comprehend. However, since the cost of a single Minuteman missile is approximately \$4.8-million, the added Soviet effort is roughly equivalent to the procurement of a thousand Minuteman missiles.

All of this in one calendar year!

Can anyone consider this anything but an obvious effort to give the Soviet Union an

insurmountable advantage in strategic weaponry over the United States before the conclusion of the SALT talks?

As a matter of fact, this circumstance alone illustrates the cold and calculating master plan of the Soviet Union, who in entering the SALT negotiations hope to freeze the United States in an inferior position in strategic weaponry.

I pray to God that the American people, and the Congress in particular, will soon awaken to these realities and recognize that the question confronting us is no longer one involving the relative allocation of priorities in spending between defense and domestic programs, but rather the fundamental question of national survival.

We can not as a nation afford to spend one penny less on national defense than that amount which is required to ensure that you and I, and our children, can convince the Soviets they dare not pull the trigger when a Soviet gun is placed against our heads.

The issue therefore is very simply how much money must we spend to insure our survival—since if we fail to demonstrate to the Soviet Union our determination to survive—the amount of money we spend for domestic programs will become merely an academic exercise.

I plead, and I beg you, my colleagues who collectively have the responsibility of the security of our nation in your hands, to ponder these facts which I have brought to you today. They are proof positive that we are in serious trouble. Unpleasant as these facts may be, you can not ignore them, for if you do, you are falling not only your constituency but also all the peoples of the world who, in the final analysis, look upon the United States as the fountainhead and guardian of the highest aspiration of genuine freedom in this chaotic world.

These are the facts that confront our President, our Congress, and our defense planners.

These are the facts which reflect the prophetic wisdom of an observation once made by a gentleman by the name of Mr. Richard M. Nixon, when he said:

"If present trends continue, the United States, a very few years hence, will find itself clearly in second position—with the Soviet Union undisputedly the greatest military power on earth."

I'm afraid that that day has already arrived.

MONROE BUSINESS INSTITUTE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as the unemployment situation deteriorates many Government officials are searching for ways to channel unproductive members of the work force into meaningful, well-paying jobs. The Federal Government has been called upon to spend millions of dollars to retrain large numbers of Americans. However, across this Nation many private enterprises are already at work attacking the problem of job retraining. These institutes are performing an essential service to the community and their efforts will complement any emerging Federal programs.

The Monroe Business Institute, located in the Bronx is an excellent example of these fine educational institutions. Established in 1933, Monroe has three schools in the Bronx. They are accredited by the New York State Department of Education and by the accrediting com-

mission, which is recognized by the U.S. Office of Education.

The school offers training in all phases of business including IBM key-punching, computer programing, NCR accounting, electric typewriting, stenography, accounting, and all related subjects. These are all good-paying fields and honorable professions.

They work with several Federal and State training programs including manpower training, vocational rehabilitation, veterans' programs, and the work incentive plan.

Additionally, Monroe has had outstanding success in training disadvantaged students. They combine basic English, spelling, and math training in all their programs where good placement depends on satisfactory use of these skills.

The school has also been invited by three Presidents to attend the Conference on the Employment of the Handicapped in recognition of Monroe's outstanding work in the training and placement of the handicapped.

Their emphasis on close personal supervision and concern with the success of each student has produced the kind of results that any program, whether public or private, would be proud of. Hopefully, Federal job training experts will take cognizance of the work being done by the private sector in this area and profit from the fine programs offered by such schools as the Monroe Business Institute.

POSITION OF ASSOCIATION OF THE
U.S. ARMY ON EXTENSION OF SE-
LECTIVE SERVICE LEGISLATION

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate Committee on Armed Services will begin hearings on the extension of the Military Selective Service Act.

In connection with the extension of this act, the Association of the U.S. Army has issued a position paper stating its views on draft extension, the all-volunteer army, zero draft, and pay increases.

Mr. President, the views of AUSA are well stated and worthy of the attention of Congress and the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the position paper be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the position paper was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE LEGISLATION

The Association of the United States Army is firmly convinced that the defense of the United States requires that a substantial portion of the young men of the country must serve, at some time, in the Armed Forces. We feel further that it is unlikely that the manpower requirements of the Armed Services can be met, at least for the foreseeable future, entirely by voluntary enlistments. We therefore reiterate the position we took in our 1970 resolution that Selective Service legislation must be extended until such time as actual experience has proven that qualified

personnel in sufficient numbers, properly distributed within the services, including the National Guard and Army Reserve, can be provided without the motivation of Selective Service.

We strongly support every effort to make military service so attractive that the need to draft anyone can one day be eliminated. Yet the effort to reach an all-volunteer force has a long way to go. Until that goal is reached we feel it is essential that a viable, fully operational Selective Service System remain in force. The national safety requires it.

In taking such a firm position in support of Selective Service extension, AUSA is mindful of the very active efforts under way to greatly enhance the challenge and attractiveness of military service. We support these efforts.

However, thus far the total efforts in this direction have been those undertaken by the services themselves, a bootstrap operation if you will. The Army has recognized that there are a number of actions which should be undertaken which involve little cost and do not require substantial reprogramming or new money. Many long standing customs and practices have a high irritant quotient with no corresponding usefulness in the modern Army. These should be and many are being eliminated. Such actions contribute to making everyday life in a military more worthwhile and attractive.

The Army should and is making a greater effort to increase the professionalism in the military. The young people who look at the military as a possible career should see clearly more challenge and responsibility than has been visible in the past. Today's young leader requires a sense of dedication, adaptability, and sensitivity to the needs of his men even greater than was needed in the past. It will take a professionally rewarding organization to attract the type of young leader the Army needs.

With all of the changes and experiments which the Army has undertaken, there are other key ingredients, over which the Army can exercise only minimal control, that will be needed in any plan to reach a zero draft. Among other things these involve public attitudes about the military and the consistent appropriation by Congress of the additional money which will be necessary to get at the root problems of declining service attractiveness.

Increased pay (including expanded pro-pay for the combat arms), improved housing, medical and dental service, insurance, equitable retirement benefits, modern equipments, and relief from menial non-military tasks, are some of the items that will require substantial appropriation if they are to make military service competitive with civilian life for the high-type young people our Services require. For example, it is estimated that civilianizing kitchen police would cost about \$115 million a year. To give our soldiers increased privacy in their barracks is estimated to cost at least \$50 million. Young people do not contend with these irritations in civilian pursuits.

One of the reasons we feel so strongly about the extension of Selective Service is our apprehension that it will take a considerable period of time before appropriations of the size required will be passed by the Congress. While there is a great reservoir of esteem and good will for the Services in Congress, there are in its membership many vocal anti-militarists. There is also amongst those in Congress who are friendly to the military Services, an openly expressed cynicism or doubt about the efficacy or practicability of an All-Volunteer Force. In this climate our visualization of a gradual, long-term effort to reach the goal of zero draft seems to be realistic.

There is another basic problem which cannot be solved by the Services alone, and that is the attitude of many Americans, par-

ticularly the young, toward military Service. Public esteem for our Armed Services has reached a low ebb. Hopefully, some of the program now underway in the Services will improve matters. Probably the further wind-down of the war in Vietnam will moderate some of the virulence which has been so unjustly directed at the military. But others outside the Services are going to have to help.

We urge that the Commander-in-Chief take a more active role using the full machinery of his administration to enhance the prestige of the Services. Congress can, of course, do a great deal not only through their appropriations, but by more actively and publicly refuting the garrulous minority who feel that there is political capital to be made by vilifying the military who cannot fight back. Leaders in business and industry can take a more active, positive and public posture in support of the military.

But most of all, many members of the religious and academic communities have the greatest responsibility to make restitution for the damage which they have done to the dedicated individuals who through their military Service have shouldered the burdens of executing our national policy while they had no voice in its direction. The anti-military activities of large numbers among the religious and academic communities have been a national scandal and have seriously demeaned their own institutions as well as doing grave injustice to those who serve their country as good citizens. We cannot have the All-Volunteer Force they profess to desire so passionately if they at the same time do all they can to discredit and vilify those who wear the uniform.

If those who so ardently oppose Selective Service will channel a portion of their energies toward making military Service more prestigious and attractive, the day may come when the draft will no longer be needed. Until then, we Americans can't have it both ways. We can't insist that Selective Service must be abolished and fail to support those measures needed to create a Modern Volunteer Army. American colleges can't protest their love of freedom and permit a radical minority on campus to deprive others of the freedom to choose a military profession through ROTC. And American citizens, for whose security the military serves, cannot fail to insist that military personnel be treated with decency, dignity and respect through out our society.

Involuntary military service has never been popular since its instigation in 1792. However, without it our country would have been lost. Much is being done to make military service less onerous, but such involuntary service through a viable, operative Selective Service System will be required until we have proven that we can maintain quality Armed Forces of sufficient size to meet our National Security requirements without it.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 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?

CONGRESS IS NO LONGER A
RUBBERSTAMP

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is no longer a rubberstamp. In the last 10 years alone I have noted a growing unwillingness in this body to accept passively the recommendations of the executive branch. No proposal, regardless of how innocent it may seem, is taken for granted, and all are subjected to the most intense congressional scrutiny.

This is, I believe, an important advance, but it is not without its drawbacks. Such close scrutiny takes time; hour upon hour of the day must be devoted to hearings and debates. As a result, most of the appropriations that should have been enacted by July 1 are delayed until the close of the session—6 months later. During the past four Congresses, for example, only eight of 102 regular appropriations bills have become law before the beginning of the fiscal year. During the 91st Congress not one regular appropriations bill was enacted before the fiscal years beginning July 1, 1969, and July 1, 1970.

This is an important problem. It disrupts not only the Federal budget, but the planning and budgets of State and local jurisdictions as well. These units depend upon Federal grants for substantial portions of their spending. If they do not know how much money they will receive from Washington, they cannot plan in advance for the year ahead. Educational institutions, hospitals, and housing programs all must wait for word from Congress before they can begin their important tasks.

I do not believe this is a sound policy. Yet, a return to our former status as a mere rubberstamp would be just as unsound, if not more so. We are left, therefore, with but one alternative: Extend the Federal fiscal year to allow us an extra 6 months to review these appropriations. In this way, there will be ample time for State and local planning as well as calm congressional deliberation.

The bill I have introduced this past week will give us that time. It provides that the fiscal year for the Federal Government will coincide with the calendar year. Discussion of appropriations will begin in January and end in December, not July, as is the present case.

To me this makes good sense. Under the existing system Federal agencies operate on continuing resolutions, spending at the prior year's level without knowing whether they are overspending or underspending.

When they finally receive their appropriation, they must use it all at once, if they expect to receive equal or higher funding in the following year. Naturally, appropriations are judged on their usefulness; if all the money is not used, then it is assumed that all of it was not necessary. So, billions of dollars in appropriations must be spent in a very short

time—a 2-, 3-, or 4-month span. The result of this huge injection of funds into the economy is highly inflationary. It is no small wonder we have been unable to solve completely the crisis of our economy.

I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that the new Federal calendar will be a perfect answer to our problems. But it seems, at the very least, a much better way of doing business than our present system. I urge my colleagues to lend this measure their full support in the 92d Congress.

COPTER MOVE HOUSE? CAN DO

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years, one of the major goals of the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Banking and Currency Committee has been to fulfill the pledge made by the Congress in 1968 to provide 10 million new housing units before 1980.

In order to try to fulfill this goal, the Housing Subcommittee has investigated many new and revolutionary forms of housing construction.

Recently, an article appeared in the Atlanta Constitution regarding a firm in my area which has constructed a house which can be delivered by helicopter. Whether or not this method will help us solve our problems, I am not sure. However, I believe it is an attempt in the right direction. For the information of my colleagues, I am inserting the article in the RECORD:

COPTER MOVE HOUSE? CAN DO

(By Sallye Salter)

The latest way to get a house delivered is to fly it in—not with its own wings but by helicopter.

The technique had a trial run in Connecticut in November, and it worked. It has potential for solving the problem of highways cluttered with widening modular and mobile homes.

The 28-by-44-foot house that passed the helicopter test was built by a Decatur firm and was the culmination of a 25-year dream of Frank Putnam of Decatur.

The demonstration, using a S-64-E Skycrane, built by Sikorsky Aircraft, a division of United Aircraft, was also a dream come true for aircraft pioneer, Igor Sikorsky, who had predicted in a 1959 speech in Tokyo that his helicopters would someday be used for delivering houses.

A company spokesman said this was one of a series of tests to be conducted by Sikorsky with the heavy-lift helicopter to evaluate the feasibility of the revolutionary system.

GREAT POTENTIAL

He said the company foresees a far-reaching potential for the technique in "Operation Breakthrough" of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Putnam, president of Utility Services, Inc. in Decatur, said his father was in the construction business and was frequently plagued by rain which stopped the work.

"I always thought we should build homes like automobiles, and we could build them in a plant all the time," he said.

While working for an aluminum firm, Putnam designed his house which he was sure

could be delivered by air. He looked into the feasibility of delivering it by blimp, but was advised this was too inaccurate.

Then two years ago, Putnam saw films of the Skycrane lifting heavy construction equipment for the military, and he decided this was how his house could be flown.

BUILT DUPLICATE

With very few changes in the basic design he created 25 years ago, Putnam had the house built on the premises of his Decatur firm, and a duplicate of it built in Stratford, Conn., for the test flight there.

Now that the house has earned its "wings" it will be put into plant production.

The yet-to-be named company, with Putnam, Charles R. Shetterly, and Aubrey Couch as partners, is currently considering plant sites in the metropolitan area, plus other sites for subdivisions for the homes.

TWENTY PER DAY

The plant will turn out 20 houses per day when it goes into production, and delivery by helicopter will probably be limited to 40 to 50 miles in the metropolitan area, according to Couch, although it would be possible to deliver as far as 500 miles.

The 1,236-square foot house has an aluminum frame with all of the support at the four corners of the house. The cable is hooked on at the roofline for corners lifting.

Putnam said the house is built like an airplane with the roof trusses welded by the space age methods used for planes.

It will sell for about \$16,000 including delivery by helicopter but excluding land and foundation costs.

HOWARD WAID OF TRUSSVILLE,
ALA.

HON. JAMES B. ALLEN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, in these days of increasing use of motor vehicles on the highways of our country, it is encouraging to hear of drivers who have operated vehicles for many years and over many miles without a single accident.

Greyhound Lines—East, one of the major commercial passenger operators in the United States, recently honored Mr. Howard Waid of Trussville, Ala., who has driven for the company 25 years without a chargeable accident.

A news release concerning this award and reporting Mr. Waid's strong theories about driver safety, has been issued by the National Association of Motor Bus Owners. Because I fervently believe that emphasis on highway safety must become a daily way of life for all drivers. I ask unanimous consent that the news release be printed in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD.

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

HOWARD WAID OF TRUSSVILLE, ALA.

BIRMINGHAM.—Greyhound is honoring Howard Waid of Trussville, Ala., for driving a Greyhound 25 years without a chargeable accident.

"Waid has compiled a remarkable road safety record," according to Walter Weiss, director of safety for Greyhound Lines—East.

"Remarkable because of Greyhound's stringent safety standards. If there's even a

scratch on a bus, Greyhound records it. Preventable accidents are always charged to the driver," Weiss adds.

During his long years on the road, Waid has developed strong theories about driver safety.

"The most common mistakes made by non-professional drivers," he says, "are speeds too high for prevailing conditions, tailgating and switching lanes without signaling. Countless accidents could be avoided if drivers would watch these basic problems."

"Intense concentration is also needed—you have to constantly try to anticipate the other guy's moves. And never believe the signal of the driver in front of you!" he adds.

According to Weiss, Waid's philosophy pays off for Greyhound and the public: National Safety Council studies show travel by Greyhound is 17 times safer than driving yourself.

Waid, 52, started his career in 1941.

A native of Gaylesville, Ala., he lives at 113 Lake Street with his wife and five children. Waid is a member of the local Athletic Booster Club. He is also manager of a little league baseball team.

Greyhound has a continuing program to honor drivers who compile outstanding safety records. Last year, more than 150 Greyhound drivers were commended for accumulating 25-year or better safety records.

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLD VOTE—MAKE IT UNANIMOUS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as a longtime advocate of the 18-year-old vote, I was extremely proud when the 91st Congress passed legislation which at last enfranchised all Americans between the ages of 18 and 20 with full voting rights. This legislation was passed by an overwhelming majority in both the House and the Senate. It was vigorously supported by Representatives and Senators from both political parties and by advocates of diverse political persuasions, ranging from the conservative views of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER to the liberal views of Senator EDWARD KENNEDY.

However, the recent Supreme Court decision has now left Michigan and most other States with the unfortunate situation in which 18- to 20-year-olds may vote for their President, but not their Governor, for their Senator and Congressman, but not their State or local legislators, nor even their hometown mayor. The present situation is neither realistic nor sensible. It simply does not make good sense to allow our new young voters to participate in national elections which predictably involve the most distant, complex, and far-reaching issues of the day and then deny them the right to participate in local elections involving issues with which they are much more familiar, and, in most cases, which are much less complex.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I have joined with 34 of my colleagues in introducing a House joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment which would provide for full enfranchisement of the 18- to 20-year-old voter.

However, in light of the length of time normally involved in amending the U.S. Constitution, alternative measures to bring about immediate full enfranchisement of these young voters should also be considered. Perhaps the best manner to accomplish this in Michigan would be the consideration of a constitutional amendment by the Michigan State Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, a convincing case was recently made on behalf of this alternative in an excellent editorial which appeared in the Mellus newspapers published in my congressional district in Michigan. I would like to insert this article into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

MAKE IT UNANIMOUS

Although we have been consistently opposed to lowering the voting age to 18, basing our stand on reasons we felt to be reasonable and logical, we would prefer, by far, to see the young people have full balloting rights then the halfway "mess" that prevails at present.

It simply makes no sense that those 18 through 20 should be permitted to vote for the nation's president in an election involving issues and personalities with which they can be only remotely familiar, but deny them the right to participate in local and state elections, where it would be possible for them to know much more about issues and personalities.

From the standpoint of providing an expression of public opinion on vital national and world problems and programs, the national elections are the most important that our citizens take part in. Generally speaking, the claims and counter claims on vital issues and on the experience, capabilities and personalities of the principal candidates are far more complex and confusing—and remote—than those in city, school, county or state political campaigns.

If we are to have an "apprenticeship" system for voters, "breaking them in" with limited privileges at the age of 18 and expanding their voting rights as they gain in age and experience, with full citizenship privileges at 21, we seem to be going at it backwards by giving them the most serious responsibilities first.

An apt parallel might be the methods employed in "bringing along" athletes to compete in major league baseball or in the top professional football conferences.

In baseball, prospective big leaguers get their starts on the sandlots or in high schools and colleges. If they show promise, they move on to minor-league teams and finally those with the necessary talent make it to the "big leagues."

Denying Michigan's approximately 500,000 young men and women 18 through 20 the opportunity to vote on local, county and state issues and candidates while national law grants them balloting privileges in presidential elections seems pretty much the same as starting a young fellow on a major league team and then, after one to three years of trial, allowing him to join a minor-league squad.

Since the United States Supreme Court has ruled that 18 years is a proper age for the voting franchise to be exercised (making this the law of the land in federal elections), Michigan should bow gracefully to the inevitable and extend full voting rights.

Aside from the apparent inequity of granting only partial voting privileges at 18, there is the problem of the confusion that is bound to develop when national elections happen to fall on the same day as state and local balloting.

With some registered voters allowed to pass on all candidates and issues while others can

act only on national candidates, separate ballots or special voting procedures will be required to make certain that only those entitled to full privileges enjoy them.

Experience has shown that even with the old system of one age limit for all voters, our ballots and balloting practices have been sufficiently confusing to foul up many an election.

We contemplate with horror the chaos that could develop with the "double-standard" of voting in an election involving national and other candidates and issues. What a field day challengers could have, demanding that local, county and state election boards prove that no person under 21 had voted on other than national candidates.

By the time the results of such an election could be straightened out, it might be almost time for the next one.

Since the next presidential election is nearly two years away, Michigan has time to remedy this situation before facing such a situation. We believe the State Legislature should take immediately whatever steps are necessary to grant full voting rights to those aged 18 through 20. If this requires a referendum, then the legislature should place the matter on the ballot as soon as possible, even if a special election is required.

RECLAMATION AWARDS CLOUD SEEDING RESEARCH CONTRACT FOR CONCHO RIVER WATERSHED IN TEXAS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a 3-year \$850,000 program of summer cloud seeding to develop techniques aimed at increasing rainfall, has been announced by the Bureau of Reclamation. This is a significant move to determine whether scientific techniques can cause rain to fall in cloud covered arid areas. The results will be followed with much interest.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the release by Reclamation. It follows:

RECLAMATION AWARDS CLOUD SEEDING RESEARCH CONTRACT FOR CONCHO RIVER WATERSHED IN TEXAS

The Bureau of Reclamation has awarded a contract to the Texas Water Development Board for a 3-year program of summer cloud-seeding to develop techniques aimed at increasing rainfall, the Department of the Interior announced today.

A result of the research is expected to include increased runoff of the Concho River above Twin Buttes Reservoir, a major unit of Reclamation's multiple-purpose San Angelo Project. The City of San Angelo has experienced severe water shortages, resulting in rationing of water in recent years.

Commissioner of Reclamation Ellis L. Armstrong said the \$850,000 project will involve the seeding of suitable convective clouds during the period from April to September through 1973. Seeding will be conducted by aircraft over a 4,600 square mile area west and northwest of San Angelo, in central Texas.

The Texas Water Development Board is expected to contract with a qualified scientific-meteorological firm for the actual seeding to begin this summer.

The effort is a part of the Bureau of Reclamation's Project Skyward, a program of scientific research begun in 1962 to explore whether cloud-seeding can produce addi-

tional supplies of water efficiently, economically, and in a socially acceptable manner.

Project Skywater contractors currently are studying the treatment of summer convective clouds with field projects in Arizona, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Winter projects concerned with the seeding of cold orographic storms are in progress in California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Montana, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

Conventional ice phase seeding with silver iodide, as generally practiced in other weather modification projects, is not applicable to the types of clouds most frequently found in the San Angelo region. Here, Commissioner Armstrong said, an additional technique—that of warm cloud-seeding—will be explored.

This technique involves the use of water-absorbing chemicals to accelerate the rain-forming process within clouds. These materials will be released into air currents feeding suitable clouds. Urea and ammonium nitrate are ideal for this purpose.

The Concho River watershed was proposed both by the Texas Water Development Board and by officials of the City of San Angelo as the site for a seeding project. It offers excellent prospects for accurate evaluation of results because of a low level of atmospheric pollution and by the presence of an extensive network of rain and stream gauges already in place.

Seeding generally will be confined to those convective clouds which, left untreated, would produce only marginal precipitation in the form of light showers. Criteria will be established dictating when and under what circumstances seeding will be conducted.

A preliminary survey of summer cloud climatology for the San Angelo area was made last year to determine the frequency with which warm convective clouds develop; their size and water yield; and other factors required to assess their seeding potential.

Both warm and cold clouds occur in the area during the spring and summer months, with a predominance of the warm type. Both are amenable to seeding, and both varieties will be treated during the course of the project.

REASONABLE PAY FOR OUR SERVICEMEN CAN BRING AN END TO THE DRAFT

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in his message on the draft last Thursday, President Nixon stated that:

With an end to the draft we will demonstrate to the world the responsiveness of our system of government—and we will also demonstrate our continuing commitment to the principle of ensuring for the individual the greatest possible measure of freedom.

Eleven months ago, the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Force found that we could end the draft by establishing a reasonable pay scale for military personnel in their first term of service. The Commission, headed by the distinguished former Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, also declared that regardless of the draft, the recommended pay raises were justifiable on the grounds of equity alone.

In a recent article in the Air Force Times, editor Bob Schweitz, a noted expert on military personnel matters,

graphically depicted the discriminatory treatment of first-termers. According to Mr. Schweitz, the Armed Forces received cumulative pay hikes of 154.3 percent since 1952, but junior enlisted men have been raised by only 86 percent in that period. He added that:

The spread in monthly pay between the recruit's mere \$134.40, the supergrader's roughly \$750-975, the colonel's \$1,800, and the four-star general's nearly \$3,000, appears entirely out of line and totally unrealistic. Yet officialdom in recent years has allowed it to take place with apparently little concern or protest.

It is clear that our "totally unrealistic" military pay structure has been allowed to develop because the draft enables us to compel men to serve at extremely low rates of pay. We can correct this inequitable treatment of junior enlisted men, and help the President fulfill his commitment for an all-volunteer force, by enacting the pay structure recommended by the Gates Commission. I commend this item to your attention:

UNDER-2 PAY GAP GREW DURING 13-YEAR DROUGHT

(By Bob Schweitz)

WASHINGTON.—The reason the military pay system is so out of kilter has been the reluctance of past Administrations and Congresses to face up to the realization that new recruits and draftees also deserve adequate pay. From 1952 to 1965 there were no pay raises for enlisted men with fewer than two years of service. The raises for all other grades since 1952 have more than doubled those for the "under twos."

Overall, the military force has received a cumulative basic pay hike of 154.3 percent since 1952, while the junior enlisted men have received only 86 percent, including the raise effective Jan. 1, 1971.

Even as late as 1969, when the Hubbell pay group was functioning, the nation was still of the opinion that the draft would continue indefinitely, so little attention was paid to increasing pay in the lowest ranks.

The problem is more than one of percentages. It is also one of the cold cash differences spelled out by the percentages.

For example the January 1 raise was 7.9 percent across the board in basic pay. At the E-1 recruit level it meant a \$9.90 monthly increase. For an O-6 with 26 years, the same 7.9 percent meant a \$132 raise. Thus the raise of the O-6 alone totaled almost as much as an E-1s present monthly basic pay of \$134.40.

The "spread" in monthly basic pay between the recruit's mere \$134.40, the supergrader's roughly \$750-975, the colonel's \$1,800 and the four-star general's nearly \$3,000, appears entirely out of line and totally unrealistic. Yet officialdom in recent years allowed it to take place with apparently little concern or protest.

Defense, of course, has asked Congress to give EM with under two years service another 20 percent in basic pay, but even that would add only \$26 a month for a monthly pay of \$161 for a recruit. Not much of an incentive to volunteer.

Nevertheless, \$134.40 or a \$161 per month figure for the hundreds of thousands of servicemen with under two years service, represents a tremendous amount of money.

A 20 percent basic pay raise for enlisted men with fewer than two years of service is budgeted at half a billion dollars next year, and now it appears Defense may ask for a bigger raise.

Other pay grades will be getting raises, too. And while there should be savings in training costs brought about by increased retention resulting from higher pay, no one is certain the hikes will have that effect.

A number of factors influence volunteerism and retention. Among these are the job market on the outside, the public attitude toward the military and the presence or absence of a shooting war. It is not yet clear what the recent slump in the civilian job market is doing to retention.

Defense, of course, is looking for more efficient ways to spend pay dollars than across-the-board increases in basic pay.

The variable reenlistment bonus is one example of the kinds of services which are more "cost effective." The VRB lets manpower planners put the dollars precisely where the need is.

The proposed pro pay for men volunteering for the combat arms is another such device, as is the newly advanced idea to give "Continuation Incentive Pay" (COIN) to many officers. Payments similar to COIN already are being made to physicians and to Navy nuclear submarine officers.

As reported in the January 20 AFTimes, the idea is to expand such payments to give line officers up to \$15,000 and more to sign up for five years beyond their obligated service.

PROGRESS THROUGH UNDERSTANDING

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, those who truly seek sound progress and mutual understanding among Americans deplore accent on racism whatever the source. They also decry permissivism toward pornography or violence in our society.

From time to time columnists assist in placing the common good in perspective. I believe the renowned columnist Al Capp has done this in the following column reprinted recently in the New Hampshire Sunday News:

HOLLYWOOD LIBERALS MAKE RACIST MOVIE

(By Al Capp)

For those with sick minds, Hollywood has come up with a nice change from the regular run of sex movies—a racist movie called "Little Big Man."

I'm sure Dustin Hoffman, the star, and Arthur Penn, the director, didn't intend it to be racist. They are both leading Hollywood-New York liberals, our largest group of unintentional racists.

Racism—and I'm sure Hoffman and Penn will agree with me—is the conviction that human inferiority is decided by skin color.

"Little Big Man" is the story of the U.S. Cavalry in the Indian Wars, the white man versus the red man.

The white man is portrayed as decidedly inferior in humanity, honesty and generosity.

Even the liberal New Yorker magazine predicted that white audiences would be insulted. Black audiences might be, too.

After a century of ignoring the gallant role blacks played in the winning of America, we now know that 20 per cent of U.S. Cavalry troops in the Indian Wars were black.

I haven't seen "Little Big Man" for the same reason I don't attend Klan meetings, and so I don't know if Hoffman and Penn's U.S. Cavalrymen are all white. If they are, that would, of course, spare blacks from the film's racism, but it revives another form of racism—the denying of credit to blacks.

I can't imagine red Americans enjoying the anti-white, or anti-both black and white racism of "Little Big Man" much either. They, more, perhaps, than any of us, have learned that whatever race is the victim of

racist propaganda, no matter how unintentional, all of us are hurt.

It isn't easy to be a Hollywood-New York movie liberal. But, then, it wasn't easy to be George Lincoln Rockwell. He was in the same business, and he wound up dead. His Hollywood new competitors merely wind up dead at the box office.

They tell us the new "involved" attitude of parents toward education will produce better kids than the simple old attitude.

When I was a kid, my parents had a simple attitude toward education and that was that all schools were good for kids, and that all school teachers were smarter than kids.

Back then, our mothers didn't snoop around other schools to find out if they had the slightest advantage your school didn't have, and if there was the slightest suspicion of it they didn't mobilize into militant mobs and storm city hall.

Back then, when you reached first grade age, your mother pointed the way to the nearest school, and told you to come back in eight years with a diploma.

Kids who did that were good kids.

Those who didn't weren't worked over by social workers and called culturally maladjusted. They were worked over by the flat of their father's hand, and called little bums.

The old attitude toward education gave us Marian Anderson and Jonas Salk.

The new one has given us Angela Davis and Jerry Rubin.

The scene: a fine old Indiana University, newly liberalized.

STUDENT. Mr. Capp, why don't you admit your capitalist society is based on greed?

ME. I'm forced to admit it. The evidence is all around us. For instance, your father obviously was greedy that you have a better education than average, or he wouldn't have sent you to such an expensive university. Clearly, your mother is greedy, too. Greedy that you have a better chance in life than average. That's why you have the unmistakable glow of a better-than-average-cared-for-kid. I've looked around the grounds here and the evidence is that this university is greedy, too. Greedy that you, and the other kids here, have a better-than-average environment. That's why we're speaking to each other in this beautiful new chapel, and that's why you'll be able to go on griping about the greatness of this society, later, in that handsome dormitory across the way. You may call it greed, son. There are other names for it. One is concern. Another is love.

Every forward-looking American sleeps better at night knowing we have Ed Muskie to prevent us from developing supersonic speed by pointing out its possible hazard to the environment.

But when we really needed him was when the automobile was being developed. He might have stopped that, too, by pointing out its possible hazards, and we'd have stayed where we belonged—on the horse.

But didn't they, occasionally, menace the environment?

THE PRESIDENT OFFERS A BOLD PACKAGE

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on January 22 in his state of the Union address President Nixon outlined the basis for a "new American revolution" to speed the process of returning more power and responsibility to State and local governments—and therefore to the

citizens where government is closest to them—after decades of power and responsibility flowing in the other direction: to Washington.

As the specific proposals come before the Congress, the next months will be spent in deciding just how and how far we go in this new direction. To arrive at the best decisions—those that will be best for America—Members of Congress will need to become well aware of the "thinking" of the Nation. To assist my colleagues in this task, I include in the RECORD at this point a thoughtful editorial from the January 25 edition to the Dayton, Ohio, Journal Herald:

STATE OF THE UNION: THE PRESIDENT OFFERS A BOLD PACKAGE

President Nixon's State-of-the-Union message is the kickoff not only for a new Congress—the 92d—but also for what may be one of the most bruising two-year eras in the political history of that Union.

His proposed program is not wildly innovative or radical in the sense that it raises issues never before considered, but it is a bold attempt to make real some of the philosophies that have been bantered about as theories.

The President's "six great goals" by now require only capsulization. (1) His welfare plan combines the long-sought objectives of aid without humiliation to those unable to help themselves with a program of work incentives. (2) His objective of full employment in peacetime restates the obviously desirable twinning of peace with prosperity. (3) The effort to systematize land use recognizes that man, not man's economic system, is central in using natural resources. (4) The President embraces the principle that the right to health care is not determined by individual ability to pay. (5) The revenue-sharing concept expresses the belief that tax revenues, no matter where collected, belong to the taxpayer and not his government, and they should be used at the respective levels of government where they can be most effective. (6) The final general proposal is to transform the federal governmental structure from its present focus on functions, a system which fosters the irony of conflicting practices between departments in some fields and overlapping projects in others, and substitutes a structure based on program areas.

The principles stated by the President are indisputable. The methods, as he himself noted, are open to debate, and the tone that the debate assumes may well determine how close the nation is to solving some of its more nagging domestic problems.

The signs are not good. The Republican Party finds trouble in forging diversity into a common strength. The Democratic Party is in an amorphous state—a host of characters looking for a theme. Numerous hopefuls are emerging to joust for the 1972 presidential nomination, and the prospects are for many individual attempts by Democrats to upstage not only the President, but rival contenders for the nomination as well.

Then, too, the President's program steps hard on the entrenched bureaucracy. Reforms in government structure, although passed by Congress and signed by the President, do not necessarily cause the ship of state to jibe in another direction. Unification of the armed services was an example of this sluggish response.

Oddly perhaps, the one program likely to get broad backing in Washington is the one which gives us pause. The economy of the country is, we believe, still fighting a perilous wage-price undertow that runs counter to the tide of recession shown by economic indicators. Although the President has given subtle signs that he is exerting pressure on

prices and wages, he has only begun the battle and the outcome is far from certain. The nation cannot afford economic gains which are illusory and thereby temporary, and the price for a President's election based on economic illusion is sometimes paid by his party for a generation after the illusion crumbles. We urge caution on massive deficit spending.

But in total, the President's program is a forward-looking and necessary one, and it would be a national disservice were irrational partisan and bureaucratic intransigence to thwart consideration of it on its merits.

MORSE PROPOSES URBAN COUNCIL

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Massachusetts delegation, and as one who has long been deeply concerned with the problems plaguing so many communities in the Commonwealth and throughout the Nation, I was indeed pleased to note the initiative recently taken by my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE) to insure that our urban problems continue to receive the top-level, priority attention that they require.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE) has recommended to the President that he create a White House Council of Municipal Advisers, which would provide a focal point for the consideration of urban problems.

His proposal merits broad support, and will, I am convinced, be eagerly received by city government leaders and the people they serve.

The following editorial from the Lynn, Mass., Daily Evening Item speaks most persuasively to the critical need for the kind of effective and creative mechanism suggested by Mr. MORSE, and to the enthusiastic endorsement it deserves:

MORSE PROPOSES URBAN COUNCIL

Local communities are beset by so many problems these days that any suggestions to ease their burdens are eagerly received.

One of the latest is that of Cong. F. Bradford Morse, R-5th District.

The Lowell representative, in a letter to President Nixon over the weekend, recommended creation of a White House Council of Municipal Advisers as a focal point for the consideration of urban dilemmas.

Morse suggested the proposed council be set up along the lines of the present Council of Economic Advisers. He expressed confidence in the latter body, headed by John Ehrlichman, but told the President that a group with "a narrower charter may be necessary to insure that our municipalities receive top-level attention."

The departure of Dr. Daniel P. Moynihan, who was an expert on urban affairs, makes it imperative, in Morse's view, that "an effective, creative and sympathetic mechanism be established to insure that the priority attention that our urban problems require be continued."

Morse suggested a three-man council with extensive practical experience at the municipal level of government. He said such a council would "accord well with the president's expressed desire to encourage and assist local government."

Lynn, of course, would have an interest in the creation of such a council. Obviously, a three-man body could not spread itself thinly enough to find cures for all the specific problems of all the municipalities in the nation.

But by studying some of the major problems common to all cities at a given time—financial woes at the moment, for example, the proposed council could come up with broad general policies to effect some degree of relief.

The fact that it would have direct access to the White House would be a tremendous plus factor.

And the President himself would benefit by having expert advisers on urban affairs part of his intimate official family to keep him constantly informed on the needs of local government.

WHAT RIGHT TO DISSENT?

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the two newspaper articles which I will insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks, raise the grave question as to whether there remains the right to dissent on the part of valued Federal employees.

The articles comprise two columns written for the Des Moines Register by the well-known journalist, Clark R. Mollenhoff, chief of the Register's Washington Bureau and Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter.

In one of his columns, "Watch on Washington," Mollenhoff details the story of Philip I. Ryther, senior safety evaluator for the Federal Aviation Agency, who tried repeatedly to warn his superiors of impending air disasters unless tighter safety regulations were applied. For his foresight and courage, Ryther was driven out of Government.

In another of his columns, Mollenhoff describes the fate of Kenneth S. Cook, an Air Force weapons analyst, who accused superiors of distorting scientific reports and was promptly made the object of repeated mental examinations.

Mr. Speaker, the right to reasonable dissent and the right to make reasonable recommendations must be protected if Federal employees are to be more than mere rubber stamps in the service of their Government. Congress ought to lose no time in investigating the facts in each of these cases as a simple matter of justice.

The articles follow:

SAFETY CHIEF FORCED FROM JOB WITH FAA (By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Department of Transportation officials reprimanded, threatened and finally forced the resignation of the senior safety evaluator of the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) who tried to warn of impending air disaster.

The story will be the subject of Senate hearings in February or March.

The tightening of air safety regulations for charter flights recommended by safety evaluator Philip I. Ryther in April, 1970, was not incorporated into an FAA regulation until last Oct. 27—25 days after the crash in

Colorado that killed 31 Wichita State University football players.

Those athletes were among hundreds killed in crashes of chartered planes between April, when the FAA evaluation division recommended the change, and October when top FAA officials finally recognized the problem.

Even if there had been no safety issue that required urgent attention, the bureaucratic pressure used against the senior FAA safety official is inexcusable. It is comparable to the firing of cost expert Ernest Fitzgerald by the Air Force after he called attention to cost overruns on the C5A aircraft, or the State Department's firing of security expert Otto F. Otepka for calling attention to lax security.

When the FAA finally did tighten the air safety regulations, the rules were virtually the same recommendations Ryther had made after a four-month study that ended in March, 1970.

Both Ryther's recommendations and the final FAA rules called for increasing the frequency of aircraft inspection and also tightened pilot-training restrictions. The rules were aimed especially at requiring pilots to be familiar with the specific type of charter aircraft they are flying.

Following is the chronology of events:

1. In early April the recommendations by Ryther were submitted to Archie W. League, FAA assistant administrator for appraisal, for immediate action.

2. Throughout April and early May, League took no action. Ryther appealed above League. FAA Deputy Administrator Kenneth Smith set up a meeting on May 26 attended by Bertrand Harding, the FAA's associate administrator for manpower, League, and Ryther.

3. A few days after the meeting, Smith rejected Ryther's plea as "not sufficiently urgent." He sent the problem back to League, who immediately started to dismantle the safety evaluator's office, and directed Ryther to go on an extended inspection trip.

4. Ryther declined to go, and continued to appeal for tighter safety restrictions to FAA Administrator John H. (Jack) Shafer and also to Under Secretary James M. Beggs. Both brushed off Ryther's complaints, declined to intervene, and again turned the safety decision back to League.

5. On Aug. 19, 1970, League filed 11 pages of charges against Ryther. Harding then conferred with Ryther on the charges, and advised that he could save himself money, worry and wear and tear on his health by resigning. Harding indicated FAA officials could easily get access to Ryther's federal tax returns, but that if he resigned the charges against him would be dropped. Ryther insisted he had nothing to hide.

6. In September, Ryther's doctor told him the frustration fight at FAA had affected his health, and advised that he resign. Ryther agreed to resign on a disability pension and the charges were dropped on Sept. 16, 1970—just 15 days before the crash that killed a Wichita State football team and dramatized the need for tighter rules on charter flights.

In October the FAA engaged in a hurried rewrite of the April safety recommendations. Approval was given and the new restrictions to bring chartered aircraft up to airline standards were printed in the Federal Register of Oct. 27. They included the following precede:

"A recent accident has highlighted the need to regulate more strictly the leasing of large airplanes by educational institutions for the carriage of student groups, as for example football teams and choral groups."

Ryther, 55, is a career government employe who had more than 26 years in government when he retired. His GS-16 salary of \$30,972 was a result of a recent promotion he had received in connection with some bureaucratic negligence he had uncovered in 1969.

Ryther, who had never gone outside of the government chain of command before, was outraged in 1969 at the evidence that the FAA was not taking the necessary steps to modernize radar and other equipment. He took his complaint to the top administrator in his area, and over the heads of his immediate superiors.

On that occasion, a board of inquiry was established that confirmed the correctness of the complaints by Ryther and resulted in three superior officers being retired from government.

His success in correcting that problem gave him courage to tackle the job of tightening FAA regulations when his four-month study came across the laxity that existed in inspections of charter planes and regulations dealing with pilots flying those planes.

Ryther is a native of Park Rapids, Minn., and a graduate of New York University, where he received a B.S. degree in 1940 in business and management.

ONE MAN'S BATTLE

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The four-year ordeal of Kenneth S. Cook, a 57-year-old Air Force weapons analyst, should concern every member of Congress who seeks to protect the rights of career government employes.

Cook's ordeal started in 1966 when he complained that then Lt. Col. Roderick W. Clarke, acting commanding officer at Holloman Air Force Base in New Mexico, was distorting scientific reports on the defense against intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs). Cook said he was neither pro-antiballistic missile (ABM) or anti-ABM, but believes that whatever decision was made should be made on honest scientific reports.

MASTER'S DEGREE

At the time of his complaint, Cook, a physicist and mathematician with a master's degree from the University of Indiana, was a \$16,152-a-year government scientist with an outstanding record. He had been listed in American Men of Science since 1954.

Today, Cook is struggling to exist on a \$300-a-month pension while fighting for a hearing on an Air Force finding that he is mentally incapable of carrying out his government duties.

The fact that the top Air Force psychiatrist, Lt. Col. Paul Grissom, has stated it is an injustice hasn't caused any effort to correct the record by either the Air Force or the Civil Service Commission.

Dr. Grissom said "a review of all available reports of psychiatric evaluation and the medical board report rendered at Holloman Air Force Base disclosed no evidence of a psychotic or severe chronic neurotic condition in Mr. Cook. (These reports) do not support the conclusion, on any sound medical basis, that Mr. Cook was incapacitated for performance of his duties."

Grissom did say that Cook, a perfectionist in his work and punctual in work habits, is "relatively inflexible."

QUESTIONED BY SENATORS

The question of misuse of the mental incapacity finding was raised by several senators in a letter to John Macy, then chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Senator Sam Ervin (Dem., N.C.) wrote, "It would appear from the record that officials at Holloman Air Force Base, displeased with Mr. Cook's policy criticisms of their operations, may have taken advantage of the many loopholes in the laws and regulations affecting the rights of the individual."

Cook charges that an Air Force clique at Holloman conspired to fire him for mental disability and to bar him from a public hearing. Cook contends a little more diligent investigation by the Air Force or Civil Service Commission into the records would prove his case.

Since 1967, Cook has spent \$9,000 fighting the case in which the Air Force says it has no authority now that the Civil Service Commission is in the case. The commission says it now considers the case "closed."

James B. Goode, the deputy assistant secretary of the Air Force for personnel policy, said where "mental instability" is an issue "we couldn't turn the case around if we wanted to do it. It is in the hands of the Civil Service Commission."

The friction between Cook and Colonel Clarke at Holloman existed for months when Cook took his complaint to Washington in a "confidential" letter to Brig. Gen. Ernest Pinson, commanding officer in the Office of Aerospace Research at the Pentagon. In that Oct. 31, 1966, letter, Cook charged that Colonel Clarke had engaged in "information manipulation" and "a general degradation of civilians" at the base.

HE IS SUMMONED

He asked General Pinson for "decent management" and specifically asked that he "get this Clarke out of here immediately and get rid of this officers' plague."

On Nov. 22, 1966, Clarke summoned Cook to his office, told him he had a copy of the letter to Pinson and stated he would run Cook out of the Air Force and the government. Clarke withdrew Cook's security clearance on the spot and detailed him to inconsequential work.

A week later, Clarke's secretary called to tell Cook to report to Lt. Col. Dwight Newton, who headed the base hospital. Cook knew Dr. Newton to be a friend and neighbor of Clarke.

"We are going to find out what makes you tick," Dr. Newton allegedly told Cook.

Newton asked Cook if he would "agree" to submit to an examination by base doctors. Cook would not agree, but when Dr. Newton replied he could order him to do it, changed his mind and said the examination would "prove my case."

One week later, Cook was examined by Dr. Herbert H. Reynolds, the base psychologist. A week after that, he was examined by Capt. Martin Reite, a base psychiatrist.

REFORE BOARD

Cook spent about 40 minutes before the Holoman Medical Board on Jan. 25, 1967. He was not permitted to have his lawyer with him on order from Colonel Clarke. The five-man board included Dr. Reynolds, Dr. Reite and three other medical men from the base.

Cooke heard nothing from the board until April 17, 1967, when Clarke directed him to report to Dr. Newton. Dr. Newton bluntly stated the board was unanimous in finding him physically and mentally "incapable of performing further service for the Air Force or for the government."

In late April and early May, Cook consulted his own doctors—Dr. George M. Schlenker, of El Paso, Tex., and Dr. W. Thomas Holman, of Los Cruces, N.M. Dr. Schlenker said Cook "may be paranoid tinged" but added that he was neither potentially dangerous nor a security risk. He said the Air Force should be able to find use for his talent and experience.

Dr. Holman was much stronger in his support of Cook. He declared that Cook had the kind of "obsessive-compulsive personality" that drives many "outstanding individuals (to) great feats on behalf of mankind." He pictured it as a "valuable" trait, and added he found "no abnormal content of thought" in the Air Force analyst and urged that he be put back to work with a pay raise.

Despite that record, and the corroboration from the office of the Air Force Surgeon General, neither the Air Force nor Civil Service Commission has given Cook a hearing. Nor has either taken into account the evidence from others who left the base in 1965 and

1966 that there was lying and falsification of records in personnel cases.

The Air Force and Civil Service Commission have given inaccurate reports to members of the Senate and House, and have contradicted themselves. They have disregarded the pleas of Senator Clinton Anderson (Dem., N.M.) and Senator Ervin that they try to do "justice" because "a man's life is at stake."

THE SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1971

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the problem of crime in the schools has grown to such proportions that it now threatens the very viability of our educational system in many communities of the Nation, especially in urban areas. I have listened with great concern to many parents and students in my own district describe the seriousness of this problem, and I have recently reviewed in some detail the situation in the rest of the country. On the basis of that review, and my own experience with the problem in New York, I have developed legislation to deal with the situation which I am introducing today. It is legislation that will be controversial. But I am convinced it is badly needed and long overdue. As far as I am aware, it is the first legislation of its kind ever introduced in the Congress.

The following chart summarizes the dramatic increase in crime in the schools:

INCREASE IN SOME CATEGORIES OF CRIME IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS FROM 1964 TO 1968

Category	1964	1968	Percent increase
Homicides.....	15	26	73
Forcible rapes.....	51	81	61
Robberies.....	396	1,508	306
Aggravated assaults.....	475	680	43
Burglaries, larcenies.....	7,604	14,102	86
Weapons offenses.....	419	1,089	136
Narcotics.....	73	854	1,069
Drunkenness.....	370	1,035	179
Crimes by nonstudents.....	142	3,894	2,600
Vandalism incidents.....	185,184	250,549	35
Assaults on teachers.....	25	1,801	7,100
Assaults on students.....	1,601	4,267	167
Other.....	4,796	8,824	84

Source: 1970 survey of 110 school districts, Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

Crime in most categories at least doubled between 1964 and 1968, and increases as high as several thousand percent occurred in some important categories in that short time. If anything, those statistics are conservative. Many youngsters are afraid to report crimes committed against them. If they were not, nearly every child in New York and many other cities could tell his own story of being shaken down, mugged, or worse.

For the school systems, and for the taxpayers who support them, it is extraordinarily costly. The National Education Association has estimated that school vandalism alone currently is costing the Nation's schools about \$200 million a year. The cost of vandalism just in New York City in 1969 was estimated at over \$5 million.

But vandalism by no means represents the total cost of crime in the schools. Vandalism figures, for example, generally do not include the cost of equipment and supplies stolen from the schools. In 1966, that amounted to \$800,000 in New York City, and it is now running at about \$1 million a year.

Vandalism costs also leave out the costs of lost instruction. Every time a typewriter, a tool, or a piece of athletic equipment is stolen or damaged students are unable to carry on their work until the item is replaced or repaired. That is often weeks or months. The real cost of this wasted time for students and teachers is difficult to calculate. But it is considerable, and it must be taken into account as part of the total cost of school crime.

The psychological and material cost to students, teachers, and school employees who become victims of crime in the schools is similarly incalculable, but certainly extensive and serious.

Finally, there are the costs of efforts to reduce and prevent these deplorable acts. Until recently, such costs for most school systems were so small that separate figures were not kept. Recently, however, security and crime control has become a major category of school expenditures. New York, in 1970, requested and received separate security funds for the first time—\$500,000 for a 170-man special security force. For 1971, the city has requested \$1,000,000. The trend is similar in other cities.

Like it or not, the schools are in the crime control business, and by necessity they are in it in a big way. Given the financial limitations on many school districts, it is highly questionable whether they will be able to free sufficient funds to deal effectively with crime. And every dollar they do free to fight crime is a dollar less devoted to their major purpose—providing youngsters with a quality education. Yet the schools themselves simply must succeed in controlling crime in the schools. Where they fail we face unthinkable developments—the collapse of the educational system, or the emergence of educational garrisons.

To help the schools out of this dilemma and to relieve parents, teachers, and children who are bravely trying to continue with education despite increasing terror in the schools, we must provide the schools with needed additional funds. These must be funds apart from those already available for direct educational purposes. They must be funds explicitly and exclusively for restoring safety from crime in the schools.

That is the essence of the legislation I am introducing today. It would provide, for the first time, a program of Federal grants to local school districts and other educational agencies to meet school crime control needs. It is a new program, separate from any existing programs of Federal aid to schools.

With all the Federal educational and law enforcement programs now on the books, no Federal assistance has been made available for this purpose.

My legislation, the Safe Schools Act of 1971, does not propose or seek to impose

any single or precise solution to the school crime problem. It provides, instead, flexible resources to enable and induce individual school districts to develop and improve their own solutions, based on their own special needs and circumstances, without having to make sacrifices in educational programs to do so. Within broad limits, the use of the Federal funds I am proposing to make available is up to local school officials and their communities.

Now it will be tempting for some to look upon this legislation rather suspiciously as a "police in the schools" bill. It is no such thing. School crime control projects funded under this legislation will have to be fully considered and evaluated by the parents of the children to be affected. Parent and community support is one of the major criteria for the granting of funds. I am confident that most parents, particularly if given other alternatives, do not want to bring police into the schools. The fact is that there are plenty of alternatives short of bringing police into the schools that can increase the safety of the school community. Those alternatives need to be explored, tried, and improved upon. New ones need to be developed. That is the intent of this bill, and I am confident that is how it will be used by State and local jurisdictions.

In those instances where a local community may determine that uniformed personnel are needed in the schools, this legislation will help assure that that decision is made responsibly, with full community participation, and with full attention to necessary safeguards. My proposal, for example, specifies that no Federal funds under any circumstances shall be used to support firearms, other weapons, or chemical agents in the schools.

What are some of the other ways we might stop the crime wave in the schools? In my judgment, after some study of the problem, there are several promising possibilities:

First. Greater professionalization and expansion of school security forces. Sadly, perhaps, but undeniably, the days of the grandfatherly school custodian-watchman, shuffling wearily about his chores to supplement his pension, are over. It is time we recognize that the job of making schools safe is a delicate and demanding one. It requires special skills, techniques, and equipment which neither teachers nor school administrators nor the average "cop on the beat," possess. We must define the responsibilities and role of security personnel in the school community, and we must provide them with appropriate special training and facilities. The head of security in a major city school system in the Midwest told me his people lack even basic rapid communications equipment that would enable them to report or summon help when trouble is encountered. Some school systems have hesitated to provide needed security equipment because its security forces are not adequately trained to use it properly. So one inadequacy leads to another. And our children and teachers are the losers.

Second. Increased adult presence in the schools through the use of trained

parent patrols. On the basis of an independent study of school disruption—including crime—for the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the Syracuse University Research Corp. strongly recommended increased use of paid, neighborhood-based security aides in the schools. Use of parent security aides has been tried successfully in schools in Cleveland, Berkeley, and elsewhere. Their effectiveness was found to be enhanced by their neutrality—that is, their lack of identification with either school officials or the police. Here again, of course, special training is necessary, especially in the area of fundamental constitutional rights. Without such training parent patrols could do more harm than good. But with proper training, it appears that they can make an important contribution. Funds under the legislation I am proposing could be used to set up such parent patrol programs, to train participants, and to pay their salaries.

Third. Installation of basic surveillance and alarm systems as crime deterrents. One special area where this type of equipment might be particularly helpful is with regard to school crimes involving firearms. As you will note on the chart, there has been a particularly alarming increase in crimes with firearms in the schools—they have increased 136 percent over the past 4 years on the basis of a study by a U.S. Senate subcommittee from which these figures are taken. That is a reflection, of course, of the great traffic and oversupply of firearms in our society in general. But we have moved swiftly and decisively through the use of sophisticated surveillance devices to cut down and deter airline passengers, for example, from harboring firearms which might be used in hijackings. Is the safety of our schoolchildren and teachers any less important? Should we not move equally quickly to make use of these methods as much as we can to stop firearms and other lethal weapons at the schoolhouse doors? I think we should. And I would hope and expect that a great many local school districts would elect to use some of the funds under my legislation to purchase and install unobtrusive, carefully managed, but effective surveillance equipment for use in stopping weapons from entering the school.

It would be a mistake to expect too much in the way of total crime reduction only from the installation of even the most sophisticated alarm systems. Nevertheless, they are of some value as deterrents. Schools that do not have them constitute extremely inviting crime targets, and resources should be available to outfit all schools with at least basic equipment of this type.

Fourth. Improved student identification and accounting methods. One of the most astounding and disturbing facts about the increase in school crimes is the extent to which such crime is committed by outsiders—people who do not belong in the schools in the first place. Such crime by outsiders increased 2,600 percent between 1964 and 1968 in the 110 school districts sampled by the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

Difficult as it sometimes is to distinguish "outsiders" from "insiders," especially in large, crowded schools, better attempts must be made. We can no longer permit school children and personnel to be such easy prey for intruders who find schools convenient settings for crime. We must, in every school, at least be able to spot individuals who clearly do not belong—and spot them quickly. Several of the other measures I have mentioned under this legislation would help. In addition, more elaborate methods of student identification, attendance, scheduling, and accounting might be effective. With a capability efficiently and continually to identify all bona fide students absolutely, perhaps through a photo identification badge, it would be that much easier to identify intruders.

Fifth. Improved school-community liaison. Every school crime control program should include systematic efforts to inform citizens near each school of the problem, and should attempt to enlist their support. A number of communities have experimented with public participation programs under which citizens are alerted to report strangers in or near schools, to report any information they may obtain about illicit activities involving schoolchildren, and so forth. In some communities, parent canvassers have been sent out regularly to request, gather, and study such information in conjunction with school security officials. In the Bronx, students have organized both to curb crime within the school and to alert the community to the problem and enlist their help in stopping it. Such efforts should be encouraged, and my legislation would enable the schools to support, implement, and expand them.

None of these potential programs under the Safe Schools Act will solve the problem of crime in the schools. They are immediate emergency measures to save the schools and those who work and study in them from further terror and injury. But school crime, like crime anywhere, can only be eliminated by getting at its causes. With that in mind, and with my support and that of most of my colleagues in the House, the Congress passed, for example, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act in 1968. Since then we have appropriated \$30 million to aid, treat, and rehabilitate delinquents.

To solve the problem of crime in the schools we need more programs like that along with improved programs in housing, health care, and job opportunities. And we need to invest more funds in them. But rehabilitation works slowly, especially in view of our limited efforts. Often, we must try to keep delinquents in the schools and work at rehabilitating them there. In so doing, however, we increase the needs of the rest of the school community for protection. And our responsibility to the potential victims of crime is certainly no less than our responsibility to those who may perpetrate it.

In my judgment, the Safe Schools Act of 1971 is a constructive step toward better meeting our responsibilities to those who bear the brunt of crime. It provides a framework for increasing and improv-

ing protection and safety of one of our most important and vulnerable institutions—our schools. It would assure that this increased effort is undertaken—without hysteria, with full attention to essential constitutional safeguards, with the initiative and power in the hands of the people most affected, not as a substitute, but as a supplement for programs directed at the causes of crime and the rehabilitation of potential criminals.

I want to note that, in preparing this proposal, I have benefited from advice and assistance from a number of national and local organizations, including the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Association of School Administrators, the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools, the International Association of School Security Officials, the National Council of Big City Boards of Education, and the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. The International Association of School Security Officials, an organization which was recently formed for the purpose of professionalizing and improving the school security field, already has given this proposal a formal and enthusiastic endorsement. A number of other organizations are studying it for possible endorsement.

I commend this proposal to the attention of my colleagues in the House, many of whom, I am sure, share my concern over school crime and may find the idea of specific Federal grants for this purpose worthy of support. In particular, I hope that the Members of the relevant subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee will give this legislation prompt and favorable consideration so that full House action on it will be possible in the near future.

CHARLIE HUGGINS DAY

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1971, the people of Gleason, Tenn., located in the congressional district which I represent, honored their mayor with a "Charlie Huggins Day."

Mr. Huggins has spent many years in faithful service to his town, county, State, and Nation. Although he is a strong Democrat, he has always placed the interests of his people above partisan politics. The people, in return, have set aside this one day to pay a nonpartisan tribute to the man for his distinguished service.

The event was announced in a story which appeared in the January 26, 1971, issue of the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal. At this point I include in the RECORD the story which was written by Mr. Tom Williams:

"GET TOGETHER" AT GLEASON WILL HONOR
MAYOR

(By Tom Williams)

GLEASON, TENN., January 25.—Friends, relatives, politicians and his fellow townsmen

will honor longtime Mayor Charles Huggins at a banquet and informal "get-togethers" Saturday in the Gleason High School gymnasium.

"It's hard to explain exactly why we are having the program. It is something we simply felt ought to be done, so we are doing it," said Dudley Sanders, the mayor's nephew and a teacher at the high school.

"Part of the reason may be that 'Charlie' isn't a typical mayor. He doesn't spend all his time in the office. When you see him, he's helping with the street patching or mowing grass alongside the OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity) workers in the city park. But he does more than a man half his age."

The mayor is not an ordinary 74-year-old man.

His hands are thick and worn, suggesting years of working the brown Weakley County soil.

Mayor Huggins offers no explanation for the special occasion. However, he did say that when they "decided to name the city park Charlie Huggins Park they went a little too far."

Mayor Huggins said he was born on a farm in the community of Catfield, between Dresden and Greenfield, and that with 11 children in the family, "times were not always good."

As the second eldest child he helped his father with farming to provide for the other children, which meant he had to end his formal education after the third grade.

"Young people today just don't realize how hard we had it back then and how easy it is to get an education today," Mayor Huggins declared.

In 1922 he got a job with the Wabash Railroad and stayed with it 15 years.

After a layoff in 1937, he moved to Gleason and took a \$30-a-month job in an auto parts business.

Two years later he bought one-third interest in the business, and during the next 10 years the company opened parts stores in seven West Tennessee towns.

The business was then divided. Mr. Huggins became owner of the store in Gleason, and the store is still in operation.

Since 1963 when he became mayor, he has spent much of his time working to improve government services and to attract industry to Gleason.

"I took the job because I thought I could do something for the town, and not for the salary (\$30 a month)," he said.

"When I became mayor the city hall was a crowded, rundown building and completely inadequate. No one thought we could afford to build a new building, but I took the job with that aim."

Shortly after he became mayor, an agreement was reached with the Weakley County Municipal Electric System to share half the cost of a new building and a \$40,000 structure was erected.

The mayor also cites with pride a \$300,000 water and sewer system completed last year, major street repairs and expansion of the city limits.

Gleason's population grew from 900 in 1960 to 1,314 in 1970.

The mayor says he dearly loves politics.

"I've been a Democrat all my life, and I'll always be a Democrat," he declared.

He was a delegate to the last two national Democratic conventions and says the Democratic Party is "the South's only hope for the future."

One of the persons already reserving a seat for the Saturday celebration is Mrs. Annabelle Clement O'Brien, sister of the late Gov. Frank Clement. Mayor Huggins said he and Mr. Clement were "close friends."

"Every Democrat from Hubert Humphrey down has been invited to the program," said Mr. Sanders.

He and Robert Owen, who helped organize the program, said it would be up to the

Democrats to make the program a success, since they both are Republicans.

"We are not selling tickets and there will be no charge for the supper. We are trying to make it attractive to everyone, and we want everyone to come," Mr. Sanders said. "The day is for 'Charlie' and for simple expressions of thanks."

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE DEDICATION OF THE DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER NA- TIONAL REPUBLICAN CENTER

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, On January 15, 1971, a dream was fulfilled for the Republican Party when President Nixon dedicated the Dwight D. Eisenhower National Republican Center on Capitol Hill. This was a truly historic occasion as it marked the first time that any American political party has taken up residence in a permanent home.

In dedicating the Eisenhower center, President Nixon called for the Republican Party "to be the party of the open door, a party with its doors open to all people of all races and of all parties, those who share our great ideals about the future of America and the future of the world."

In choosing these words, President Nixon could not have paid a more fitting tribute to a great American. I include the President's remarks at the dedication of the Dwight D. Eisenhower National Republican Center at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE DEDICATION OF THE DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CENTER

Chairman Morton, Mrs. Eisenhower, Members of the Congress, Members of the National Committee and our very special guests this morning:

I feel that it is a very great honor to have the opportunity to participate in this ceremony that I understand has been going on for some time before I arrived.

I don't know whether there was any significance in the fact that they gave the dollar away before I got here.

But, in any event, the remarks that I will make will be brief and quite personal, as I think General Eisenhower would have wanted them to be on such an occasion.

We have here a building and we think of how it came into being. And we know that it came into being because men helped to build it, men who knew things about bricks and mortar and superstructure and architecture and all of that. And we are very proud that they built such a good building.

It also came into being because one man in particular had a dream. I know that his name has been referred to previously, but let me refer to him in the terms that General Eisenhower, I think, would have referred to him.

I will recall a conversation I had with General Eisenhower right after he became President and I became Vice President in 1953. We were riding back from Quantico after a meeting there of various members of the Armed Services with regard to our Defense budget. The General was reminiscing about some of the great days of the victory in Europe and about some of the men who served under him and with him.

And I asked him that if he had to select one quality in an individual for an organization, above everything else what would it be? And he thought a moment and answered, "Selflessness." He said, "Of course, other things matter. You want brains and dedication and hard work." But he said the most important quality that you can have in an army, whether it is an army in war or an army in a political campaign or an organization in a great national administration, is "selflessness," the willingness to go out and do hard and tough jobs in a completely unselfish manner; the willingness to sacrifice one's self for a greater cause than himself.

I think Jim Auchincloss was a selfless man. I remember 20 years ago when I was in the House and later in the Senate and then as Vice President and when I was out of office, I could always expect a call from Jim Auchincloss about the Eisenhower Center.

And he spoke about his dream, the necessity to get support for it, ideas that didn't seem to have any chance of succeeding. But he drove on and on and others then joined him and eventually this great building, the Center for all of the Republican National Committee's activities finally came into being.

And a selfless man, Jim Auchincloss, and all the other selfless people with him, and many of them are right here in this audience, I think General Eisenhower would want me especially to pay tribute to this morning.

The other thing I think the General would say today is something about the Party of which he was a member, and the Party to which he had such dedication and what he would like for it in the future. And perhaps he would speak of this Party the way he used to speak about the Party and its organization to the Members of the Cabinet and to me during those occasions when we were in political campaigns in '54, '56, '58 and then again in 1960. He often used to emphasize the necessity for the Party to expand, to get more people, more troops to join with us. And he pointed out what was actually a very great truth, that by itself neither political party in this country could win an election. In order to win, it is necessary to pick up enough independents and enough members of the other Party to get the majority.

And President Eisenhower, for that reason, would emphasize the necessity in speaking to a Party organization and all of us, you, our Party organization people here today, to say organize the Party well, but be sure you organize it in a way that you can bring others into the Party and allow others to have allegiance to it and to our cause even though they may not be members of the Party.

And I think on that score one thing that General Eisenhower used to say in talking about the party on those occasions when he saw a tendency that might be too introverted was that, he said, the tendency of most organizations is to organize fewer and fewer better and better.

And that, of course, is the great danger of any party organization. It is the great danger of any club. It is the great danger of any association of people to be more interested in the organization as a goal and an end in itself rather than an organization as simply a base to do something, do something bigger than itself, an organization that will grow, an organization that will have an influence on the community and on the State and on the nation and even on the world.

And so I think General Eisenhower would have said, "Organize this Republican Party well. But organize it in a way that it can grow, that it can attract independent voters and Democratic voters, that it can attract Americans in all walks of life so that we can become an organization that will be an effective instrument for doing better things for America and better things for the world."

As a matter of fact, I noticed as I came out onto this platform today—which, incidentally is heated by the television lights—but in any event, I noticed as I came out that door was open. And now it is closed.

Symbolically, what I would like to say as this new building is officially dedicated is that I would like this building to be the building of the open door, a party with its doors open to all people of all races and of all parties, those who share our great ideals about the future of American and the future of the world.

That is how the Republican Party came into being. It was a party then that brought into it not just a group of people who believed certain very narrow things, but people who differed about a great number of things, but who were united on one principle; they wanted union. They believed in the unity of this Nation. They believed in the freedom of men.

And, so our party has great principles, principles that are far bigger than the Republican Party. They are big, as all of America itself. But our party will not grow unless it is the party of the open door, open to all people, all people who share our principles, who want to work with us for the betterment of America and the betterment of the world.

And so I think these are the two thoughts that General Eisenhower would have wanted me, who was proud to be his Vice President during the eight years he was President of the United States, to convey to you, this very distinguished audience today:

First, an appreciation to all of you who have been selfless in your work for our Party in campaigns. Sometimes we won. Sometimes we lost. But you gave everything you had. That is, of course, the greatest attribute an individual can have.

And, second, his advice that ours should be the party of the open door, open to all people, all parties, all faiths, all races.

That is the kind of a party he would want and that is the kind of a party we are, and that we shall be in the years ahead.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, the 53d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine was celebrated by over 2 million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry. Unfortunately, the independence which they celebrated, and which I now join in commemorating, was short-lived, for the Ukraine's dream of freedom was transformed into a nightmare of Soviet domination less than 3 years after the national council at Kiev declared the Ukraine a sovereign republic in 1918.

Nevertheless, the dream of freedom has never been extinguished in the hearts of 47 million Ukrainians. Despite the hardship and anguish which they have experienced, they still cling to the conviction that the reality of freedom will again be theirs.

I am delighted to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the courage of the Ukrainians, and in reconfirming our dedication to the task of bringing freedom to the Ukraine and to all the other captive nations. Each of us has a stake in the future of these nations—for without a firm commitment to freedom

for all, we can never hope to establish lasting world peace.

Along with freedom-loving people everywhere, I hope that those who now struggle against tyranny will soon win their battles, and that next year's celebration of Ukrainian independence will be celebration of a fact, and not just a dream.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT INCREASE NEEDED NOW

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with my efforts to secure passage of an increase in social security benefits, I have obtained a copy of a fairly thorough comparison of the social security system and other retirement programs. The article was written by Walter W. Kolodrubetz of the Office of Research and Statistics, Division of Economic and Long-Range Studies in the Social Security Administration. It is entitled: "Private and Public Retirement Pensions: Findings From the 1968 Survey of the Aged." It appeared in the September 1970 issue of the Social Security Bulletin.

Inasmuch as the article is so pertinent to the question of increasing social security benefits, I intend to insert parts of the article into the RECORD over the next few days:

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC RETIREMENT PENSIONS: FINDINGS FROM THE 1968 SURVEY OF THE AGED

(By Walter W. Kolodrubetz*)

The Federal social security program is today the major source retirement income for the aged population. For a sizable and growing group, however, private and other public group retirement programs have considerable effect on the maintenance of income. In 1967, private pensions were received by about 1.8 million aged couples and nonmarried persons, almost all of whom were receiving monthly cash benefits under the old-age survivors, disability, and health insurance (OASDHI) program. Retirement programs for Federal (civilian and military), State, and local government employees and for railroad workers provided support for an additional 1.5 million aged units, two-thirds of whom were also receiving OASDHI benefits.

Examination of the sources of retirement benefit income of the aged population reveals the role of private and other public pension programs (excluding veterans' pension programs) in supplementing the basic OASDHI program. About one-fifth of the aged couples (with one or both members aged 65 or older) reported receiving private pension payments that supplement their OASDHI benefits (table 1). Seven percent of the couples, had, in addition to their OASDHI benefits, a retirement pension through another public program, and 3 percent received only a public pension other than OASDHI in retirement benefit income. For more than three-fifths of the couples, however, OASDHI benefits were their only periodic retirement benefit. Nine percent of the couple's received no retirement benefits but relied mainly on employment as the source of

*Office of Research and Statistics, Division of Economic and Long-Range Studies.

their income; presumably most of them were qualified to receive OASDHI benefits and, in some cases another public pension or a private pension.

The same general configuration of sources of retirement benefit income prevailed for the aged nonmarried. The degree of supplementation of OASDHI benefits through other pension plans was far less than it was for couples, however. The proportion of the nonmarried dependent on OASDHI only for retirement benefits was therefore larger, especially for nonmarried women. Of the 2.4 million aged nonmarried men, 13 percent had private pension income—more than twice the proportion among the 7.4 million nonmarried women. For both men and women the proportion receiving public pensions such as those under Federal, State, and local gov-

ernment systems was not significantly different from that for the couples.

Since practically all jobs with private pension coverage were also covered under OASDHI, only rarely would a private pension be payable but no OASDHI benefit. All but 3 percent of all aged units reporting private pension income were also OASDHI beneficiaries in 1967, and that proportion is probably even lower today. Yet, since Federal employees and some State and local government employees did not have concurrent OASDHI coverage, only two-thirds of the aged units reporting receipt of a public pension other than OASDHI were also receiving OASDHI benefits. In some cases, one member of an aged couple might be receiving OASDHI benefits and the other member might be getting a different public pension.

TABLE 1.—SOURCE OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS: AGED UNITS WITH MONEY INCOME FROM SPECIFIED SOURCES 1967

Source of retirement benefit	All units	Married couples	Nonmarried persons		
			Total	Men	Women
Number of units (in thousands)	15,779	5,989	9,789	2,356	7,434
Number with—					
OASDHI and—					
No other pension ¹	10,942	3,702	7,240	1,626	5,615
Private group pension ²	1,801	1,136	666	308	358
Other public pension	942	447	495	133	362
Public pension other than OASDHI	509	166	343	109	234
No retirement benefit ¹	1,584	538	1,046	182	865

¹ Includes a small number of units who did not report whether they received private pensions.

² Includes 16,000 married units and 38,000 nonmarried persons not currently receiving OASDHI benefits, according to beneficiary records. Also includes 66,000 married beneficiary units and 14,000 nonmarried beneficiaries reporting both a private pension and another public pension.

A few of the couples and nonmarried persons, according to the Survey findings, were getting three or more pensions. An estimated 80,000 aged units—most of them OASDHI beneficiaries—were receiving a private pension and, in addition, a public pension based on government or railroad employment.

The wide differences in median annual income for the groups receiving various types of retirement benefits point up the powerful influence of dual pensions in the financial position of the aged population in 1967, as the following summary shows.

Source of retirement benefit	Median income of—			
	Married couples	Nonmarried persons		
		Total	Men	Women
OASDHI and—				
No other pension	\$2,752	\$1,254	\$1,488	\$1,195
Private group pension ¹	4,257	2,418	2,580	2,331
Other public pension	4,424	2,435	2,848	2,319
Public pension other than OASDHI	3,746	1,649	(?)	1,290
No retirement benefit	6,270	1,020	1,175	1,007

¹ Includes a small number of units not receiving OASDHI benefits and a small number also receiving other public pensions.

² Not shown where base is less than 100,000.

The most fortunate among the retired aged population were the nearly 1.6 million couples receiving OASDHI benefits and a public or private pension as well. For them, median total income was above \$4,200. Dual pensions usually mean the difference between a less than modest and a fairly comfortable income position, but even dual pensioners had lower incomes than those still working. The median income of the 1.2 million elderly nonmarried persons with dual pensions was about \$2,400—about \$2,000 lower than that of married couples, yet their economic position was markedly better than that of others among the nonmarried.

For the married couples in the small group of the aged with a railroad or government retirement pension but no OASDHI benefit, the median income was \$3,745—roughly \$500 below that for couples with two pensions. Their median income was \$1,000 above the median of couples whose only pension was from the OASDHI program.

For the bulk of the aged units, OASDHI benefits represented their only retirement benefit income. This group (3.7 million couples and — million nonmarried persons) fell in the lower end of the income-position balance sheet. They had median

incomes of \$2,750 and \$1,255, respectively—amounts \$1,000–\$1,500 below the medians of their counterparts with two pensions. The median for these couples with OASDHI as their retirement benefits was just a little higher than that for nonmarried persons with OASDHI benefits and supplementary pensions.

At the lowest end of the economic scale were the 1 million elderly nonmarried not receiving any retirement benefit; their income averaged a little above \$1,000. Some of these nonmarried persons were employed, but they were not as likely as the married couples to have high earnings. For these nonmarried persons, the most disadvantaged were among the 865,000 women without a spouse, a high proportion of whom had to rely on public assistance during old age.

The public and private retirement benefits paid to 9 out of 10 aged units in 1967 accounted for an estimated 42 percent of the aggregate income of persons aged 65 and over and their spouses. The Survey findings reveal that the role of retirement benefits was substantially larger for the nonmarried than for the couples.

These findings of the overall retirement benefit status of the aged were obtained from

the 1968 Survey of the Demographic and Economic Characteristics of the Aged (DECA). The Survey was designed to provide information similar to that obtained from the 1963 Survey of the Aged¹ on private and other public pension income, as well as other characteristics of the aged population.

The first article on the DECA Survey gives a detailed definition of income and discusses the problems of measuring income size.² A statement about the Survey design, rough approximations of the standard error of selected estimates, and a discussion of non-sampling errors are included in the technical appendix to that article. Confidence levels of medians pertinent to the data presented here are shown in table I on page 21 of this article.

This article analyzes detailed information on the characteristics of the aged population in 1967 with various retirement benefits. Particular attention is devoted to the factors that account for the contrasting economic positions of aged persons with and without retirement benefits that supplement OASDHI benefits.

The Survey did not permit distinction between veterans' disability and pension payments. This important source of retirement income was thus necessarily omitted from the detailed analysis of pensions.

Since practically all the units receiving private pension payments received OASDHI benefits, examination of sources and size of income of private pensioners is restricted to OASDHI beneficiary units receiving private pensions. A substantial number of other public pensioners were not receiving OASDHI benefits, however, and their characteristics differ from those of units receiving two public pensions. Separate analysis for these groups was therefore necessary.

The analysis in the remainder of the article is restricted to regular OASDHI beneficiaries who received at least one check by January 1967. Inclusion of part-year beneficiaries, those transitionally insured, and special "age 72" beneficiaries would have distorted comparisons.

MODERNIZING FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce two bills designed to affect needed changes in the operation of the Farmers Home Administration. One raises operating loan limits from \$35,000 to \$50,000; the other transfers funding of the operating loan program itself from the Federal budget to the private money market.

In the last Congress I introduced legislation which, among other things, would have accomplished these two goals. I was gratified a portion of these proposals were adopted, and that farm ownership loan limits were raised from \$60,000 to \$100,000. As a result, young

¹ Lenore A. Epstein and Janet Murray, *The Aged Population of the United States: The 1963 Social Security Survey of the Aged* (Research Report No. 19), Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics, 1967.

² Lenore E. Bixby, "Income of People Aged 65 and Over: Overview From 1968 Survey of the Aged," *Social Security Bulletin*, April 1970.

farmers who are just starting out and more established farmers who want to expand their operations now better meet their financial needs, at least as far as FHA real estate loans are concerned.

With the farm ownership loan program reasonably updated, I think Congress should turn its attention to the farm operating loan program and make those changes necessary to bring it too in line with the demands of today's economy.

Perhaps the most basic change that is needed concerns the method by which the farm operating loan program is funded. At present, money for the program is taken out of the Federal budget and appropriated by Congress. For some time I have thought this to be an inefficient mechanism. And after analyzing the problem in detail I have concluded that the taxpayers interests would be best served if operating loan funds were generated from the private money market rather than from the Federal tax dollar. This I discovered could be accomplished by transferring funding from the budget to the agricultural credit insurance fund, a change which has also been earnestly sought after by the extremely capable Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, James V. Smith. Moreover, not only have I found approval for my idea at FHA, the Bureau of Management and Budget and the President have been equally receptive and a mutually acceptable legislative proposal has been arrived at. The importance the President attaches to this proposal is demonstrated by the fact that it is one of the 40 specific legislative requests he sent to Congress earlier this week.

In summation, transferring the FHA operating loan program from the Federal budget to the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, as proposed in my bill, would save tax dollars. And with program funds being generated through the sale of FHA paper in the private money market, the interests of governmental efficiency and would be well served.

Mr. Speaker, my second bill raises the limits on farm operating loans from the \$35,000 ceiling established in 1960, to \$50,000. I think this change is vital to the ongoing success of this particular FHA loan program.

By way of general background, FHA was established to provide supplementary loans to small farmers unable to obtain commercial credit. For three decades these loans have enabled farmers to obtain vital financial assistance; and as a result, many successful farmers owe their beginnings to FHA loan programs. Incidentally, financially this program has been as successful for the Government as it has been operationally for the farmer. I say this because, not only have the FHA loans been repaid with interest, rural borrowers have had an outstanding repayment record.

With regard to the operating loan program specifically, it was established for the purpose of assisting farmers develop efficient and profitable farming operations. Although this program has provided a needed function; perhaps its greatest single problem is, since the costs

of farm machinery, equipment and supplies have risen along with the cost of living, the 1960 limits are inadequate now. By way of illustration, during the last 7 years, the capital investment costs for farms and ranches have climbed 79 percent. Annual outlays for fertilizers have increased 64 percent; costs of various pesticides are up 20 percent; and, feed costs have risen 33 percent.

These increases have had dramatic consequences for the farm sector as a whole. To cite but a few examples, in 1967 the average grade A dairy farm in Wisconsin required well over \$50,000 operating capital compared to the \$30,000 that was required between 1957-59. The average hog or beef fattening farm in the corn belt required more than \$84,000 in 1967, compared to \$44,000 in 1957-59. Finally, in 1967 the average cattle ranch in the Southwest required an operating capital investment of nearly \$60,000, as contrasted to the \$38,000 that was needed between 1957-59.

If these statistics are coupled with the fact that inflation has jacked up operating costs considerably since these figures were gathered, all but the unconscious can get a pretty good idea of the financial problems facing farmers today.

Turning to my proposal, I would like to see farm operating loan limits raised from \$35,000 to \$50,000. Abstractly, this does not sound like much of an increase, but I have been assured by FHA officials that this extra amount would enable the loan program to fulfill the credit needs of most small farm borrowers.

Additionally, I would like to stress that if the funding of the operating loan program were transferred to the private money markets, as I have proposed, then raising loan limits would not cost the taxpayer anything. In this connection, I have been assured that, pending this transfer, FHA could provide for some increase in the level of program funding in accordance with the new loan limits without relying on any additional appropriations. Such an approach I find eminently suitable.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to expedite these two proposals. Transferring the funding of the operating loan program from the Federal budget to the private money market has the full support of the administration. Increasing the outside limits on operating loans would give FHA officials greater flexibility in meeting the credit needs of this Nation's hard-pressed farmers. Both are worthy goals; both deserve prompt congressional approval.

REMARKS OF DR. E. E. DAVID, JR.,
SCIENCE ADVISER TO THE
PRESIDENT

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the meetings of the Advisory Panel on Science and Technology of the Com-

mittee on Science and Astronautics on the 26th, 27th, and 28th of January were distinguished by many, many outstanding presentations by eminent scientists of our panel and the visiting guest panelists from many portions of the world. Those presentations on international science policy were brilliantly highlighted by the remarks of Dr. E. E. David, Jr., science adviser to the President, who addressed the Panel members and committee guests at a luncheon on the 27th of January. His penetrating views on the need for international science policy and scientific cooperation between the nations of the world were amplified by his concepts by which international scientific cooperation can be implemented and made a reality. It is very easy to agree that international scientific cooperation is good for the peoples of the world. It is indeed another thing to make the hard decisions that will make international scientific cooperation an actuality. I daresay not a Member of the House accepts the idea that science and technology are the predominant ingredients of modern society. I am also sure the Members will agree that wherever political leaders join with their science counterparts and transcend the ever present nationalism and begin working for the welfare of the world—not just for their own particular country—the peoples of the world would inevitably become the beneficiaries. I urge every Member to read and meditate upon the words of Dr. David.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF DR. E. E. DAVID, JR.

It is a great pleasure today to address this distinguished audience of members of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, its Panel on Science and Technology, members of the AIAA, and the foreign guests who have been participating in this three-day session on International Science Policy.

I must compliment the members of the Committee and particularly Chairman Miller for organizing these annual meetings. In so doing, you continue to demonstrate your deep interest in the health of science and technology, not only in this nation but also internationally.

Before I proceed, let me recognize the splendid efforts of the Committee and your Subcommittee, formerly headed by Mr. Daddario and now in the hands of Mr. Davis, to develop the issue of domestic science policy. Your hearings have been invaluable, your questions have been searching, and your reports have been thoughtful and provocative. We will draw on them heavily.

Since World War II there have evolved in most of the developed nations small but dedicated bureaucracies promoting international scientific and technical cooperation. The cliches which motivate them read something like this: science is international by nature; international cooperation makes good international relations; hence, international science is good international politics and good human relations and should be promoted at every opportunity.

I personally am very susceptible to the logic of these phrases. In my own professional career in communications and computing, I have found that wherever I have traveled throughout the world, regardless of language, culture, tradition, or degree of political tension between my country and my hosts, mutual interests in engineering and science immediately provided a common ground for useful communication.

President Nixon is also a strong believer in the value of functional partnership rela-

tions among nations in science and technology. Since he took office two years ago, new or greatly expanded cooperative programs have been developed with Romania, Yugoslavia, France, and most recently with Spain, all related to visits of the President to those countries.

But a deep feeling that international science is good is still, I confess, not sufficient to stir the elephantine bureaucracy of our government into responsive action, nor to persuade the Congressional wardens of the appropriations process that the small, but finite quantity of federal monies required to turn these convictions into reality are justified. There is no phrase that passes from the lips with less effort than "international scientific and technical cooperation" nor any budget request that is harder to secure through our present process of funding domestic, mission-oriented agencies to participate in these activities. There are reasons for these difficulties. They run the gamut from pure chauvinism to a gross misunderstanding of the delicate processes of creative technical work. We must confront these difficulties. In short, I am suggesting that we need a U.S. policy for international science and technology. I see that as a direct and logical extension of our national scientific and technical policies.

The President has asked me to submit to him in May of this year the first of what may become an annual report on science and technology. This I shall do and if it meets with his approval, I would expect it to be transmitted to the Congress and to the nation as the first attempt by Executive to blueprint our national R&D priorities. In that report we intend to have a chapter on international scientific and technical cooperation. What I would like to do today is to tell you some of my personal views on the subject. I assume that these will be reflected to some degree in our official posture.

Basically, we understand the advantages to be gained in scientific cooperation—we understand much less about the benefits and costs of technology transfer between nations. In addition to the much-discussed difficulties of technology transfer, how do we balance proprietary losses in technology against the intangible benefits of cooperative ventures? It is a difficult question, but I believe that the only way for our country to sustain technological leadership is to use fully our excellent R&D enterprise—that is, to outperform our competition through excellence. This view can facilitate international cooperation since it encourages the flow of information and techniques, yet insists on a quid pro quo. Let me discuss some of these thoughts more fully.

Cooperation in matters scientific has a long and honorable history. The free exchange of information and research results is the basis of our scientific and professional societies and archival journals. Even here, however, there are protective mechanisms so that individual workers and inevitably their countries are recognized for their accomplishments. In the commercial world, patents and copyrights are also an important protective mechanism. Make no mistake these mechanisms make possible the sharing of scientific information through such activities as professional meetings. In terms of federal government policy, the support of domestic research by our government implies a willingness to finance the international exchange of knowledge, at the same time insisting on proper protection. We recognize, too, that often a researcher traveling abroad can acquire a fact or hint from a foreign colleague that can save months of effort at home. It is clear, however, that this process implies tight management to assure that foreign travel is not abused. It is not easy to decide how much is enough in this area. Perhaps these three-day discussions will shed some light on the subject. We also

need the views of other nations on the extent to which we should finance exchanges and cooperation in these areas of "little science."

Basic research in big science provides another motivation for cooperation. High energy physics, optical radio astronomy, space and oceanography require such immense investments in facilities that we are approaching the stage where no single nation, even the largest, can afford to build all that is desirable or even necessary for its own research community. A deliberate move toward international sharing of major facilities is indeed appropriate. Again, however, with careful attention to the accepted protective mechanisms.

The Western Europeans with their highly successful CERN venture have set one example of effective cost-sharing in high-energy physics. Already France and Britain are cooperating with joint user groups for certain large national facilities. While laboratories in most countries have traditionally received visiting foreign scientists, I believe it is no longer adequate to consider the construction of a large new facility as a matter of only national concern. At the very minimum, we should stimulate in the scientific community a global approach to facilities construction and discuss frequently on an intergovernmental basis national plans and priorities for major new developments. The purpose would be to stagger these developments in the big science fields so that each becomes available to the best of the world's scientific community at a time which will maximize its productivity and usefulness.

Space research facilities, such as an orbiting space laboratory or an orbiting astronomical observatory, also could well qualify for cooperative support.

So much for basic science. There are also areas of applied research and engineering of direct social or public benefit which governments in all countries are financing. For example, effective action against drug abuse, evaluation of the long-term effects of trace chemicals or pesticides on plants and animals, solutions to urban transit snarls, improvement in the delivery of health care, protection of environmental quality and combating of pollution are all areas of common concern. In these areas we can minimize our national investments and maximize our results by attacking these problems together. Indeed, there are some problems which cannot be solved at all without international cooperation. For example, controlling pollution in Lake Erie or the North Sea requires a coalition of governments. In cases where multilateral cooperation between governments is needed, international organizations can supply the means for cooperation. This approach, however, can become fragmented. For example, I am told that many international organizations—some 26 of them, now have pieces of the international environmental problem. We need a strategy for managing these efforts and for guiding the work of these organizations. We have thought a great deal about this issue in the United States and will have a U.S. position to discuss in the framework of the 1972 U.N. Conference on the Environment in Stockholm.

The environment is only one example of the scientific and technical issues being dealt with today in international organizations. Furthermore, new issues are arising all of the time and as the thrust for development of the Third World accelerates, there will be increasing burdens placed on our international machinery. This international machinery must be adequately supported and cultivated. This will not be a popular issue with Congress and many people in the United States. There has been and continues to be a feeling that money spent in the area of foreign affairs of international organizations means waste, soft-headedness, and a lack of return. I believe that this can be offset to a

great extent by responsible actions in protecting the proprietary aspects of science and technology, using the accepted mechanisms which I mentioned earlier.

Another facet of the problem involves the developing nations. We in the developed world have an obligation to encourage and aid their peaceful development. Secretary Rogers yesterday mentioned the President's proposal to create an International Development Institute as a future focus for our bilateral technical assistance efforts. This promising proposal will lay a new foundation for effective technical cooperation between the U.S. and developing countries. It will provide a unique instrument for bringing the best of U.S. scientific and technological talent to bear and in a way which will strengthen, not supplant indigenous institutions in those countries. It is very clear here that we have much to learn about how to make such efforts truly effective. I will have a bit more to say about this later, but basically I believe the key lies in creating competences within the developing societies relevant to their own needs.

As we progress in this discussion from basic research toward the applied side, the problems of nationalism, national security, and proprietary interest become greater. Again, I believe that we can confront these problems responsibly and still maintain effective interactions among us.

One of the key challenges facing this nation, and other nations as well, is finding means by which technology can be advanced, shared, and applied to common problems without restricting our individual national ability to compete for markets with the products of this technology. There are some fine examples of how this can be done. One of the most cogent is the application of communications satellites for global point-to-point communication. Here we have seen the initial research blossom into a demonstrated capability and then into an international cooperative venture. This effort follows a long tradition of international cooperation in communications, including joint ownership of Transatlantic and Transpacific cables which preceded the satellite technology and which are still being installed. The Intelsat story indicates that we should have no illusions about the readiness of nations to give up competitive advantages without compensating return. At the same time it is fair to say that we have seen there a willingness to accept indirect as well as direct benefits. By indirect benefits I mean such things as enhanced national security resulting from international stability, an enriched quality of life, and better understanding of man as a biological entity. This is a hopeful sign and it is a point of view which I think needs to be emphasized and cultivated. Similar promising opportunities and potential problems can be seen in several other programs involving space-based systems now being discussed as part of post-Apollo cooperation. Dr. Low mentioned these yesterday. However, there is a specific field from my own experience which I would like to comment upon.

It is the area of computing. Here is an area of intense international competition on a commercial basis. Yet a group of us over the last few years have found a topic within this field which is right for international cooperation in the best sense.

As you know, computers must have programs in order to operate. The principal international competition concerns the computer hardware itself and not the software, which is so vital. In fact, all countries recognize that the use of computers to solve their problems, public or private, is limited today not by the capabilities of the machines themselves but by the lack of an adequate software technology for programming. A group in Western Europe, Canada, and the United States has been studying for the past four

years the possibility of an international institute of software engineering. The purpose of this institute would be to develop a technology for the production of software. It would not develop software itself but would only provide the means whereby programs could be produced economically and reliably. The well-being of nations in the next twenty years will hinge on software.

For example, the problems of privacy, air traffic control, government operations, scholarship, and education are all going to be dependent on economical, reliable software. The concept of the institute illustrates what I consider the vital features of technological cooperation. A central institutional group would carry out the core work to develop software engineering technology. Associated with this central group would be at least one institution from each member country. These members would, in turn, adapt the centrally-developed techniques to their particular local needs. This approach draws on the strengths of all countries, at the same time permitting individual countries to reinforce their own capabilities. I believe this offers a powerful model for technological cooperation.

Returning to my original comments, I believe we can suggest a policy basis for international scientific cooperation. It is simply that nations' international programs should aim to maximize the use of worldwide R&D resources and also to encourage the development of new resources where they do not now exist. If this objective were accepted, I believe national and proprietary interests could be protected and at the same time the synergistic effects of cooperation could be attained.

SAGINAW JUNIOR LEAGUE HONORED FOR TV PROGRAM

HON. JAMES HARVEY OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, recently an issue of the nationally circulated Junior League magazine was called to my attention because of a special article relating to the success achieved by the Saginaw Mich., Junior League for its part in a highly popular public affairs television program aired over the educational television station connected with Delta College, channel 19, and the following day on a Saginaw radio station, WFAM.

Not only was I happy to read of the accomplishment of the league because its activity encompasses the largest city in our Eighth District, but also because the originator of the program, Mrs. Barbara Opperman, is most deserving of this national recognition. My wife June, who was most active in the Saginaw league, and I have great admiration for Mrs. Opperman's talents and dedication to league efforts.

The Junior League's panel-type TV program is called TNT—the acronym for "Thursday Night at Ten"—and is designed to stimulate the community toward indepth thinking on many of today's issues and potential problems.

Viewers are invited to call in at the conclusion of the live panel discussion with pertinent and timely questions. On occasions, the response has been so great

that the hour-long show has spilled over into the next half-hour time slot. The next day a civic-minded radio station re-plays the program.

There have been many noteworthy achievements of this program. Not the least of these have been those which helped establish better communications between two welfare organizations, and the establishment of active ecology groups in the local high schools.

The Junior League has been assisted by the League of Women Voters and the Association of University Women.

Mr. Speaker, it is genuine pleasure for me to salute the Saginaw Junior Leaguers as well as the members of the other assisting organizations, for their signal accomplishments through this vital community service program.

The magazine article, a real success story, is as follows:

TNT—SAGINAW'S TV SUCCESS STORY

Overheard on a Michigan educational television station:

"But should deviant behavior be explained in the classroom? Suppose a teacher goes through the chapter on masturbation with his students, and then one day he sees a boy in the back of the classroom doing the very thing the book's been talking about."

"Good land, I should hope he would say in no uncertain terms that you don't do that in the classroom, and tell the boy to get his fancy down to the principal's office."

"That's part of the problem though. The schools can't teach sex in a moral manner. I believe sex education is a parental responsibility because only the family can explain it in terms of the principles of Christian morality."

The program is "TNT" (the acronym for "Thursday Night at Ten"), a live discussion of controversial issues that encourages viewer telephone calls to spur on the panel. Conversations like the one above, on sex education, are dynamite on television, that medium of the innocuous, of Doris Day pink-filtered puritanism, and the calls come in so hot and heavy that the hour-long show often spills over into the next half-hour slot.

Barb Opperman, who's been a member of the Junior League of Saginaw for "ten holy long years" started the program in October 1969, serving as producer-coordinator for her League placement. "It's been so incredibly fun that I feel guilty because it's not League placement. I mean, it can't be—it's too much fun."

The program is done "for no money" on Channel 19, an educational television station connected with Delta College, and is rebroadcast the following day over WFAM, a Saginaw radio station which hits Saginaw, Bay City, and Flint. Despite her non-existent budget, Barb has managed to produce an extraordinary effective opening for the program: "I did that in my backyard. My husband's a pyrotechnic. He has a wholesale fireworks company, so he built a sign for us with little lances all fused together. When we lit it, the letters 'TNT' just took off."

IN THE BEGINNING

The Saginaw League's present deep involvement in television was preceded by a year devoted to studying the entire TV media in the area. The research committee was convinced after this survey that "TV is a wonderful and unlimited field in which the surface has barely been scratched, and that the Junior League should be strongly involved and take full advantage of the many opportunities it offers." Barbara and her TV committee of six took a course in TV Production before plunging into the enormous task of creating community service programs.

"Something has come out of almost every

"TNT" program we've had," says Barb. "For example, we did a program on welfare, with a panel that included people from the welfare department and people from the Welfare Rights Organization. The WRO and the people here had been somewhat at odds. They really hadn't communicated well; but after they appeared together on the program, communications were established and some positive things are beginning to come out of it. As a result of our ecology program, a number of high school action groups were formed. And recently, something really exciting happened. We had Dick Lugar, the mayor of Indianapolis, up talking about metropolitan government. (His wife is a League member.) Now the city assessor of Bay City here wants to bring the mayor of Nashville, a democrat, up to show that the ideas of Unigov crosses party lines. He's willing to pay his way to appear on 'TNT'."

GETTING THE IDEA

Barbara got the idea for this kind of League community service from a Channel 19 presentation last spring concerning mileage; she watched the telephone/question procedure and liked the immediacy of it, seeing this method of presentation as a way to bring issues out into the open.

Barb talked with Channel 19's William J. Ballard and together they laid out the basic two-segment format. The initial program offers background material on a subject; it is followed the next week with the call-in panel discussion. Ballard asked if the Junior League would produce the program, and suggested that perhaps other groups, also concerned with public affairs, would be interested. The League of Women Voters and the American Association of University Women were approached in each of the tri-cities. All were enthusiastic.

"One huge mass meeting" was held to discuss and decide upon topics. Volunteers for subjects ranging from abortion through pollution and housing code enforcement were determined, and time slots filled.

Responsibility for presentation is divided. Channel 19 (NET) gets the film and material for the first segment, while the organization assigned to that subject lines up a fair panel. Three or four volunteers answer the phones and relay questions. M. Anderson Rapp, one of the station's commentators, is moderator.

The League Public Affairs Committee, chaired by Margaret Clark, handles the League's responsibilities for panel and publicity. Just promoting the program has proven an immense project. Newsletters and monthly bulletins have been sent to schools, churches, and to assorted civic groups, depending on the program's topic. Delta College's public relations department and local newspapers have been cooperative in promoting and lauding the service venture and its results. Radio announcements are given regularly, and in January four billboards in the area advertised "TNT."

Response by the public has been excellent. That is, at least people are watching. The phone-in average is 50 calls per program. Response seems to depend on the controversial nature of the subject: the program on sex education, for example, generated some 100 calls.

THEY COME IN THREES

"TNT" is but one of the three programs in which the Saginaw League is involved, and Barbara Opperman is connected with all of them. One is "Marquee," a program promoting the arts. The television committee produces, acts in, and writes scripts for this program. One girl even works on camera. "It's just fabulous," says Barbara. "We do things like pop art and wine as an art as well as the symphony and the ballet. We have people who are really knowledgeable—from the area or from the state—come in and talk to us. I'm one of the hostesses, as well as producer-director of the program; Mary Princ-

ing, also of the Saginaw League, does alternate shows. Mary and I ask the dumb questions that everyone else would ask, you know, and then we have a host, Mr. Henderson, who is the arts editor of the *Saginaw News*. He's the solid person on the show; he gets into the meat, the drag-it-down-into-the-depths sort of thing."

"The other program is called 'Introspect.' I'm the hostess and producer for that one too. We present a person who has a hobby that is really different and exciting, but completely remote from his education or vocation. We had a dentist who's a magician, and a guy who runs a trucking company and collects fire engines, real ones, and also builds little teeny models."

In addition to coping with three television programs—quite a load for a professional, let alone a housewife—Barbara has three children: a boy, 7, and two daughters, 5 and 3. It's a corny question, but how does she manage?

"My house is dirty sometimes. But I think the more you have to do, the more organized you get. If I get up in the morning and I don't have anything to do that day, it takes me all day to get the house picked up and the dishes out of the dishwasher. But I have a meeting at 9:30 a.m., everything is done by 9:00. Besides, I only tape 'Marquee' once a month, two shows at a time. 'TNT' is at 10:00, so the kids are in bed by that time. And I started taping 'Introspect' last summer, so there wasn't that much to do this winter. I do most of the work coordinating 'TNT' on the phone at home. I'm not really out much."

NEXT YEAR: PROJECT BRITE

"Next year I'll just be doing a little bit of television. But I'll be working mostly in inner-city schools. I'm involved in a project down there that's really going to pan out to be something neat. It's Project Brite (Bridging Resources to Improve Teaching for Everyone). We're starting with a very deep inner-city school. The Board of Education began this, and I've been working as a volunteer. We've done things like the Career Orientation program. I've gone out and gotten tapes of black community leaders who have made it—ministers, drug store owners, beauticians, and so on, who give about two minutes of pep talks on tape. We play maybe two a week on the speaker system in the school, and the kids feel like the people are in there. The tapes just say, 'each day in school is important.' It's a black voice and a black person whom they know, at least by name. The point is to motivate the kids to bigger things."

"Then every other week we have a successful black come into the school to talk to the fourth and fifth graders. Like one week we had a program on ministers. First the kids studied a little bit about what a minister does, and then we had a minister come into the classroom and he talked to the kids. Each minister had three half-hour sessions with them. It was great because it was double reinforcement, both for the minister and the kids. I sat in on one session featuring a girl who works for the Wicks Corporation. She's black, an accountant. She explained what she did, and what sort of education she needed. Just sort of a general career talk, and then the kids asked questions."

INDIGENOUS PUPPETS

"And then . . . the neatest thing now is that we're starting a puppet program. We're actually making black puppets. We've hired an artist who makes black heads. First, the heads were molded out of clay and then we made plaster of paris molds. We're in the experimental stage now to see if we should use latex, ceramic, plastic wood or papier mache. We'll test the puppets this summer, using black voices on tape, to see which puppets are most successful, and which method goes over best. We'll send it out into the

school system next fall. We're writing the scripts ourselves, using everything from reading concepts, math concepts, dental hygiene, family problems, social situations, or just fun. Just everything. We're working in conjunction with Saginaw Valley College and the Board of Education on this program. It may go throughout the country if it works."

"So it's really just kind of . . . well, I guess you could say . . . the Saginaw League is really moving."

HERE WE GO AGAIN ON EAST-WEST TRADE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, several years ago over 120 Members of the House cosponsored legislation to establish a select committee to review this Nation's policies regarding trade with Communist countries. Unfortunately, as in the case of many other proposals, the legislation was not enacted. This proposal was based on the experiences of the House Select Committee on Export Control in 1961 and 1962 which reviewed and appraised grandiose recommendations for increased trade with Communist countries involving chemical processing equipment, machine tools and electronic equipment. As a result of the extensive work of the select committee, not only military but economic restrictions were made a basis for future policies.

In late December and January two excellent articles appeared in *Barron's*, the business and financial publication, which update developments in this all important field. Written by Shirley Scheibla, *Barron's* alert and inquisitive investigative reporter, this material provides ample arguments for the establishment of another House select committee to review our present policies in this area. For a sobering look at what the State and Commerce Departments have in store for us in the East-West trade field, I include at this point the two articles appearing in *Barron's* issues of December 28, 1970 and January 4, 1971:

[From *Barron's*, Dec. 28, 1970]

BUSY BRIDGE-BUILDERS—COMMERCE OFFICIALS PUSH PLANS FOR EXPANDING EAST-WEST TRADE

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—For the past few months, the Commerce Department's Director of International Commerce has been quietly urging U.S. industrialists to make business deals with Romania, Bulgaria and other Communist countries.

The proposals include factories for the manufacture of electronic components and ball bearings, as well as several chemical plants. These ventures and others are on so-called Communist shopping lists which Director Harold Scott obtained during a trip he and three other Commerce officials made last summer to Eastern Europe to look into the prospect of expanding East-West trade. Ever since, Mr. Scott has been traveling throughout the United States, making the same speech in which he reports on his mission and seeks to whip up business sentiment for increased trade with Communist Europe.

LOW-KEY PROGRAM

So far the speech is the only visible sign of an intensive low-key program designed to achieve what once was known as bridge-building between East and West. Both the Commerce and State Departments already have taken policy positions in favor of new legislation to extend Export-Import Bank financing and most favored nation (MFN) treatment to Eastern Europeans. (MFN treatment offers tariff advantages, while Exim financing, terms of which are below-market, amounts to a subsidy.) Except for Yugoslavia, which enjoys both advantages, and Poland, which gets MFN treatment, both now are outlawed for Communist countries.

Commerce wants legislative authority to empower the President, at his discretion, to grant Exim financing and MFN treatment for any European country in the Communist bloc. State, going even farther, seeks legislation authorizing both advantages for all Communist nations with which the U.S. has diplomatic or trading relations (and State, by the way, favors trading with Red China.)

Commerce argues that the establishment of "normal" trade with Eastern Europe will be impossible without the legislation it advocates. The measures, it contends, would encourage U.S. exporters to promote sales in Eastern Europe and enable the European Communists to expand their purchases from the U.S. On this score, Mr. Scott also obtained a list of everything the European Communists are willing to export to the U.S. Christopher Stowell, one of his assistants, told *Barron's* the list includes 100 products, such as ham, fish, tomato sauce, cheese, wine, fresh fruit, furniture and glass. Quite a quid pro quo for ball bearings and transistors.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Contrary to long-standing contentions of the bridge-builders, trade with Communist Europe, either with or without new legislation, is unlikely to have much effect on the U.S. balance of payments—it is not expected to constitute more than 1% of total U.S. exports. According to official projections, U.S. exports to Eastern European countries are put at between \$500 million and \$700 million by 1975, compared with total U.S. exports of between \$55 billion and \$60 billion for that year.

State, in advocating broader Communist trade legislation than Commerce, reasons that, if the Administration is going to make the effort on Capitol Hill, it might as well seek broad authority. Moreover, the Department argues that such authority would help President Nixon carry out his policy of negotiating with the Communists.

Contrariwise, the Defense Department has consistently maintained that State and Commerce have failed to provide adequate justification for seeking such changes. Defense is not convinced that the U.S. should reverse its policy of not lending or guaranteeing loans to countries with records of defaults on debts, confiscation of property without adequate compensation and supplying countries engaged in hostilities with the U.S. (According to Senator Thurmond, the Soviet Union and its Eastern European satellites furnish Hanoi with over 80% of the materials used in the Vietnam war.)

If the Administration opts for MFN treatment, Defense suggests asking Congress for it for only one Communist country at a time—and then only when assured of reciprocal gain. Like Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission are leery of the whole idea.

"TEMPTATION PERSISTS"

But Commerce's Harold Scott talks as if he has a Congressional mandate for promoting U.S.-Communist trade. "The Export Administration Act said to encourage trade with the Communists, and we started with that when

it went into effect the beginning of this year," he told Barron's. In that speech, which Mr. Scott has made so many times, he says he undertook his trip to Communist Europe "in conformance with the spirit of the present Export Administration Act." He adds, "While in the Commerce Department it is not our mission to dream of bridge-building, the temptation persists. . . ."

Close reading of the Act, however, indicates that Mr. Scott interprets it liberally indeed. The law states: "It is the policy of the United States both (A) to encourage trade with all countries with which we have diplomatic or trading relations, except those countries with which such trade has been determined by the President to be against the national interest, and (B) to restrict the export of goods and technology which would make a significant contribution to the military potential of any other nation or nations which would prove detrimental to the national security of the United States."

The three Commerce Department officials who accompanied Scott on the three-week mission last June were Rauer H. Meyer, director of the Office of Export Control; Ernest Rubin, director of the Eastern European division of the Bureau of International Commerce; and Robert Simpson, director of the Office of International Commercial Relations. They visited Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia.

SHOPPING LISTS

In his speech, Mr. Scott says, "from each country visited, we obtained so-called shopping lists consisting of major technology or plants which each country is interested in buying or co-venturing. Using these shopping lists we are making contact with qualified American companies to determine interest and arrange introductions. We are trying hard to be an effective broker."

During a phone conversation with Mr. Scott, Barron's sought to learn more about the lists. At that point, he abruptly said, "The Secretary (of Commerce) is calling me, and I have to go immediately." He then hung up. Subsequent calls to his office brought the response that he was out of the country.

The aforementioned Mr. Rubin told Barron's, "We're not in a position to make available to you lists which have been made available to us by other governments." Asked why he couldn't let Barron's see them if he was showing them to industry, Mr. Rubin explained that Commerce is giving only parts of the lists to particular companies. "See the Romanian Embassy for the list," he suggested.

Reminded that we wanted lists covering more than Romania, Mr. Rubin replied, "There were only one or two other countries besides Romania which gave us lists. I can't remember who they were."

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION?

When we quoted the part of Mr. Scott's speech in which he stated that his travel group (including Mr. Rubin) obtained shopping lists from each country visited, Mr. Rubin declared, "I have to go; Mr. (Christopher) Stowell will take care of your questions." Mr. Rubin then hung up.

Mr. Stowell said, "I'm not positive I'm allowed to say which countries gave us lists. The information is confidential. What are you driving at? What conclusions are you trying to support?"

Finally, we were advised by Mr. Rubin that if we would make a request in writing for the lists, he would take the matter up with the general counsel of the Commerce Department and others and "try to get a ruling."

Two weeks after mailing such a request to Mr. Rubin, and sending a copy to Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans, we received a reply from Mr. Scott which said, in part, "The disclosure of this trade information to U.S.

firms has only been made at the express request of the government concerned, only to the extent that government requested, and only to U.S. firms selected by that government. On this basis, I am sure you will understand that disclosure of these lists would constitute a breach of our pledge of confidentiality to these governments which could have most adverse consequences to United States foreign relations with Eastern Europe."

Barron's has managed to obtain the shopping lists of Romania and Bulgaria. The Bulgarian list says that country wants American-built plants for the large-scale production of such items as benzene, kerosene, polyester filament, melamine, acetaldehyde and isoprene. The Romanian list has the following proposal for American firms to supply technology and build Romanian factories, with 51% Romanian and 49% U.S. ownership:

GETTING THEIR BEARINGS

A radial bearing plant, with a capacity of 30 to 35 million bearings per year, to begin operations in 1976. Technological lines in the factory for which Romania wants U.S. help include forging, lathing, primary heat treatment, grinding, secondary heat treatment, assembly bearing case manufacturing and roller bodies manufacturing. Payment would be made in bearings.

Production lines for electronic component parts, including six kinds of resistors, for development in 1971-75.

Equipment for freeze drying in a vacuum capable of producing 1,000 metric tons a year. Romania would handle the construction and pay for the equipment with freeze dried products.

Offshore drilling platform capable of drilling in 270 feet of water, with construction to start in 1971. "American Partner would provide for the equipment and materials which are not manufactured in Romania, as well as the necessary technical documentation and licenses and technical assistance for construction and personnel training. The Romanian Party would pay the American Party for its participation by supplying the same with Romanian-made goods. The credit would be paid within a period agreed upon by both parties. An offer for such offshore drilling platform has been received so far from the Offshore Co., U.S.A."

Commerce has labeled the Romanian proposals "joint ventures." According to State, "Joint ventures" or, as the Communists call them, "industrial cooperation agreements," have been increasingly pushed by Communist Europe since 1964. They consist of various cooperative business arrangements, usually contracted at the company or enterprise level, that involve a greater degree of Western assistance or East-West interdependence than provided in traditional commercial transactions. . . . Joint ventures located in the Communist partner's territory often require difficult and protracted negotiations, and they are covered by a heterogeneous collection of complex agreements. The main reasons for this are the anomalous position of joint agreements in a planned economy, and the absence of the legal and economic institutions covering foreign investment in a Communist country. . . . The Communist partner obtains capital and know-how from the Free World without incurring fixed charges on loans which might be needed to finance outright purchase; repayment is from profits or in goods. Furthermore, the technology may be quite advanced or unique, and not for sale."

Since items on the Romanian list would require licensing for export, Mr. Meyer has sent the list to the Operating Committee, an inter-agency group which considers export control problems and has members from State, Defense, NASA, AEC, Interior Department, Agriculture Department, and an advisor from the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. Meyer asked the Committee to give the Romanian list urgent consideration.

Mr. Meyer told Barron's that the U.S. government is giving Romania preferential treatment, without any explicit quid pro quo, because the country is pursuing an independent foreign policy. He said that when the President of Romania was in Washington recently to visit President Nixon, Commerce arranged for him to talk with four or five businessmen at the Department.

[From Barron's, Jan. 4, 1971]

ARSENAL OF COMMUNISM?—BRIDGE-BUILDERS CHANNEL STRATEGIC MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT TO THE REDS

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—The Congressional Joint Atomic Energy Committee, headed by Rep. Chet Holifield (D., Calif.), may soon try to stop the export to the Soviet Union of computers which could spur the development of its nuclear weaponry.

Washington newspapers recently reported that when British Prime Minister Edward Heath was at the White House last month, he asked President Nixon to approve the sale to the Soviets of \$25 million worth of British computers now embargoed by NATO countries through the Co-ordinating Committee (CoCom). Rep. Holifield told Barron's that he has directed his staff to look into the proposed sale. If it involves advanced computers not otherwise readily available, the Committee, he said, probably will lodge a protest.

NUCLEAR EDGE

From other sources (who requested anonymity), Barron's has learned that the computers are the most modern the United Kingdom is capable of producing; they would take the place of similar U.S. equipment involved in a deal killed a year ago by the Joint Committee. That latter's interest reflects its belief that superior computers are the main reason for any nuclear edge this country and its allies may have over the Reds.

A bitter intra-Administration feud has raged over the British request for months, with the State Department leading the vanguard of proponents. According to one Capitol Hill opponent (not Rep. Holifield): "If we lose this one, we've lost the whole ball game, because this case can serve as a precedent for giving all Communist countries the advanced technology they need to equal our nuclear and other might."

Though plainly the most dramatic case, the proposed U.K. computer deal is only one facet of a widespread campaign by East-West bridge-builders within the Administration to achieve a massive liberalization of export controls. For example, the shock waves are still reverberating in some quarters over the bold bid of the Commerce Department (still pending) for sole authority to rule on exports of U.S. computers to Communists. Commerce admittedly lacks the expertise of such agencies as the Defense Department, Central Intelligence Agency, Atomic Energy Commission and National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

POLICY DECISIONS

Several other significant export control cases call for policy decisions on dealing with Communists. They involve French integrated circuit manufacturing technology for Poland (now embargoed by CoCom); electro-dynamic vibrators for Poland which could be used in guided missiles and a MIG plant in that country; computer components for Poland and Romania; integrated circuit manufacturing equipment for Hungary; microwave equipment for Czechoslovakia.

The bridge-builders already have scored some notable "victories," including computers and a rolling mill for Russia, trucks for Red China and calculators and a petroleum refinery for Romania. Opponents, how-

ever, have succeeded in defeating plans for the export of catalytic cracking technology to Poland; a computer, oil extraction equipment, trucks and gear-making equipment for the Soviet Union; and machinery for microwave equipment for Czechoslovakia.

Those British computers, manufactured by International Computers Ltd., are roughly equivalent to third-generation American units which substitute integrated circuitry for solid-state electronics. (The fourth generation (Barron's, November 2) went on the drawing boards in this country without any breakthrough in the state of the art.) The Russians would use the British computers at their science center at Serpukhov. Early in 1969, the Soviets offered the U.S. time on their 76 GeV particle accelerator at Serpukhov in exchange for delivery of the CDC 6600 computer made in the U.S. by Control Data Corp. The Departments of State and Commerce almost pushed the deal through about a year ago when the Joint Atomic Energy Committee stopped it.

CENSORED VERSION

The story unfolds in a censored version of Committee testimony taken last March and released in July. M. C. Greer of the Atomic Energy Commission told the Committee, "It still is one of the most powerful computers in the world."

According to Rep. Hollifield, the Russians said, "We just want to use it. You can put a padlock on it, and we won't steal the technology or anything like that." Commented Rep. Hollifield, "You should know what that would amount to."

Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, the Navy's Director of Naval Reactors, testified that an Atomic Energy Commission study of the proposal "underestimated the risks and did not address several important considerations. . . . The fundamental element in modern technology is computers. If you give your best computer away, you are giving the competition the opportunity to develop the technology just as rapidly as you do. . . . Even if we furnished the Soviets a U.S. computer and could insure it was not used for defense purposes, having this powerful unit at Serpukhov would probably free up other computers of Soviet design for weapons use. For many years this committee has seen this issue more clearly than any other committee and any branch of the executive department. Had it not been for this committee, the Defense Department, the AEC and the State Department would have long ago given away this vital technology."

Sometime this month, President Nixon is expected to rule on whether the U.S. should approve that \$7 million French deal involving integrated circuits for Poland. Like the British computers, the circuits are the subject of an intra-Administration feud.

LONG-TERM CREDIT

The French company would provide the plant, manufacturing machinery and engineering know-how and would train the Polish technicians. The French government would provide long-term credit, with repayment by barter. Reportedly the transaction would furnish enough technology to enable Poland to meet the military and civilian need for these circuits for all the countries of Communist Eastern Europe.

The French think they have two precedents to assure them of U.S. consent. For one thing, this country already has approved the first stage of a deal in which the circuits would be the final step. This one involved supplying Poland with \$2 million worth of silicon transistor manufacturing machines.

The other precedent is U.S. sanction of the export of two British 4-70 computers, valued at \$5 million, to a research institute in Moscow. These are second-generation computers which replace tubes with transistors.

The French argue that if the U.S. has approved the export of computers to Moscow, why not computer parts like integrated circuits for Poland? However, they fail to mention that Moscow got a second-generation computer, while integrated circuits are for the third. Moreover, the Moscow deal stipulated surveillance by U.S. technicians to see that no military use be made of the computers, while the proposed Polish venture involves no such deal, whatever it may be worth in a closed society.

MAY BE A PRECEDENT

The outcome of the French proposition, in turn, is apt to serve as a precedent for action on a pending United Kingdom request for exemptions from CoCom embargos to allow export to Hungary of \$141,000 worth of integrated circuit manufacturing equipment and a \$72,000 thermo-compression ball bonder used for producing transistors and integrated circuits.

The push by the Commerce Department for sole authority to rule on exports of U.S. computers to Communists is based on a contention that present U.S. controls are ineffective. The U.S. has its own list with many more items than that of CoCom. Commerce maintains, however, that if a computer or computer part isn't on the CoCom list, there is no point in controlling it because the Communists can get it from one of the numerous allied countries. Thus, Commerce authority over exports of computers only on the U.S. list would mean no control at all.

In rebuttal, the Defense Department argues that since most of the allies' computers are dependent upon this country for vital parts, the U.S. exercises effective control over where most computers, even if not on the CoCom list, go. Any foreign computer using U.S. parts cannot be exported to another country without U.S. permission. For those computers not requiring U.S. parts, Defense contends there has been inadequate examination to determine whether they are the equal of American makes (unlikely, since this country's computer technology is superior to that of the rest of the world).

ASTONISHED OTHER AGENCIES

Commerce has further astonished other agencies by authorizing a \$1.5 million Friden calculator program for Romania without obtaining the assent of other federal agencies concerned. The program involves manufacturing equipment and technology for desk calculators using solid-state transistors. Commerce simply assumed that consent would be a matter of course and told the other agencies after the fact. Now the Department is trying to talk them into approving the export to Romania of insertion machinery which ostensibly would be used for the manufacture of calculators but which also could help make components for third-generation computers.

Another pending computer component case involves a U.K. request for an exception to a CoCom embargo to permit it to sell Poland the technology for manufacturing strategic line printers. The U.S., which finds itself divided on the case, has not yet made known its position. Opponents contend that many of the printers manufactured with this technology would be exported to Russia and other Eastern European countries and would enable them to transform a completely inadequate precision mechanics sector of the computer industry into one equal to that of the Free World.

Last July the bridge-builders won a notable victory when President Nixon approved the export to Red China of \$30 million worth of Perini trucks made in Italy with General Motors engines, overruling opponents who pointed out that the trucks could serve military purposes. Reportedly, he was persuaded by the argument of State and Commerce that maintaining good relations with

Italy was more important. Now Commerce is citing this case as a precedent for allowing the export of about \$2.5 million worth of French trucks to Red China made with U.S. parts, including GM and Cummins engines and Allison transmissions.

The East-West traders also scored at the White House in October 1969, when President Nixon, overruling objections by the Defense and the Interior Departments, authorized an \$8 million American petroleum refinery for Romania.

Just a few days ago the State Department won a fight for approval of a \$613,700 Japanese rolling mill for Russia despite the likelihood that the end user will be the Serp 1 Molot Plant, one of the leading Soviet producers of high-quality steel for strategic purposes. In any event, experts explain that a mill of that size and type is capable of rolling hard steel and titanium used in military and space equipment.

However, the bridge builders have suffered defeats, too. In September 1969 and again in April 1970, President Nixon ruled against exporting \$25 million worth of Gleason gear-making equipment to the USSR which could have been used to manufacture military vehicles.

Defense apparently was responsible for killing a deal early last year under which an American firm would have designed and installed a \$26 million system for oil extraction and gathering for Russia.

The Interior Department, its Petroleum and Petrochemical Task Force Group and the Defense Department successfully blocked a plan by Universal Oil Products Corp. of Chicago to transfer catalytic cracking technology to Poland. Officials pointed out that, with no quid pro quo, it would have contributed significantly to the industrial capability for military support and that the technology is not readily available abroad. It would have served the growing petrochemical complex at Plock, where oil from the Soviet Union is refined into such products as high octane gasoline.

WITHDREW APPLICATION

Despite disagreement among the agencies, that dispute did not require a White House decision. In the face of what is considered overwhelming opposition, Universal simply withdrew its application. Now Interior's aforementioned Task Force is trying to draw up guidelines for similar future cases.

State and Commerce maintained the venture was justified on the basis of special U.S. relations with Poland. Those "special relations" emanated from the Polish uprising of the 'Fifties. Nevertheless, there has been no official reversal of U.S. policy regarding Poland, despite the latter's participation in Russia's 1968 march into Czechoslovakia and, of course, prior to the widespread riots in Poland and their brutal suppression.

The first article in this series discussed how the State and Commerce want Export-Import Bank financing and most favored nation tariff treatment for Communist nations. If the two departments obtain these goals, further liberalization of export controls and trade with Communists is bound to result.

So far the agencies have failed to reconcile their advocacy of more East-West trade with present policies regarding Rhodesia and South Africa. While neither poses a military threat to this country, the Administration bans military exports to South Africa and maintains such strict embargos against Rhodesia that it deprives the U.S. of vitally-needed chromite.

Foes of the bridge-builder point out that, instead of encouraging independence which Communism does not encompass, additional help from the West will stave off collapse of inefficient Socialist systems and enables them to continue to concentrate on arms production. Without help, the Reds would be forced to produce more non-military items to earn the foreign exchange for imports to

offset the shortages of their own making under a system inferior to free enterprise.

Barron's closing comment in an editorial on East-West trade, published on January 16, 1967, bears repeating today: "There remains a final, supreme consideration for any American businessman who may still hanker after elusive profit from selling to the Communists. He must decide in his own private conscience whether the profit is worth the personal risk that some day, soon or late, on some near or distant battlefield, his neighbor's son or his own may be struck down by a weapon which his zeal for trade put into an enemy's trade put into an enemy's hand."

LAWRENCE WELK SPEAKS OUT ON GUARANTEED INCOME

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the renowned orchestra leader and television personality Lawrence Welk recently made some interesting comments on the proposed guaranteed annual income. He said:

The most destructive aspect of the guaranteed wage plan, it seems to me, is the fact that it endangers our free-enterprise system . . . and I believe with all my heart that this is the best system the world has ever known.

In an article in *Christian Economics*, Mr. Welk aired his views on this subject in these words:

Numerous spokesmen today are advancing the theory that a guaranteed annual wage plan for every person in the United States would solve our hard-core unemployment problem and dramatically alleviate the suffering of our poor. I share very deeply the common concern we all feel for these terrible conditions . . . but I believe there is a better solution than a guaranteed annual wage.

I speak not as a politician or a statesman . . . but simply as a father, a business man, an orchestra leader and a concerned citizen of this country which I love so very much. I have known extreme poverty in my lifetime, and I have been blessed with a measure of success, and I have had a unique opportunity during these past forty-five years in show business to observe human nature at work. I base most of my objections to the wage plan on the lessons I have been able to learn through practical experience and observation.

Under the guaranteed annual income plan four thousand dollars has been suggested as the minimum amount for a family of four. If the head of the household earns part of that sum, the government will make up the difference. If, however, he earns nothing at all . . . the government will pay him the full amount.

To my way of thinking this is a negative approach which does not solve the basic problem. Instead of inspiring and helping a man fulfill his potential by working to support himself and his family, it actually encourages him to sit back and do nothing, secure in the knowledge that the government will take care of him. This destroys his initiative and his will to succeed. It robs him of his natural human dignity, and even the right to direct his own life.

I am also concerned about the effect such a guaranteed wage plan would have on our children. A child raised in an atmosphere of defeat and apathy, and taught to expect

that his every need will be taken care of whether he works or not, stands little chance of developing a strong character. His own natural eagerness to learn and to grow and to excel is cut off at the very beginning of his life, and he may never know the thrill of achievements on his own. A child who is encouraged early to earn extra pennies, by shining shoes or selling newspapers or doing household tasks, stands a much better chance of reaching them than a child who is taught to do nothing.

We have achieved a higher standard of living, given more, helped more, and been more alert to the needs of our citizens than any people, under any other form of government in the history of the world . . . and I, for one, do not want to lose it. I believe one of the reasons our country has been able to accomplish so much is that our founding fathers and early immigrants had the freedom to dream great dreams and work hard to achieve them. We must not lose this right.

Rather than give a man money, simply because he exists . . . let us educate him to the glory that can be found in work . . . and then bend every effort towards helping him find and hold a job. I do not think it is ever too late to help a man accomplish this, no matter what his condition in life. We can start right now by educating our people to the fact that this is still the land of opportunity, and that any job . . . no matter how lowly . . . can lead to a successful and happy life if it is performed with spirit and enthusiasm. Our primary goal should be to build the character of the man who is doing the job, for in this way we will build the character of the nation as well.

We have made tremendous progress in the fields of science and technology. We have learned how to send a man to the moon and probe the underside of the sea. We have learned how to split the atom and harness the energy of the sun. We have built giant computers that do incredibly complex jobs for us. But we have neglected our most important obligation. We have neglected our primary duty to build men.

I think we began to get into serious trouble when we took God out of our schools and out of our hearts. We need to re-introduce basic moral values into our lives. We need to affirm again those American virtues of hope and courage and faith . . . the principles of fair play and integrity, and an honest day's work for a day's pay.

Somehow I feel that the real answer to our difficult problems can best be found in the teachings of Christ. He spoke of the dignity of the individual human being. He demonstrated through the love and compassion of his own life how valuable each human soul is.

A human being is far too valuable to be paid off in money. A human being grows and prospers through the dignity of work.

SURPRISE FRIEND FOR PASSENGERS

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, today we hear of constant concern and interest regarding the obvious need for our Government to respond to the needs of our Nation and its people. There is a great tide of support for reform and responsible change throughout our Government.

Of course, reform and change are needed, but I think we also need to pay

attention to what our Government is doing right and to make sure we do not reform or change ourselves into more bureaucracy, more unneeded expense and more problems.

In this light, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article from the *New York Times*. The article concerns the Interstate Commerce Commission, a Federal agency that has received quite a bit of criticism of late and has been a topic of interest to professional reformers for some time.

The *New York Times* points out the ICC, under the direction of its new Chairman, Mr. George Stafford, has become a public defender of passenger service. Seldom, if ever, do we hear of a Government agency that is so public oriented—an agency that goes out of its way to defend the public's right.

In my home State of Kansas, an area most vulnerable to any change in rail service, the Commission's latest defense of passenger rights is most welcome and appreciated. So often our governmental agencies are the subjects of criticism, both from the executive branch and the Congress, and so often neither group offers any constructive suggestions or direction. In light of recent criticism, it is most gratifying to see the Interstate Commerce Commission protecting the public.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to the attention of all of my reform-minded colleagues:

SURPRISE FRIEND FOR PASSENGERS

The most remarkable aspect of the Interstate Commerce Commission's attack on the inadequacy of the projected national railroad passenger network is the source of the criticism itself. The I.C.C. has a spotty, not to say imperceptible, record as a public defender of passenger service. It often seemed more accommodating to the railroads' desire to discontinue trains than to the passengers' need to ride on them.

Thus the commission's charge that the rail network proposed by the new, quasi-governmental National Railroad Passenger Corporation is far too limited only underscores the extent of those deficiencies. In his letter to the Department of Transportation, I.C.C. Chairman George Stafford argues rightly that the determination of proper passenger service entails more than cost-accounting. The railroads' role in the battle against automotive poisoning of the air must surely be taken into account in any federally subsidized restructuring.

Introduction of Metroliners on the New York-Washington run demonstrates that even a modest venture into technological improvement can turn the tide. Efficient train service through all of Western Europe has proven that the railroads can be both a national asset and a boon to tourism. It is a devastating commentary on the American deterioration of rail service that the United States today has fewer than 400 intercity passenger trains, compared with 1,000 in Britain, 850 in France and over 500 in West Germany. Governor Rockefeller's warning that the proposed rail network would isolate upstate New York and cut virtually all rail travel links with Canada further emphasizes the total inadequacy of existing plans.

The I.C.C.'s defense of passenger rights makes it imperative that Transportation Secretary John Volpe come forward with a much more comprehensive design. Failure to do so would show blatant disregard for the public interest.

REORGANIZATION PLAN "MAKES SENSE" TO DOMESTIC AFFAIRS EXPERT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Califano, President Johnson's special assistant for domestic affairs, has commented favorably on the Federal Government reorganization scheme presented in President Nixon's state of the Union address. Mr. Califano notes that:

... man's technology and aspirations have changed so much faster than his institutions that we face a major crisis if these institutions cannot be adapted to serve him.

His remarks from the January 29, 1971, New York Times, follow:

THE NIXON PLAN MAKES SENSE

(By Joseph A. Califano, Jr.)

(Joseph A. Califano Jr., now a Washington attorney, was President Lyndon Johnson's special assistant for domestic affairs)

WASHINGTON.—The President's proposal to reorganize eight of the Cabinet departments into four departments—human resources, community development, natural resources, and economic development—will raise the hackles of virtually every special interest group in Washington.

But the plan should make abundant good sense to conservatives and liberals alike. It should be particularly appealing to those of us who believe in a strong Presidency and who have struggled with the problems of conducting coherent domestic policies in the present organizational framework.

For conservatives, the four new departments offer opportunities to eliminate overlapping programs and for more efficient operation and cost reduction. For liberals the proposed organizational changes could be a long step forward in our ability to convince the American taxpayer that we are providing government machinery capable of giving them something for the taxes they are paying.

Twentieth-century problems will not be solved with nineteenth-century organizations. The Federal Government cannot hope efficiently to administer over 400 major domestic programs with an organization that was set up to handle forty.

The time is long overdue to rearrange the old-line agencies. As anyone who has worked in the Federal Government discovers, coordination is no substitute for getting the boxes in the right place, for giving to the President one man with enough authority to be held responsible for natural resource development, human resources, or community development.

Smaller agencies respond to Presidential leadership only in the minds of the most naive students of government administration. Under the myth of reporting directly to the President, these agencies operate as independent fiefdoms.

The Nixon proposals come out of the work of task forces that have studied this problem in both the Johnson and Nixon Administrations. Anyone who looks at the present organization of our domestic departments begins to ask the same questions. For example:

Where does education end and job training begin? Where does health end and nutrition begin? Should all education and skill-giving programs, as well as nutrition and health programs, be in one department of human resources?

What are the distinctions that require one

Cabinet department to handle parklands and another forest lands? What are the distinctions that require one department to handle wilderness areas and another recreational areas? Should all these functions be combined in one department of natural resources?

The answers are likely to be just about those that the Administration has reached. But institutional change must not stop at the last page of the Federal Government organizational manual.

The problems of our society are increasingly multijurisdictional. To plan and execute economic development programs in terms of a state boundary is as arbitrary as the line the Pilgrims drew some three hundred years ago. The resources and conditions that affect prosperity and poverty extend over entire regions—New England, the Great Lakes, Appalachia.

The problems of pollution, water and power supplies and transportation span huge areas. New levels of cooperation in which resources can be pooled and shared must replace ego-centric and bureaucratic lines.

The responsibility of states must not be clouded by archaic notions of sovereignty. Economic development is much more effective on a regional basis; water and air pollution problems cannot be solved without cleaning the whole river basin or the entire airshed.

The web of government extends into the county commissioner's office, city hall and the local neighborhood. Here the confrontation between the citizen and his government can become a most horrendous maze.

Bureaucratic problems between mayors and other metropolitan officials must be subsumed. New taxing jurisdictions must be devised. The parasitical relationship of suburbanites with the large tax base to inner city residents with the decreasing tax base must be re-examined. Suburban workers and visitors in the central city must bear a fair share of the services they use. Moreover, scarce human and physical resources must be pooled.

Within the cities themselves, lines of authority and control must be established with clarity, fairness and firmness. Mayors must be given more power vis-a-vis city councils, city departments and county officials. James Reston put it as well as anyone in his column calling New York's Mayor "a goat called scape." If we are going to hold our mayors responsible for so much, we should give them the authority to fulfill that responsibility.

Institutional and organization problems tend to be considered dull and superficial. At this time in the development of our government—at every level—this is far from the case. Indeed, man's technology and aspirations have changed so much faster than his institutions that we face a major crisis if these institutions cannot be adapted to serve him. President Nixon appears to have proposed a good start at the Federal level. Let's hope it will inspire similar efforts throughout the states, cities and counties of our nation.

CONSTANT PERSECUTION OF NON-RUSSIAN PEOPLE IN U.S.S.R.

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is important for us to keep in mind that the Soviet Union is in fact a giant slave state in which constant persecution is committed against the non-Russian people within the U.S.S.R.

Therefore, it was impressive for us to note that spokesman for the numerous non-Russian people within the Soviet Union rallied in support of the Jews who have recently been subject to trials and other forms of persecution.

Of special interest was the following release issued by the American Latvian Association on the subject of persecution of minority people within the U.S.S.R.:

PERSECUTION OF JEWISH AND OTHER MINORITY PEOPLE BY THE SOVIET RUSSIAN REGIME

The Board of Directors of the American Latvian Association in the United States passed the following resolution at its meeting on January 9, 1971 in New York, N.Y.

"We protest the recent sentencing of eleven Jews in the Soviet Union to death or long imprisonment. Their only crime was to try to leave the Soviet Union to go to Israel, their spiritual and historical homeland. In our judgment that is no crime but an attempt to exercise individual freedom and choice.

The Jewish and other minority people in the Soviet Union are persecuted because of their religious beliefs and national aspirations. There is abundant evidence that this persecution is well planned and has as its goal a complete obliteration of all religious groups and ethnic units. Such process started in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia after the Soviet Russian Military invasion of these independent Baltic states in 1940. It is continuing today and the deported and killed Latvians, Lithuanians and Estonians are replaced by Russians.

We are aware that the Soviet government is planning trials of more Jews in Riga and elsewhere because of their aspirations and attempts to go to Israel. This persecution of Jews and other minority people constitutes a genocide. Therefore, we ask all people to join us in our protests about the persecution of Jews, Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians and other minority people in the Soviet Union.

The defender of individual and civil rights Jan Jachimovics, before he was imprisoned by the Soviet authorities in Latvia, wrote a public letter. In it he gave a long account of the Soviet persecutions and encouraged people to protest the imprisonment of thousands of Latvians in the Mordovian and Siberian slave labor camps. The regime is strong only because the people are down on their knees, he cried out and invited people to stand up and be counted. Today Jachimovics is imprisoned in an insane asylum.

American Latvian Association, representing Americans of Latvian heritage, takes a stand to promote individual and national freedom of all people suffering under an unjust and cruel rule.

NEWARK MAYOR GIBSON TESTIFIES ON URBAN CRISIS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Newark, N.J., Mayor Kenneth A. Gibson in testifying before the Joint Economic Committee last week explicitly enunciated the gravity of the crisis with which Newark and our Nation's cities are plagued. And, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following recent editorial from the Star-Ledger:

URBAN PETITION

Mayor Gibson certainly did not pull any punches in his appearance before the Joint

Congressional Economic Committee, depicting Newark as the "most decayed and financially crippled city in the nation."

The mayor put it in blunt terms in describing the harrowing conditions that afflict urban communities. It will take nothing less than a "bold affirmative commitment" from Congress "before it is too late" to prevent the complete collapse and deterioration of the nation's cities. Mr. Gibson made it eminently clear that this urban catastrophe could only be averted by massive infusions of federal funds.

Newark's problems may be aggravated, but they serve as a graphic microcosm of America's urban ills. What has occurred in the state's largest city is an old and oft-told story that could be applied with chilling parallel to any other large municipality.

You name them—New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, ad infinitum. The list is long, and it keeps getting longer.

In appealing for greatly expanded federal subsidies, Mr. Gibson was in effect speaking for mayors of all large cities afflicted with widespread physical obsolescence, social blight, unemployment, astronomical costs and shrinking revenue bases, rising welfare caseloads, soaring crime rates and changing population composites.

The mayor, in his relatively short time in office, has become intimately—and painfully—aware of the debilitating syndrome of the ailing big city. And he has sought to impress the gravity of the urban crisis on federal legislators and members of the Nixon Administration. All that he has been able to evoke thus far is sympathetic understanding and little, if nothing, in the way of tangible commitments.

But Mr. Gibson appears to be indomitable; he is determined to keep petitioning at the seat of power in Washington until he gets more in return than lip service, a historical staple in the nation's capital.

APOLOGIES TO HOOVER

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Phoenix Gazette, January 15, 1971:

APOLOGIES TO HOOVER

There is a campaign by the Communist-loving New Left not only to force J. Edgar Hoover out of his job as director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but to smear his name so badly in the process that nobody would ever again pay any attention to anything he might say.

It is understandable that the actual American Reds and their conscious sympathizers would participate in the effort. Hoover is one of their most capable and dangerous enemies, and to get him out of their way would be a momentous victory. It is more difficult to find cause for the actions of some other Americans who seem to have joined the get-Hoover vendetta.

We have in mind the columnists, TV commentators and politicians who whooped up a storm of derision for Hoover after he testified under questioning at a U.S. Senate hearing Nov. 27 that a plot to kidnap a highly placed government official was under investigation, and that the inquiry involved the draft-protesting, bond-skipping priest, the Rev. Philip Berrigan and his brother, Daniel, also a priest. You'd have thought that Hoover had viciously, irresponsibly and untruthfully

manufactured a fiction out of whole cloth for some devious purposes of his own. Hoover, they shrieked, should resign.

Well, sir, a federal grand jury in Harrisburg, Pa., has now indicted the Berrigan brothers and four others on charges that they conspired to kidnap presidential foreign policy adviser Henry Kissinger and blow up heating ducts in government buildings. We remind our readers that an indictment is not a conviction, and we are not commenting here on the truth of charges that are made. Guilt or innocence will be properly decided in a courtroom.

What we are pointing out is that Hoover said an investigation was under way, what it involved, who it involved, and that he was the country's top police officer making an official report to a committee of the U.S. Senate on a matter of grave national concern. He told it the way it was. His distractors owe him an apology.

STRIKES BY PUBLIC EMPLOYEES ENDANGER THE NATION

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, when the Boston police went on strike in 1919, the then Governor of Massachusetts Calvin Coolidge called out the State militia, who took over the policing of the city.

Governor Coolidge won national recognition for his prompt and decisive action. Shortly thereafter he was elected Vice President and then President of the United States. Coolidge declared:

There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, any time.

While Coolidge's position continues to have general acceptance, the current wave of strikes by policemen, firemen, and other public employees seems to have caused relatively little concern among citizens—or public officials.

State police and National Guard personnel have been called out in many instances to protect the public where the public safety has been ignored by strikes of public employees.

An editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune issue of Friday, January 29, draws attention to the threat which could result if police in a number of localities should go on strike simultaneously. This kind of threat, uttered by a militant leader of a police "union," should revive support for the firm position taken by Governor Coolidge—which is as clearly applicable—and vital—today as it was in 1919.

The Boston police of that day were underpaid and overworked to a far greater degree than any police in America today. Still, the grievances today may be as great as those of the Boston police.

But there is no surer way to produce martial law, national curfews—or worse, than for strikes by public employees to proliferate to the point where citizens will demand protection—even at the sacrifice of individual freedoms.

The Tribune editorial articulates a message that needs to be heard—particularly by public employees who feel

that they must "strike." This timely editorial follows:

NO IDLE THREAT

John Flood, president of the Combined Counties Police Association [CCPA], has given the Labor Laws Study Commission further reason to submit a substantial report in the near future. Flood's organization, formerly known as the Cook County Police Association [also CCPA], has reacted strongly to what befell it in Waukegan. After getting what it wanted in a series of suburban police strikes, CCPA hit a snag. Waukegan did not knuckle under as expected; when 54 policemen refused to obey an order to return to work, the city Civil Service Commission fired them. Mayor Robert Sabonjian asked for and got the services of Illinois state troopers to fill the vacuum.

Now Flood says, "instead of taking 70 guys out at once we'll have to go out with hundreds." The strategy is to get numerous police forces mobilized to strike simultaneously, in numbers prohibitive of even the briefest replacement by state troopers. Policemen in New York and Milwaukee have just demonstrated that policemen are entirely capable of the mass walkouts Flood is planning for Illinois municipalities.

This state [among others] needs new, unequivocal legislation concerning strikes by public employees. We urge the Labor Laws Study Commission to act with dispatch, and the legislature to define quickly the statutory public interest where strikes by public employees are concerned, in new law with explicit teeth. We cannot conceive that any legislature, even in this permissive age, is prepared to countenance strikes by policemen, firemen, and prison guards. Are sanitary district workers' services much less essential? Teachers? Prison guards? The assignments of mental hospital staffs? Wherever the legislature draws the line, it should state severe penalties for disregard of the law, and these penalties must be rigorously enforced.

Of course, public employees are not slaves. Public employment has to offer pay adequate to attract qualified applicants. But it is intolerable to permit incumbent public employees to extort ever higher salaries for themselves by threatening to disrupt essential public services if their demands are not met. Experience in numerous cities, in Illinois and elsewhere, has shown that these threats are not idle. The possibility of making such threats must be eliminated.

THE 1971 SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel very privileged to have been able to participate today in the 1971 U.S. Senate youth program sponsored by the William Randolph Hearst Foundation.

This program, created by a Senate resolution nearly 10 years ago, is a richly satisfying experience both for the young people who come to the Nation's Capitol to learn the machinery of the Federal Government firsthand and for those of us who are able to share our experiences in government with them.

I was proud to learn, Mr. Speaker, that one of my constituents, Luis L. Granados III, of Takoma Park, Md., was selected to participate in this 1971 program. I congratulate Luis for the scholastic and

extracurricular accomplishments which merited him the opportunity to participate in this program.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my congratulations to another person associated with the Senate youth program, and that is Mr. Ira P. Walsh, the director of the program. He has done an outstanding job in coordinating these programs. My own association with Ira Walsh goes back much farther than the 10 years that the program has been in existence. Ira Walsh was my mentor back in high school when I served as the first editor-president of the Scholastic Sports Association which he founded while he was associated with radio station WWDC here.

Mr. Speaker, last year the members of the Senate Advisory Committee for the U.S. Senate youth program stated the following:

With few exceptions over the years, the delegates and their Senate representatives have apparently experienced little of the much discussed "generation gap" or "lack of communication." Indeed, at the height of the question-and-answer periods, it seemed that communicating was thick and fast while the maturity and knowledge of the students bridged whatever "generation gap" may have existed.

This is very heartening, Mr. Speaker. In fact, in meeting with these young people today, I began to believe that we may very well be experiencing a return to those qualities of life which have made this Nation what it is. Perhaps the freaked-out generation of the 1960's is dying with the birth of the 1970's. Let us hope so.

I have always been convinced, even during the height of the disturbances on our Nation's college campuses and high schools, that the great majority of our young people espouse the same beliefs that most loyal Americans espouse, far different from their counterparts who, for such a long period of time, have been the featured attraction on the evening news. This belief is reaffirmed again every time I participate in programs such as the Senate youth program. The great majority of our young people are good, rational, and humanitarian patriots who are conscientiously seeking the best quality of life for themselves and their fellow men.

This point was made most eloquently in an editorial in the Christian Science Monitor last April which stated as follows:

Even if we confine ourselves to that proportionately small segment of youth which is most active in questioning today's inherited values, we by no means find that the majority are copping out, placing vague mysticism above rationality or reason, or avoiding their fellow human beings in favor of animals. And to imply that this is true of all youth is the height of irresponsibility.

Such accusations against youth are an example of missing the forest because of a few trees. It cannot be denied that the increased tempo, the greater nervousness, the speed of various kinds of permissiveness, the problems which rack contemporary society have produced a higher degree of alienation among youth than formerly. But we are convinced that the great majority of young people, regardless of higher hemlines and lower hairlines, are still hard-headed and

hardworking. To say otherwise is no service to anyone.

I think most of us heartily concur in these sentiments.

ELIMINATING DRUNK DRIVERS

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, it was most encouraging to me to learn that Secretary of Transportation John Volpe and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Elliot Richardson recently signed an interagency alcohol safety countermeasures agreement to reemphasize to the American public the danger inherent in drinking and driving on our highways. They will have my support in the advancement of any joint effort to eliminate drunk drivers from the Nation's highways.

As a member of the Tennessee General Assembly, I had the honor of sponsoring and seeing enacted our implied-consent law which requires any person arrested for driving under the influence of an intoxicant to submit to a mandatory test or have his license revoked.

The breath-testing requirement of our law has been in operation since December 1, 1970. The highway patrolmen in all districts have been trained to give the tests. They collect breath specimens and submit them to one of three alcohol testing laboratories, each of which is supervised by an M.D. or Ph. D. with special training in toxicology and alcohol testing.

It is the plan of the department of public health, which supervises this activity, to hold a series of educational seminars throughout the State dealing with the implied consent law, alcohol effects, and the laboratory support program. We have 75 percent of our counties submitting breath samples to the laboratories now. Through this educational program, we hope to have 100 percent participation soon.

It is probably too early to see what effect this law is going to have in reducing the number of drunk drivers in Tennessee. A great deal will depend upon the enforcement it receives. Our State program can benefit from the thrust which is put behind the national program Secretary Volpe and Secretary Richardson have in mind.

By the same token, Tennessee's program could become a part of the national effort which must be made if we are going to deal effectively with this problem.

The prospects for making further gains in reducing highway deaths is good. As evidence, I wish to call attention to an editorial appearing in the January 24 edition of the Chattanooga, Tenn., Times. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial "Safety Gains" in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SAFETY GAINS

Safety-minded officials and organizations once said they concentrated on the "three

E's" as a formula for reducing auto fatalities. They were "education, engineering and enforcement."

Now, Transportation Secretary John Volpe has revamped the expression of major emphases in this field to "the man, the machine and the highway."

In many ways, the two mottoes are saying the same thing.

"The man," that is, the driver, is still the key factor in the equation. The current attention to getting the drunken driver—and, in many circles, the word has been changed from "drinking" to "drunken" on the theory it is the habitual, the problem, the heavy drinker who is the cause of so many mishaps, rather than the social imbibor who might be called a "drinking driver"—involves both education and enforcement.

There must first be the effort to keep the true alcoholic from behind the wheel through impressing him or his associates with the dangers involved; then there must be the enforcement followup to impose penalties heavy enough to be deterrents for those who are guilty of driving while drunk.

The element of engineering nowadays is present both in the improved highways, built to carry heavier traffic loads with greater safety, and in the automobiles themselves, built to comply with higher federal safety standards.

But, of course, words are meaningless without results. Secretary Volpe can point to the fact that 1,100 fewer fatalities occurred in 1970 than in the previous year despite more cars and more miles driven. That's progress, anyway it is expressed.

NIXON'S OMISSIONS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, an historian, Thomas H. Greer, has written a brief and perceptive analysis of the state of the Union message of President Nixon. Professor Greer has, with a perspective eminently appropriate to his calling, described in a recent letter to the editor of the New York Times, what the President's message did not say. His letter follows:

NIXON'S OMISSIONS

TO THE EDITOR:

In his State of the Union address on Jan. 22 President Nixon produced a kind of masterpiece. He himself suggested that his speech was perhaps the greatest message presented to Congress since the founding of the Republic, and in one sense he was correct. It was a masterly evasion of the central problems of our time.

What are the central problems of our time? First and foremost, there is the problem of war—the present war in Asia and the wars for which we are preparing. Next is the all-devouring arms race which continues to threaten human existence and to drain away our human, physical and financial resources. Third is the problem of creating effective international controls to provide global order, health, food and the other necessities or life for an exploding world population. All of these problems profoundly affect the state of the Union.

On the strictly domestic scene, these are the central needs: a drastic reordering of United States patterns of production, consumption and life style in keeping with our diminishing resources and mounting pollution. Needed are the elimination of poverty

and unemployment, rebuilding of the national rail network, provision for mass transit in urban communities, rehabilitation of the core cities and ghettos and accelerated programs for sound low-cost housing. We must have sweeping reform of our antiquated court and prison systems, improved and universal health service, purification of air and water and guarantees of immediate and powerful aid to the nonwhite and other "trapped" groups. Students and educational institutions at all levels must have more funds. A general de-escalation is called for of threats, violence, and repression throughout the society.

What did we hear in the speech? While the President touched upon some of the central problems facing the nation, he gave chief attention to matters of secondary importance (e.g., revenue sharing and Cabinet reorganization). He also declared that the race in history of the 92d Congress will depend upon how well it carries out his proposals.

As an historian I should say, rather, that its place will depend upon how quickly the Congress disposes of the President's diversionary agenda—and what it does about the central problems of our time.

OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVANT RETIRES

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the same qualities by which dedicated public servants merit recognition usually cause them to shun it. Such has been the case with Haley Sofge, the executive director of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for Metropolitan Dade County, Fla.

To the regret of all who have been privileged to know him and the many thousands who have benefited from his labors in the field of public housing, Haley Sofge is stepping down for reasons of ill health.

I want to add my word of praise to the tributes being paid to this man. His guiding philosophy has always been pro bono publico, and the example he has set for others in public life will be a permanent legacy.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the attention of our colleagues to a recent editorial from the Miami Herald concerning Haley Sofge and the outstanding contribution he has made to Dade County:

SUCH GIFTS OF PUBLIC SERVICE BESTOW GREATNESS ON AMERICA

Many thousands of Miamians who were touched by the works of Haley Sofge probably do not know him. He is the self-effacing, dedicated executive director of the Metro Department of Housing and Urban Development, who has retired because of ill health. The event, we think, is an opportunity to pay tribute to the good and faithful servant of the public, wherever he is, as exemplified by Mr. Sofge's career.

He won national attention in Nashville, Tenn., by helping rid the Tennessee capital city of its worst slums. A dozen or so years ago, these hovels marched by the thousands up the slope of Capitol Hill from the valley below and burgeoned in other areas of what has since become a lovely city. After his de-

parture for Miami the area was cleared and now is a model part of downtown. He had a major hand in it.

In proportion the blight of Greater Miami probably is greater. In the 14 years since Mr. Sofge first became assistant director of the old Miami Housing Authority 4,500 public housing units have replaced some of the worst shacks and shanties.

Progress also has been made at the private level. In neither sector is it sufficient. The expressways have displaced thousands of slums dwellers without creating any housing replacements.

But Haley Sofge's example surely will challenge the community to pursue as avidly his goals. "He really was emotionally and intellectually committed to the public housing process," attests Martin Fine, an attorney who has been in the forefront of the housing program for many years. "He was an innovator, he was creative and he was daring. And all of these are minimum statements about Haley."

Indeed, they are. They encompass as well his leadership in the construction of housing, much of it architecturally distinguished, for senior citizens.

The citizen (to say nothing of the newspaper) often grouches with good reason about government employes. Too often both are slow to recognize excellence and to acknowledge dedication.

Thomas Jefferson could say in the last years of his Presidency that "I have the consolation of having added nothing to my private fortune during my public service, and of retiring with hands as clean as they are empty." Of such stuff were the nation's first public servants.

In a time of cynicism, suspicion and doubt surrounding public service, it is not a small thing but a large one to be able to bestow tribute where it belongs. In truth it is the Haley Sofges, in public life or private, over the generations who have made America.

A TOAST TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues will find of interest a most unique occurrence which has been a tradition of the Saginaw Club, Saginaw, Mich., for almost 60 years now. It is the annual toast to the President.

On the first day of each new year at exactly 12 o'clock noon, the members have gathered with their sons, sons-in-law, and grandsons in the club's ballroom to hear a speaker deliver a timely address and offer the annual toast to the Nation's President.

By tradition, the identity of the speaker is kept secret from the membership and the public until the moment he is introduced by the club president.

The 1971 toast was delivered by William J. Edwards, president of the Lake Huron Broadcasting Corp. Mr. Edwards was introduced by C. Ward Lauderbach, the president of the Saginaw Club.

Annually, the address is broadcast live by all Saginaw radio stations and the text is published in its entirety the following day in the Saginaw News. Furthermore, a copy of the address is sent

to the President of the United States each year.

I found of particular interest, while noting this latest address, Mr. Edwards' remarks where he said:

You and I know, but let us make every effort to have young people understand that we know, that we have every reason to be ever grateful for our heritage as Americans. It is right and proper for all to be proud, humbly proud, to be Americans. I hope we adults will never cease to be as long as we live, and I have a hope for you young persons present and those of your generation across the land.

I hope you will never become so sophisticated that you will consider true patriotism to be old-fashioned and outmoded. I hope your love for your country and respect for its ideals will grow as you grow in knowledge and experience in life, that you will do your part to make America ever better in the years to come. I hope you will never fail to keep the American dream alive in your hearts despite all the disappointments that you may come so that others to follow after you will have the same grand opportunity.

For this is the greatest nation on earth. The wealthiest. The most powerful. The most charitable. And, with all of its human frailties, the noblest of all.

Mr. Speaker, believing that my colleagues will find the entire address by Mr. Edwards timely and of interest, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I am grateful for this privilege to have a part in keeping alive a cherished tradition that has existed in our club for fifty-eight years. Just as were those other members, who have stood here on the first day of years past, I am humbly proud to offer the Annual Toast to the president of our nation.

Like them all, I am honored to address my fellow members of the Saginaw Club, your sons, your sons-in-law and your grandsons and to extend my warmest wishes to each of you for the New Year.

Down through the years, speakers have used this occasion to reflect upon the past and contemplate the future and many of them have incorporated into their remarks a warning of the dangers confronting the nation at that point in history.

As we prepare to offer the fifty-ninth annual tribute to our chief executive, it is not my desire to preserve that part of our tradition that warns of national peril. It seems to me, however, that reality compels its inclusion on this first day of 1971 for these are disconcerting times in which we live.

We are hearing the impatient demand for change all about us and experience tells us that the certainty of change is always accompanied by the twin certainties of delight and despair. At once, we recognize the never-ending need for constructive change on one hand, and we see unreasonable demands for change creating new frustrations on the other.

We are reminded of our weaknesses as a people and certainly we have our share. We hear that young people are disenchanting and unmotivated, and sometimes, we gain little comfort in recalling that Socrates also worried about young people nearly twenty-four centuries ago. We see a broad decline in moral values and that is reason for our concern in a very real sense.

We have cause to be mindful of many threats to man's existence on this globe. No thinking person can ignore the rapidly increasing problem of over-population of the earth and the whole family of attendant threats to food supply and pollution of the air we breathe and the water we must have to survive. The consequences of failure to meet these threats to the continued existence

of mankind are almost beyond comprehension. The magnitude of the problem and the relentless speed of its movement may very well force man to put aside his divisive interests and unite in the common fight for survival.

Because of the priceless advantages of a free press and an unparalleled system of mass communication, we are not only exposed to much unpleasant news every day, we find it almost impossible to avoid becoming at times frustrated and frequently discouraged about the future of our country.

We know that organized crime continues to grow more powerful by the day in our land, that crime in general is increasing, and we reason that public apathy is at least partially responsible for that condition. We are constantly reminded of the tragedy of Southeast Asia, and we yearn for an end to war. We are becoming more fully aware of the imperfections within our social order, and we witness the mounting unrest that results from injustice. In the midst of widespread affluence for most, we see pockets of want for the few. We see and hear alarming reports of the increasing use of drugs among young people and we frantically hope for an awakening that will decisively put an end to that destructive practice. We see decaying inner cores of great cities and we know that answers must be found to that gigantic problem, for a whole new set of social ills multiply in such an atmosphere of despair.

We have seen dramatic changes in our time and we see the need for changes to come, but for many of us, some of the changes have been most difficult to accept.

We are having our traditions discarded, our values challenged, our beliefs subjected to ridicule, our ideals discounted and our institutions attacked. Moreover, we are becoming increasingly uneasy about the forces among us that would change everything we hold dear as a people.

I am persuaded that the permissive atmosphere prevalent throughout much of the land and the growing unlawful activities of the militant few that continues to threaten our personal safety and national security are reasons for our deep concern.

It is no longer a strange experience to hear from the mouths of native-born Americans revolutionary rhetoric that was framed in Marxist camps beyond our shores. We have come to expect violent civil disruption whenever and wherever it serves the purposes of those who can cause it. We have observed outbursts of brutality and destruction disguised as peaceful dissent and we have seen those evil activities hastily excused as understandable reaction to social injustice. We have also heard those willful acts described as the justifiable right of citizens to freely express their dissatisfaction with the system.

We have known our courts of law to become stages for obscene derision, insult and disdain. In the midst of the clamor against police brutality, officers of the law have become living targets for the assassin's gunshot.

We have witnessed our country's constitutional guarantees mockingly employed by those who would destroy those very guarantees. We have come to know about vandalism, arson, riots and even murder in the streets of our cities and on the once-quiet campuses of colleges and universities. We have seen our proud flag publicly desecrated, burned and trampled under foot, and we have seen the red banner of the communist enemy openly flaunted by Americans, on American soil, at a time when American men are still dying in Vietnam.

What appears to be a concentrated campaign by a handful of radical leftists has left a trail of kidnappings, murders, hijackings and sabotage in various parts of the land. In the minds of many of us, there is no longer any doubt that subversives are at

work in our midst. There is the widening realization that a small, but ruthless, revolutionary segment of our society is waging a deadly war of terrorism, and that a determined effort to put an end to it is long overdue.

I believe the present condition will not be tolerated by the great majority of citizens, indefinitely. The choice of total anarchy on one hand or heavy-handed repression on the other is no choice at all for a free people, and the time has come to avoid both, it seems to me.

Let me hasten to add that I do not advocate the suppression of dissent. Our system guarantees our right to protest, as well as support, government action and policy. I do not urge the maintenance of the status quo by any stretch of the imagination, for I know that change is inevitable and indeed necessary to avoid stagnation.

I cannot deny that injustice exists in our society as it does in all others to varying degrees. As individuals, we are not without sin and our nation, like others, reflects its citizenry.

I do not even challenge the right of the volatile few to proclaim their discontent and stridently voice their demands for immediate change. Let the day never dawn in this country when men and women cannot safely swim against the mainstream current when opposing views, as unpopular as they may be, cannot be openly and fearlessly expressed, when you and I cannot risk being wrong without suffering dire consequences.

What I suggest must be eradicated without further ado from the American scene is the ruthless terrorism that is designed to destroy our way of life and our nationhood. Regardless of the worthiness of some causes, blatant lawlessness cannot continue to be endured. The time has come when outrageous demands by unreasonable militants must be rejected forthrightly. Violators of the law must be prosecuted promptly in order to protect the public interest and to insure that justice is served. Roving trouble-makers must no longer be allowed to invade peaceful college campuses and disrupt the education of law-abiding students. Faculty members who foment unrest and advocate the forceful overthrow of government must be made responsible for their illegal acts and subjected to the penalty of the law. The unlawful occupancy of premises and the willful destruction of private and public property must be punishable, upon conviction, in a court of law, regardless of the causes espoused by the guilty ones.

I am convinced these steps must be taken despite the to-be-expected protest that they represent the suppression of personal liberty. I believe they will not jeopardize the civil right of any law-abiding citizen nor endanger the precious right of free expression. To the contrary, I believe that failure to uphold the law will cause our cherished liberties to erode and pass into oblivion. For I think that protest, to be valid, must be peaceful in America's free society; that dissent, to be effective, must not threaten the lives and property of others, that change, to be usefully and meaningfully sought, must not be designed to violently destroy a system that by its very nature and heritage accommodates the idea of change and recognizes the need for constant improvement.

I believe, too, that we must work for constructive change that will enrich all of our lives and increase our understanding and appreciation of each other for the common good, but I also believe that we must resist the forceful imposition of change, for the sake of change, by those who would rather destroy the present system than contribute to the building of a better one.

I think we must strive to be compassionate especially for the less-fortunate among us without embracing the permissive attitude that prevails so widely today. I refer to that

state of mind that easily accepts whatever comes as natural and inevitable, that tolerates indecency and law-breaking as lamentable signs of the times, that somehow manages to provide ready excuses for public violence and usually sympathizes more with the offender than the offended on the grounds that so much injustice exists in the country. I think we have another responsibility. We must make a better effort to communicate our beliefs with respect to the problems of our time to the generation that follows a step behind us, not in a feeble attempt to defend this system, but because they have the right to know our thoughts.

There are those who cite unrest among young people as the classic sign of internal decay in America. They argue that a deep distrust of their elders is universally shared by them all. They warn that there is widespread resentment and almost total disenchantment among young persons, because they are tired of adult hypocrisy, tired of corruption in high places, tired of profiteering in a capitalistic economy and tired of an oppressive and unjust social structure.

You and I cannot deny, of course, that some young people are totally committed to the obliteration of our way of life. They represent, however, but a tiny percentage of today's youth. By any measure, the overwhelming majority of young men and women today are decent, patriotic and God-fearing people. If they were not, there would be no promise for the future, no hope for human development.

Many of them at their impressionable ages, however, are being subjected all too frequently to the dramatic exhibitions of the activists, who are admittedly tired of the way things are. They must also be confused at times, if not discouraged, by the apparent absence of adult concern about the important issues and events of our time. Perhaps, they would welcome some timely expressions of opinion from our generation. If so, I would not presume to represent a broad opinion of my contemporaries. I would merely pass on a personal view in the hope that it might have some worthiness for consideration. I would start by saying that I, too, am tired of some things. I am tired of hearing so much about all the things that are wrong with this system of ours.

We adults know that we have many faults and there are wrongs to be corrected but there are some right things about this beloved land that cry for recognition. Admittedly, we have a social problem of monumental proportions that surely must be the concern of all men of good will. It serves no useful purpose to cite that all majorities have historically imposed their wills on the minorities in their midsts and we cannot truthfully deny that some of our fellow Americans have been shamefully exploited. What is important is this. Discrimination for reason of race, color or creed is unlawful in this nation. That is national policy and it is proof that we, as a nation as painful as it has been for some, are committed to the proposition of equality of opportunity and justice for all citizens. Let me further say that I know of no other successful attempt in history to assimilate such a large minority into a nation's mainstream of life. We have by no means won the battle against discrimination, and we most certainly do not always live up to the high ideals of our nation, but we are trying and progress is being made in our time. Brotherhood in the fullest sense remains much more of an ideal than a reality but, at least, it is still an ideal in the good land of many people.

The view is often expressed that a mistake of massive proportions occurred when our military forces were first sent to Vietnam. That decision may not have been in our best interest, but keep in mind that Americans did not go off to war in Southeast Asia in pursuit of the spoils of war. We did not go to conquer a free people, to force our will

on another nation or to annex real estate in that part of the world. We responded to the call of a friendly government to protect it from the ravages of a communist takeover, and we went because it appeared to serve our national interest and that of all free men to halt the spread of red aggression in Vietnam, just as we did more than a decade earlier in Korea.

Let me say to responsible young people that I am tired of having my country described by some of its home-grown critics as imperialistic. Let them produce just one case in history where a single nation has borne the heavy burden of defending so many from the imperialistic design of another.

I am tired of the often-voiced accusation that we are a completely materialistic and decadent society that places the dollar above all else. We are the wealthiest nation, to be sure, but we are for the most part a spiritually-motivated people undergirded with an abiding faith in God and our churches are living proof of it. We are condemned for failing to eradicate poverty, for not caring enough for the weak and the poor among us. Can anyone show us a people of any other period in history that shared more? We are branded because ours is the highest living standard ever known to man, and yet privation still lingers to haunt our people, but who can truthfully say that condition is the result of callous disregard for our fellow men? What other citizens have ever been so generous and charitable at any time? If this is a materialistic society, how can its heart be so compassionate when it comes to helping its own and reaching out to alleviate human suffering in other lands?

This nation is castigated for being militarily strong by the enemies of freedom. It is branded a war-monger and the Pentagon is depicted as a symbol of man's evil against man. Yet, this country continues to seek peace hopefully as it serves by necessity as the single bulwark against communist aggression on many fronts.

We are criticized for spending so much money on space exploration when there are so many unmet needs here on earth. But, American feet made mankind's very first and only impressions on the surface of the moon, and who can belittle that unprecedented achievement in human history?

I am tired of hearing the American ideal described as hypocrisy by the cynics among us, because even now there are lofty goals as yet unattained. And finally, I am tired of the complaint by some that there is no freedom in this bastion of liberty, we call the U.S.A.

You and I know, but let us make every effort to have young people understand that we know, that we have every reason to be ever grateful for our heritage as Americans. It is right and proper for all to be proud, humbly proud, to be Americans. I hope we adults will never cease to be as long as we live, and I have a hope for you young persons present and those of your generation across the land.

I hope you will never become so sophisticated that you will consider true patriotism to be old fashioned and outmoded. I hope your love for your country and respect for its ideals will grow as you grow in knowledge and experience in life, that you will do your part to make America ever better in the years to come. I hope you will never fail to keep the American dream alive in your hearts despite all the disappointments that may come so that others to follow after you will have the same grand opportunity.

For this is the greatest nation on earth. The wealthiest. The most powerful. The most charitable. And, with all of its human frailties, the noblest of all.

And now, in keeping with our long-established tradition, let us stand together and

propose a Toast to the Chief Executive, Richard Nixon.

Gentlemen, to the President of the United States!

"1985"—A MESSAGE FOR AMERICA

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker one of the gravest concerns that has faced Americans as a major issue during many months, now, has been the question of arresting the destruction of our physical environment: purifying the air we breathe, cleaning up the water we drink, reducing the stinking piles of garbage we throw out, reducing the noise that threatens our hearing and nervous systems, finding pesticides and herbicides that do only their intended jobs, saving green space. If we do not find answers to many of these problems, the quality of life Americans have enjoyed since the first settlers arrived in this Nation is seriously in danger. How much danger and how long we have to reverse the trend is a question no one can answer.

In a remarkable public service television program, aired for the first time last June 1, the Metromedia network attempted to give Americans a view into the future if the Nation failed to come to grips with the many environmental problems and the worst happened. "1985" was an hour-long dramatized newscast that used film footage of present situations to show what a day in 1985 might be like if all of the destructive forces of our environment were to suddenly overtake the environment's ability to cope with them. It was a chilling account that left little to the imaginations of viewers all too well aware of the picture before them on their TV sets.

I have collected a number of previews and reviews of the program, and insert them in the RECORD at this point for the attention of my colleagues who may not have seen either the program or the articles. After reading them, I would hope my colleagues would take any opportunity to view the program if it is ever again made available. It and others like it project what could happen if we fail to complete the job begun in protecting and preserving our environment. This is an impressive example of the power of the television medium to dramatize a real problem—hopefully to a positive purpose. Metromedia is to be congratulated for its great and effective public service.

The articles follow:

[From the Broadcasting magazine, June 1, 1970]

"1985" SEEKS TO INSPIRE ACTION ON POLLUTION

Orson Welles' 1938 adaptation of H. G. Wells' "War of the Worlds" led some listeners to near hysteria before the realization that it was fiction calmed them. In 1970, Metromedia television is adapting the Orwellian, "1984" theme to the *Mercury Theater's* dramatized newscast in the hopes that

it will stir people into action. Orson Welles advanced his wordy holocaust one year to 1939. His modern-day counterpart, Zev Putterman, director of program development for Metromedia television, has done the same to produce "1985," a one-hour special on what can result from continued pollution of the atmosphere, the seas and the land.

"The entire concept is based on what some ecologists and environmental scientists say could happen within 15 years if pollution continues at its present rate," according to Mr. Putterman. The dramatized newscast makes use of Metromedia's facilities and anchor-men in New York, Washington, Kansas City and Los Angeles and details not what has occurred, but what could.

A total of 30 video "crawls" will advise viewers throughout the broadcast that "1985" is a fictionalized newscast taking place in the future. During the actual broadcast, a similar disclaimer will be voiced in Spanish for metropolitan viewers who may not read English. Local programs, focusing on the specific problems in their markets, will be aired by the Metromedia stations immediately following the special.

The various pollution topics covered by the special include air pollution in Los Angeles, water pollution in New York and Washington and damage to the land caused by insecticides in the Midwest.

Worldwide ramifications of pollution are also presented. Although fictional, each segment discussed on the special will be based on research already conducted and prognostications made by ecologists during the past year. The format of the programs following "1985" are designed to be solution oriented, according to Mr. Putterman.

The program is being offered to other stations free of charge and Mr. Putterman expects between 50 and 100 stations to request copies. Metromedia is also preparing a booklet based on the script of the program to be sent to members of Congress and various civic, business, educational and political leaders around the country.

"While we don't want to panic people into doing something rash as a result of the program, we do want to move them into action," says Mr. Putterman.

"We will be painting a picture of reality as some scientists predict it will be and hopefully, sounding an alarm that will get people to head off what has been prophesied."

Metromedia stations will air the program June 1 at 8 p.m. with their local specials following at 9 p.m.

[From the Washington Post, May 31, 1970]

"1985" ON METROMEDIA: A PREVIEW

(By William E. Smart)

"1985," a fictionalized news documentary portraying the United States in the midst of a worldwide environmental crisis, will be telecast Monday at 8 p.m. on Metromedia Television's four television stations (Channel 5 locally).

The hour-long program is not unlike Orson Welles' 1938 radio broadcast of "The War of the Worlds." Unlike that program, which caused widespread panic by listeners who thought the United States had been invaded by Martians, the enemy in "1985" happens to have been created by man himself.

The enemy is pollution—the massive pollution of the atmosphere, the earth and the oceans.

Here's how the fictionalized story goes: The United States is in the middle of a national catastrophe. The President has just spoken to the nation. All television and radio stations are operating around the clock to relay official instructions and report the developing crisis.

At Metromedia, anchorman Mark Evans

(Metromedia's vice president for public affairs) summarizes the President's message, then introduces reports by Metromedia newsmen across the country—George Putnam in Los Angeles, Bill Jorgensen and Ken Gilmore in New York, Glen Hanson in Kansas City and Alan Smith and Maury Povich in Washington.

As each newsman tells his bleak story, the viewer sees film of actual air, land and water pollution that exists today. The footage accompanying reporter Alan Smith's report on starvation deaths in Africa is stark. It isn't pretty.

Near the end of the program, reporter Jorgensen comments on the concern voiced by people beginning in the late Sixties and the lack of action that followed: "And so the best intentions on earth are not enough—not until people couple them with enough action. That's the lesson we've learned—too late."

"1985" producer Vernon Hixon sums up the program with a warning: "The things we will describe have not actually happened but they could!"

Immediately after the simulated newscast the independent group's stations will present locally produced hour-long discussion programs relating to current pollution problems. WTTG-TV's discussion program, entitled Status "70," was produced by Ed Scherer.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, May 28, 1970]

A MESSAGE TO PONDER

(By Morton Moss)

People, in general, are so constituted that, if they aren't hit personally amidstships with a problem, they find it remote, theoretical and unreal.

Pollution of the planet, excessive human breeding are such problems. Conditions that build toward a catastrophe continue to pile up. These conditions lead logically to frightful disaster.

But the disaster hasn't struck. Meanwhile, there are only occasional ominous irritants. There's no emotional sense of emergency. Ignored, the logic of catastrophe doesn't go away but proceeds relentlessly toward its predestined conclusion.

We've had the impression about these documentary essays on man's rape of his environment that they somehow just graze the target. This isn't because they fail to present the data that contrives a strong intellectual case. They do. But the emotions must be reached, the jolt of immediacy achieved.

This is done with shocking impact by "1985," an hour's piece of Metromedia theater about a catastrophe that embroils planet earth in that year. Fictionalized reality and prophecy, it attains a cutting edge through a simulated newscast, anchored in Washington, D.C., and moving electronically around the map of the United States and the world.

Mark Evans, Metromedia vice president for public affairs, plays anchor man in an exceptional telecast that shows on KTTV-11 Monday night at 8. Producer Vernon Hixon took the bold conception and forged a winner. Metromedia utilizes newscasters and commentators from its television stations here, in New York, Kansas City and Washington. Evans and Maury Povich, George Putnam, Bill Jorgensen and Ken Gilmore, Glen Hansen and Alan Smith lend an alarming imaginative dimension to the real.

At intervals, reminders are given that the events aren't actually occurring but are dramatizations of what might occur in the absence of measures to avert them.

The program so successfully mimics reality that the frequent interruption serves to avoid possible serious public misapprehension. Panic stirred in the late '30s by Orson Welles'

radio fiction of a Martian invasion has left an indelible memory.

Man's technological miracle, its demands to be properly tended shugged off by stupidity, greed, lust for anarchic sensation, has crumbled worldwide.

An appalling state of chaos reigns. The president, advised to leave Washington, stays on seeking to concoct a way out of the environmental Armageddon. He has been assigned extraordinary powers but all the signs point to a further deterioration, even amid the depletion of food stocks, to a threat of cannibalism.

In Los Angeles, the death toll from the toxic fumes of a great air inversion is already 11,000 and expected to climb fast. Against orders, a despairing rush starts in an effort to flee the city.

CONSTRICTED INTO DEATHTRAP

This increases the tragedy. Jammed freeways constrict into a mazy death trap. Caught in the nightmare, cars honk a mad chorus. They contaminate the air all the more with their exhaust.

From New York to Boston, electric power is gone and the cities are ghostly. Garbage piles high. Police and fire fighting breakdowns mount as toxic smog saturates 47 American cities.

The midwest agricultural heartland is rank, deserted. Poisons like DDT, industrial disposal, sewage have made a diseased muck of the rivers, killed the fish and the birds which ate those fish. The soil is poor, it produces scanty and that a prisoner of life. Even the oceans have been fouled.

Epidemic hovers, airports are closed and mobs, rioting and looting, swirl around helpless National Guardsmen. The tooth of need has been sharpened unbearably by gigantic population expansion in the U.S. and overseas. Beyond U.S. borders, governments topple, humans lose their humanity and rage berserk from elementary deprivation.

Evans maintains a special optimism. He asks his newscaster lineup its assessment. One by one, contact with them snags. He still speaks of options that remain open. As Evans mentions hopeful developments in the Pacific northwest, he suddenly flicks off the screen which goes blank. It then conveys a message to ponder:

The End.

[From the Baltimore Sun, June 1, 1970]

LOOK AND LISTEN WITH DONALD KIRKLEY

George Orwell's ominous prediction of a world made hideous as the result of human stupidity, as contained in his frailty and novel "1984," has been superseded by a television documentary called "1985," to be aired on WTTG-Channel 5 tonight, 8 o'clock to 9 o'clock. It will be followed by another hour of discussion and comment by a panel of experts concerned with the problems of ecology.

The program is a scoop for WTTG, and an important one. This production by Metromedia News is the first in the field of dramatized documentary, which has been overlooked by the networks and independent stations. It is, indeed, the best of the many specials which have been telecast since the environmental crusade was launched by CBS-TV last March. It is also the most frightening of the documentaries on the subject.

As seen in a preview in Washington, "1985" went far beyond earlier warnings of clear and present dangers to mankind than any of its predecessors. That is because it embodied all the pollutions in one hour of "fictionalized news." The script, written by Don Bresnahan and Vernon Hixon, was based on the idea that 15 years hence, the various threats to mankind—smog, population explosion, befouling of the earth, air and

water, poisoning by DDT—all came to a climax at a certain time.

The story begins at the end of a presidential message describing the situation. Mark Evans, news announcer for WTTG, and anchorman for the special, gives a summary of the telecast from the White House. Un-counted thousands have been killed by smog in Los Angeles. The highways leading from the city have been jammed by refugees and impassable for two days. Over the nation, 130 other cities are suffering from the same cause. In other continents, a cumulative wave of starvation, rioting and other ills is continuing. The Northeast United States has been in the grip of a total power blackout from Boston to New York for a week.

All this is conveyed to the viewer in an ingenious way. The regional situations are reported by the Metromedia News men: Bill Jorgensen in New York; Alan Smith and Maury Povich in Washington; George Putnam in Los Angeles; and virtually every other member of Metromedia's staff.

In addition to their coverage of the fictionalized disasters, they remind viewers of the reasons for them and the inadequacy of the minimal efforts to prevent them which began circa 1970. They overlooked some of the causes: for example, the indifference to the warnings on the part of many people, such as the ladies of the D.A.R. who thought the whole thing was a Communist plot; people who didn't believe the scientists; those who disregarded the warnings as a passing fad, and fat-headed politicians.

Remembering the near-panic which was set off by Orson Welles and his fictionalized tale of that martian invasion, Producer Hixon and his staff were careful to include frequent reminders that what was appearing on the screen was not factual. This was a necessary weakening of the illusion. For someone tuning in later after the introduction, the pictured disasters might have seemed all too plausible. There have been fatal smogs, dangerous power blackouts and documentaries about starvation in the United States and other nations.

This might have been an unduly talkative program, but it wasn't. The reports of the various correspondents are copiously illustrated, with photographs and film clippings. Some of these, such as starving children in Biafra and records of the actual blackout several years ago, may be viewed apprehensively as prophetic of worse things to come. Also, "1985" builds up suspense from start to finish.

After it is aired tonight, it should cause quite a stir and it may have interesting repercussions.

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1970]

TV: A FRIGHTENING LOOK AT THE PROBLEMS IN "1985"

(By George Gent)

Taking a note from Orson Welles' celebrated 1938 "War of the Worlds" radio scare, Metromedia television and WNEW-TV took a brave look into the future last night and discovered—the Apocalypse.

The two-hour study of the problems of pollution—present and future—was an exciting exercise in journalistic imagination, with the first-futuristic hour the more interesting and valuable. It attempted to show through a dramatized documentary—not unlike those usually seen on TV with Metromedia reporters covering a disaster—what the world of 1935 will look like if present population trends and environmental neglect continue.

It was a harrowing vision of thousands of smog deaths, power failures, depleted rivers, barren lands and smothered oceans.

Famine stalked most of the underdeveloped world and food riots tore the major

Asian capitals, the United States Government was seeking legislation for compulsory abortion and sterilization, while large bonuses were being asked for childless couples and heavy taxes for the fruitful.

The reporters and commentators did not blink at the tough controversial, moral and philosophical reevaluations that would have to be made if their bleak vision was not to become a reality.

The major problem, of course, is that such prophecies can become self-fulfilling. The aim of "1985" was to frighten and it did. But it was notably short on rational solutions on how to avert disaster and always opted for the most pessimistic projection of events. It raised many more questions than it answered, but perhaps that should be accounted a major virtue. The program was a frontal assault on the complacency, and in terms of its limited objective it was brilliantly successful.

Channel 5 reported that 42 calls—about equally divided, for and against—were received during and immediately after the show. The objectors protested what they regarded as the program's scare tactics. A few, having just missed the opening caution, called in to ask if the events portrayed were actually happening.

However, the program scrupulously interrupted the narration every five minutes to warn that the program was a dramatization and also inserted streamers in the lower portion of the screen during particularly frightening portions.

Police and radio stations had been alerted to forestall public panic and avert the problems created for Mr. Welles by his famous broadcast.

"Nineteen Eighty-five" was produced by Vernon Hixon, with Zev Putterman, executive producer.

TELEVISION REVIEW

[From the Hollywood Reporter, June 3, 1970]

(By William Tusher)

Does off network television really hold promise? Is there any evidence that if the prime time siphoning goes through, the public won't be cheated, as critics claim? The implications for the multiple program source doctrine of the FCC couldn't have a more persuasive friend in court than Metromedia's absolutely shattering, Orwellian documentary on the ecology crisis, "1985."

We've had television warnings coming out of our ears on the encroaching dangers of polluting ourselves into extinction. Here is a documentary that meets head-on the gamble of being yet another anti-climactic echo, the repetition of which risks leaving the public more numb than alert to the perils. The inescapable apprehension is, "What—yet another soap operation on environmental survival?"

Given all those built-in handicaps, Metromedia, in "1985," has exceeded in impact anything done by the networks on this critical—yet curiously safe and apolitical—issue, and the networks on the whole have done well, indeed. In a massive effort involving the key news personnel of MM's owned and operated stations in Los Angeles, New York, Kansas City and Washington, D.C., "1985" projects the galloping pollution crisis 15 years forward and gives it such immediacy and impact as to defy any lingering pocket of indifference or skepticism.

So real that it is reminiscent of the Orson Welles Martian scare that shook up radio three decades ago, "1985" takes warranted precautions against panic by periodically billboarding warnings that the events being portrayed aren't actually happening. That could be pretentious as hell—except that the simulation of a world strangling in its death rattle is so starkly believable.

The fictionalized news drama, as it is aptly

called, starts in the wake of an emergency address by the president. People, fish and wildlife are perishing by the millions all over the world—suicidal victims of a world which blindly ignored all warnings and indulged itself into self-destruction. Fantasies of optimism, daydreams of miracles, mystic faith in Yankee ingenuity, naive faith that God won't let this happen to his errant children find stubborn adherents until the end as anchorman Mark Evans loses contact with one remote feed after another. Finally he is blacked out himself while mouthing, to the last, the ritual optimism that things can't be as bleak as they seem.

It is as shattering and jolting an experience as television is capable of serving up—and it is masterfully achieved. All the Metromedia correspondents—anchorman Evans and Bill Jorgensen, Glenn Hansen, Alan Smith, Maury Povich, Ken Gilmore and George Gilmore—heighten the impossible to distinguish from their daily newscasts.

Don Bresnahan and Vernon Hixon have written a taut and controlled script. They artfully combined documentation with science fiction, keeping the viewer on the edge of his seat every second of the allotted 60 minutes. A virtuoso team job of film editing, charging narration with almost unbearable visual impact, is registered by Densil Allen, Joe Dialon, Ben Foti, Joe Rizzo, Vincent Russo and Bob Taylor. They make simply remarkable use of stock film and footage supplied by the Environmental Control Administration of the U.S. Public Health Service, the American Museum of Natural History, the U.S. Senate committee on public works, Empathy Graphics and Airlie House. And they do stitchless wonders integrating the camera mark of Metromedia cinematographers Steve Alexander, Dick Herrera, Jerry Kahn, Jack Leppert, Jerry McGallicher and Leroy Parker.

Every conceivable technique is employed to advance the illusion of the day the world realized it waited too long. The sense of anchorman Evans pulling in reports from across the country and other parts of the world, with live remotes from far-flung disaster areas, is flawlessly and chillingly realized. There's no make-believe about it. The television set becomes a suction tube swallowing all in its path. Side crawls keep flashing bulletins of proliferating disasters and warnings to citizens who may be tempted to take to highway, water or air.

With Zev Putterman as executive producer, with authenticity heightened by Ken Gilmore's special science reports, with excellent graphics by Mark Cantor and Jack Crawford it is a fine group effort. A monumental achievement for Metromedia television, for producer Hixon, for art director Jerry Bailis, and especially for directors Russ Segel in New York, Joe Nagy in Washington and Larry Cazan in Kansas City. The Los Angeles cut-ins, directed by Lennie Blondheim, well voiced as they are by Putnam, lacked the impact of the others.

This one should most assuredly be placed in a time capsule—just in case there are any post-1985 inheritors. A smasher from every point of view.

[From the Variety, June 5, 1970]

"1985": TELEVISION REVIEWS

With Mark Evans (anchorman), Alan Smith, Maury Povich, Bill Jorgensen, Ken Gilmore, George Putman, Glen Hansen.

Exec. Producer: Zev Putterman.

Producer: Vernon Hixon.

Writers: Hixon, Don Bresnahan.

60 Mins., Mon. 8 p.m.

Metromedia-TV.

Metromedia's view of the environment, as shown on all its tv stations except in San Francisco, is daring, vivid, and much more pessimistic than television stations are wont to wax. The one amusing aspect, in fact was a

conscious or unconscious parody of tv documentaries. At the end of the show, Mark Evans, anchoring a news show from pollution-ridden 1985, is pathetically polling his correspondents for optimistic predictions while, one by one, city interconnection is lost and finally the screen goes dark in the middle of a sentence.

Metromedia solves the "War of the Worlds" syndrome—"My God, Bev, the world's coming to an end"—by flashing frequent disclaimers on the screen, warning the audience that they are watching fiction. Several devices are extremely effective in diluting the play-acting atmosphere, however, including using as actors fulltime newsmen from the various Metromedia cities, who do essentially what they would be doing if the drama were actually happening and running unrelated news bulletins across the screen warning of airport closings, etc., while Evans talks.

It's encouraging that the pseudo-documentary pulls no punches in showing the role that industries and particularly autos play in pollution—probably a good reason why there was no commercial interruption. The program attempts to show what will happen to this country if the worst that is predicted happens, and without passing on the validity of the research done, it all seems logical and frightening. Air pollution is lightening only because industry is at a virtual standstill, much highway traffic is outlawed, the exploded population is starving because all food sources are polluted, the President has been given dictatorial power (only implied), poler blackouts and looting are rampant—in other words, just like 1970, only worse.

All the outlets, by the way followed the hour show with local hours devoted to market environmental problems.

Mick.

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 25, 1970]

TELEVISION NOTES

"1985," a Metromedia fictionalized news report of the end of the earth owing to pollution of air, land, and water, will be aired at 11:30 p.m. Saturday on channel 32.

Mindful of the panic created by Orson Welles' drama about a Martian invasion of the earth on a 1938 radio broadcast, the producers of "1985" will include video scrawls across the screen to assure the viewer that this is fiction.

The documentary is based on what some ecologists and scientists predict will happen in 15 years if serious measures are not taken now to stop the pollution of our environment.

Metromedia newsmen across the country report on the envisioned ecological disaster much as when they cover major news disasters today. Reports of power failures, smog deaths, spoiled waters, famine in an overpopulated world, rioting and looting, and the toppling of foreign governments come in to anchorman Mark Evans, who bleakly hunts for some shred of hope.

Altho this is strictly a dramatization, the program seeks to make people acutely aware of the magnitude of pollution problems, hoping to inspire the steps necessary to avert the doom portrayed in "1985."

RADICALS MAKE UP 1 PERCENT OF NATION'S YOUTH

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Aurora, Ill., Beacon-News of Tuesday,

January 12, carried a column by Dumitru Danielopol, a Copley Press columnist who is a thorough student of radical activities at home and abroad. His comments in this column are based on persistent study of the subject and I believe this particular column gives an accurate summary of our Nation's youth.

The item follows:

RADICALS MAKE UP 1 PERCENT OF THE NATION'S YOUTH

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

During the past few feverish years of student unrest, many polls have been taken in an effort to find out just what it is students want, what they think.

The results show that the radicals—the ones who profess hatred of the system and a desire to destroy it—make up about 1 per cent of the nation's youth.

Yet the polls have somehow failed to impress. Sample opinions expressed in cold percentages offer little reassurance amid fire-bombs, rioting and the nose-y rhetoric of the radicals.

More convincing—and far more encouraging—is the picture gained by one who is able to travel widely and converse on the spot with many of this country's youth.

I have met and talked to young representatives of all points of view, to would-be wreckers of our system who refer to police as "pigs," and to others who love their country, respect the law and support those who risk their lives in order to enforce it. For the latter, the policeman is not an enemy but a friend. If the word "pig" is applied to him, they say, it would stand for "patriotism, integrity and guts."

These youngsters are well in the majority, I found. They are as keen as steel to stand up and be counted in support of what they consider to be the basic ingredients of a lawful society. Said one:

"The loudmouthed few wish to start from scratch. The vast majority accept the world as it is and work out problems with examples taught by history."

I talked to representatives of the "Heartland Youth for Decency," a Californian group formed in May 1969 by a number of youths who are fed up with campus unrest, moral laxity and street violence. They decided to do something about it.

They work on many worthy projects in their community. They have collected and sent gifts to our servicemen, visited hospitals, helped rebuild an orphanage which was destroyed by fire, and initiated a veterans memorial monument in La Mesa, etc., etc.

Their singing group, "Freedom Sounds," has performed at more than 100 functions in Southland.

Their most recent and probably most spectacular activity is on behalf of U.S. prisoners of war.

Working in conjunction with the "Concern for Prisoners of War, Inc.," they have helped collect millions of letters, petitions and signatures addressed to the Communists in Hanoi asking for the improvement of the conditions of U.S. prisoners in North Vietnam.

With the help of some U.S. labor unions—such as the Teamsters Union—and other interest groups, some 50 tons of mail and a roll of petitions one mile long will be transported to Paris.

The youths hope to be able to deliver that mail in front of the building housing the North Vietnam delegation at the Paris peace talks, in order to dramatize the concern of the American people for the fate of their fellow Americans now in enemy hands.

It is not the Yuppies, the Hippies, the Vietnick and other such demonstrators that represent America. They are freaks in our society.

It is the kids who build rather than burn who are the heart of this nation.

SIX VIRTUES OF THE SENIORITY SYSTEM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, this week a large delegation of young Christian men and women are visiting Washington and Capitol Hill.

Under the auspices of the National Association of Evangelicals, over 100 upper-class students from evangelical liberal arts colleges across the country are participating in a Federal service seminar. These young Christians are here to study our American system of government firsthand, and to explore career opportunities in the Federal service.

This morning the seminarians were led in a stimulating and thought-provoking question and answer session by my friend from Libertyville, Ill., Donald E. Deuster, who serves the Nixon administration as a congressional relations officer.

Mr. Deuster took the opportunity this morning to outline six virtues of the seniority system as it operates in Congress. He spoke from his years of practical political experience on Capitol Hill as well as from the perspective of a committed Christian involved in the public service.

Because the controversial seniority system is so rarely defended in public by anyone, I am certain that my colleagues will be especially interested in the thoughtful and philosophic remarks by my Illinois friend:

SIX VIRTUES OF THE SENIORITY SYSTEM

(By Donald E. Deuster)

My fellow Christians, good morning and welcome to Washington.

Your wise leaders, Clyde Taylor and Judith Brown of the National Association of Evangelicals, both suggested that I speak briefly on some controversial subject, and then, respond to your questions.

Accordingly, let me say a word about "your friend and mine," that great historic and distinctively American custom—the Congressional System of Seniority.

The Seniority System is not only currently controversial, but it seems to be eternally so. Ten years ago in 1961 as President John F. Kennedy took his oath of office, and as Congress organized itself, Chairman Emanuel Celler of the House Judiciary Committee felt compelled to make this statement:

"It is a rare session of Congress that does not produce its share of proposals to abolish that perennial red herring—the so-called 'seniority rule.' This long-standing Congressional tradition, under which the House and Senate organize their working committee, has become as popular a target as sin itself.

"It is intermittently bombarded by Democrats and by Republicans, by liberals and by

conservatives, depending largely upon whose ox is being gored."

Yes, indeed, even today the Seniority System still serves as a whipping boy for the frustrations of everyone whose favorite legislation somehow fails to sail as swiftly, as smoothly and as unceremoniously through Congress as its proponents would like.

Few practices of our Congress are so continuously controversial, so widely criticized, so generally misunderstood and so rarely defended.

It seems to me that we Christians especially should befriend and defend the System of Seniority. We remember that Jesus said "Blessed are the peacemakers" and we often repeat the prayer of Saint Francis of Assisi, "Lord, make me an instrument of thy peace." If there is one great instrument which contributes to an atmosphere of peace on Capitol Hill, in my humble judgment it is the time-honored System of Seniority.

Speaking as a friend of this beneficial American tradition, and speaking as one who serves as a "professional peacemaker" for President Nixon on Capitol Hill, allow me to simply outline six virtuous qualities that the Seniority System contributes to the functioning of our Congress:

1. Harmony.
2. Efficiency.
3. Stability.
4. Continuity.
5. Familiarity.
6. Maturity.

What is this Seniority System? How does it inject these virtues into the workings of Congress? What is the basis of my opinion? How is the cause of good government served by Seniority?

WHAT IS THE SENIORITY SYSTEM?

First, you will not find the Seniority System in the Constitution, in the Rules of the Senate or House, in Jefferson's Manual, nor in any other official document. It is not a law nor a rule of Congress but simply a practice observed and respected by both political parties in the House since 1911 and in the Senate for over a century.

Simply, Seniority means that in each of the committees of Congress—twenty-one in the House and sixteen in the Senate—the Member of the Majority Party with the longest continuous service on that committee automatically becomes Chairman.

What does it mean to be Chairman? Essentially, the Chairman is the presiding officer of the committee. He is responsible for the efficient functioning of his committee. He schedules hearings, invites and welcomes witnesses, presides over public hearings and executive sessions, supervises the work of the professional staff, and symbolically he sits in the big chair under the flag and holds the gavel.

Can he be a dictator? Not for long. Yes, the Chairman has powers, but they are usually overrated. Yes, he hires the professional staff. But, since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 most of the professional staff are able to stay on in their jobs notwithstanding changes in the chairmanship.

Should the Chairman become tyrannical or obstreperous, the majority of his committee has the power to change the rules and strip him of his power. And, it has been done.

Can the Chairman kill a bill? Not if a determined majority inside his committee or in the Congress want to pass it. Any time the Chairman or even his entire committee refuse to report out a bill, a simple majority of the House or Senate may sign a discharge petition and bring the bill to the floor for a vote. And, that goes for the Rules Committee of the House as well.

HOW DOES SENIORITY PRODUCE HARMONY?

The Seniority System contributes to the internal harmony and peace inside the Congress by quietly, quickly and automatically elevating the most senior and experienced Majority Party Member to the Chairmanship.

This avoids having a rough and tumble political campaign inside each of the thirty-seven Congressional committees at the start of every Congress. Seniority avoids the wheeling and dealing, the power plays, the intrigue, the deals, promises, back-slapping, apple-polishing and vicious personality clashes that such election campaigns can produce.

HOW DOES SENIORITY MAKE FOR EFFICIENCY?

Seniority enables Congressional committees to organize quickly and get on with the public business. No time need be wasted in agonizing and debilitating political campaigns for the chairmanship, nor in healing the resulting wounds and bitterness.

Enough time and difficulty is associated with the assignment of the new freshmen Members to the committees. At the beginning of this 92nd Congress all fifty-six freshmen House Members and eleven freshmen Senators—sixty-seven ambitious men and women—receive a committee assignment. This task alone calls for juggling and sorting the conflicting desires of new and old Members alike to join the most prestigious and politically attractive committees.

Furthermore, we do have election campaigns for Republican and Democratic Party leadership positions in both the House and Senate. Your banquet speaker this evening, my good friend Congressman John B. Anderson of Illinois, was re-elected Chairman of the House Republican Conference last month by the very close margin of 89-81, over another able House Republican, Congressman Samuel Devine of Ohio. And, Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia defeated Senator Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts for the position of Senate Majority Whip.

These high-level political campaigns take time and sometimes create lasting dislocations repercussions and hostilities. The Seniority System shields the working committees from such time and energy-consuming conflicts.

HOW DOES SENIORITY BRING STABILITY?

Seniority rewards those Members who stick with one committee and thereby move up the leadership ladder. The system discourages hopping about from one committee to another depending upon where the political grass looks greenest at the moment.

Seniority avoids the waste attendant upon drastic changeovers of committee personnel. By enticing Members to stay with one committee and one general subject matter area, the custom guarantees relative stability in a political world that is generally characterized by change and job insecurity.

Members of Congress come and go depending on the election day desires of the American voter. To the extent that some stability can be woven into the management structure of our national affairs, the Seniority System helps immeasurably.

WHY DOES SENIORITY MEAN CONTINUITY?

Most of our national problems creep up on us gradually. It may take ten or twenty years for local problems to become national in scope. Hearings may be held one year by a Congressional committee and no Federal law passed for another three or four years. This was the case with the famous Medicare program.

This was so with the new landmark Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, one single piece of legislation that has occupied my

time for almost two years. Our passenger trains have been dying off since World War II over a period of thirty years—longer than most of you have been alive.

Furthermore, even after a law is passed, it must be implemented, administered and enforced. Finally, Congress must exercise some oversight to see that the law they passed really did solve the problem. This entire process may cover forty or fifty years.

The Seniority System encourages Congressmen to stay on one committee and thus become experts in one subject area. Thereby, they acquire through personal experience great knowledge concerning the development and long-term solution of our national problems.

This beneficial system assures us that the leadership of our legislative committees will be in the hands of men with the greatest experience. The system insures expertise and continuity.

HOW DOES SENIORITY BRING ABOUT FAMILIARITY?

Committee Members not only become familiar with the scope of problems under their subject matter jurisdiction, but also the full Membership of the House and Senate, the leaders of the Executive branch, and the leaders of the American public become familiar with the committee leaders.

Many a committee—indeed, most committees—are highly respected on the floor of the House and Senate because of the personal prestige, character, expertise and reliability of the committee chairman, and also his various subcommittee chairmen. Over the years we learn that a chairman's word and judgment can be trusted.

The longer you are in Washington, the more you appreciate that this government and world of ours is so complex and so immense that no one person can know everything. You absolutely must trust the advice of someone else. Consider such highly technical and complicated matters as our space flights to the moon, our anti-ballistic missile defense system, the aeronautical and atmospheric aspects of the supersonic transport aircraft, and the whole field of defense, military intelligence and international affairs.

In such a world as this, the Seniority System helps assure us that the committee leaders in Congress will be men and women with the greatest experience, expertise and familiarity with the immense problems confronting us.

SENIORITY MEANS MATURITY

Critics call it the System of Senility. Perhaps a few old men are as feeble and senile as a few young men are rash and foolish. Yet, in my personal experience, the great preponderance of committee chairmen and the older Members of Congress are wise, alert, intelligent, mellow, kindly, moderate and mature.

On a personal note, my young Christian friends, let me tell you this. If the Good Lord allows me to live to the ripe age of eighty-one, and I am as alert, wise, aware of the world about me, and as responsive to the needs of my country, as is Chairman William M. Colmer of the House Rules Committee, my cup shall be running over with gratitude to Almighty God for his blessings.

Through the years these senior Members of Congress see Presidents come and go. For example, wise, experienced and mature Congressman Les Arends, Republican Whip of the House, was first elected to Congress in 1934 when Franklin Delano Roosevelt was President. I was five years old and you were not born. Mr. Arends has served in Congress under six Presidents.

These many senior Congressmen have seen many Administrations come to town with various notions of how to bring about the millenium. Also, they see freshmen Members

of the Senate and House arrive on the Hill, filled with enthusiasm, and stamped by their electorate with ever-changing concepts of what America needs.

Through these long years of wrestling with national and international problems—the depression, war, defense, foreign aid, taxes, civil rights, poverty, welfare, and more recently, the environment and the need for reform of the Federal bureaucracy and revenue sharing with the states and local governments—Members of Congress develop deep philosophic perspectives, great wisdom and maturity.

SENIORITY WILL SERVE ON

In summary allow me to predict that the Seniority System will serve America for many more years to come. Probably your grandchildren will visit Washington in the future and ask some questions about Seniority.

Yes, at the opening of this Congress both parties did take action to allow the custom of Seniority to be modified. The House Democrats voted to conduct a caucus vote on nominations for committee chairmen whenever demanded by ten Members. The House Republicans agreed to hold a secret vote of the entire Republican membership to determine who will serve as ranking minority Members of the committees.

Furthermore, both parties wrote into their caucus rules a statement that their respective Committees on Committees need not follow seniority in drafting lists of committee assignments for caucus approval.

Nonetheless, my Christian friends, even in view of these actions to more easily enable exceptions to be made to the Seniority System, my expectation is that the custom will—and should—be followed for many, many years to come.

As Chairman Colmer of the House Rules Committee said to me in the corridors just a few days ago, "The Seniority System is not perfect, but no one in one hundred years has conceived of a better one."

And on this line of thought, I am reminded of a speech that Winston Churchill made in the House of Commons on November 11, 1947, in which he said:

"Many forms of Government have been tried, and will be tried in this world of sin and woe . . . no one pretends that democracy is perfect or all-wise. Indeed, it has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except all those other forms that have been tried from time to time."

Likewise, let me say that so far the System of Seniority is the best humanly conceived arrangement for assuring some basic harmony, tranquility and peace on Capitol Hill to offset the tendencies for partisanship and hostility.

My hope is that you, and other informed Christians, will appreciate the virtues of the Seniority System, and beyond that, my hope is that you will defend and befriend this beneficial institutional instrument of political and legislative peace.

UKRAINE**HON. JAMES A. BURKE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 53d anniversary of the ill-fated declaration of independence of the freedom-loving people of the Ukraine. After centuries of domination by the czars who were over-

thrown in the name of freedom and to usher in a new era free from the tyranny of the oppressor, the Ukrainians—long-suffering and courageous persons that they were—seized the occasion to realize the nurtured hopes of centuries and declare their national identity and independence. Alas, the dancing in the streets was premature. The new Russian Government lost no time in giving the lie to their slogans as they ruthlessly put down the experiment in freedom. Soon the streets echoed only with the marching feet of soldiers, the clatter of horses hooves of invading armies, and the cries of dying heroes. The new breed of Russians—the Communists—had lost none of the czarist zeal for foreign domination and showed early on in the Ukraine, what they have shown so many times since, that they do not hesitate to roll across national boundaries to suppress the flames of independence. Early on, it was made clear for all to see that the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was at its very heart built on ruthless force and denial of independence. The U.S.S.R. rose from the ashes of czarist Russia; however elaborate the disguise about a new order, it was made perfectly clear that little intrinsic had changed with regard to the fate of millions of subject peoples. The monolithic exterior of the U.S.S.R. has come to be a standard feature of the international landscape the past half century. Commentators have grown accustomed to describing it, referring to it, and watching it from the outside and not surprisingly, the impression has been created of a giant political hegemony that moves with one accord and is a union of diverse people who have surrendered their national feelings in return for a concerted effort to bring about a new world order.

That is understandable. That is also why it is good to pause on this anniversary each year—to recall the tragic events of years ago and the noble sentiments of those early Ukrainian heroes, to be sure; but more important, perhaps to be mindful that the monolith is not as monolithic as it seems. Within this forced union, hundreds of forces are at work pulling in opposite directions and away from the center, which is Moscow. For memories of an independent Ukraine, which survived the centuries of Czarist domination have not dried up and disappeared in so short a time as half a century of Russian Communist domination. National identity, cultural heritage, pride in one's country, centuries of ethnic tradition cannot be legislated away with an act of Congress—not even the powerful Soviet congresses. Today behind the outside wall the Russians have thrown up around their so-called Union, the flames of national identity still burn and if one looks closely the mortar of the wall is loose and cracked and with each month and year the cracks are getting deeper and wider.

This country, the new home of countless Ukrainians, has only to listen to these outstanding citizens of America to know of what proud stuff these mortals

be and with what determination they face not only the past but also the next 53 years.

ALUMINUM INDUSTRY PREVEWS NEW RECYCLING PLANT: ANSWER TO MODERN WASTE DISPOSAL PROBLEMS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the aluminum industry has come up with a concrete, realistic answer to one of this Nation's largest pollution problems—garbage.

Previewed in New York the other day, this proposal, a recycling plant that would produce everything fed into it to a valuable reusable substance, is one that should receive the attention of all concerned with pollution problems.

One of the more encouraging aspects of this idea is that the plant would demand no more technology and know-how than we already possess. In other words with a push from the right direction, we could begin in the very near future constructing these plants that would solve this Nation's massive garbage disposal problem, and the many other environmental concerns connected with our increasing accumulation of garbage.

David Bird, writing in the New York Times, discusses this engaging idea.

I would like to introduce Mr. Bird's article into the RECORD at this time:

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. Waughan, 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.

KRETCHMER 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 files and a 20 per cent 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."

MRS. SHARON JOHNSON—"WOMAN OF THE YEAR"

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday night, January 29, the Lawndale Coordinating Council selected Mrs. Sharon Johnson as the "Woman of the Year" in recognition of her unselfish efforts for the betterment of the community.

Her work with our youth deserves special praise. As a member of the Advisory Board of the Lawndale Youth Council, Mrs. Johnson was instrumental in the success of the 1970 cancer drive, and the October "clean-up" drive. In addition, she has been an assistant leader for the G.S.A. Brownie Troop; assistant den mother for the Cub Scouts; and is currently a member of the Lawndale Little League Association.

In the community, Mrs. Johnson has been equally active. For the past few years, she has worked on the local cancer fund. In 1968, she worked in the YMCA fund drive. Mrs. Johnson was a volunteer worker in the pediatrics section of the Los Angeles County Health Services, and has worked in tuberculosis and respiratory disease mobile units in the last few years.

For the past 5 years, Mrs. Johnson has worked in the Lawndale Chamber of Commerce Christmas festivals, serving as chairman, cochairman, and committee chairman. She was the entertainment chairman for the Lawndale 10th anniversary and city hall dedication. She has been instrumental in the success of the Lawndale Youth Day Parade, and had the honor of serving as the Easter bunny in the 1969 parade. In that parade, she was the cograndmaster with Santa Claus.

Her active participation in the Lawndale "Monday Eves" has resulted in her election to most official positions in that organization. She served as toy loan coordinator and helped to form this worthwhile project.

In the Lawndale Women's Club, Mrs. Johnson is the current chairman of "Operation SAM." For the past 5 years, she has been on the Lawndale Coordinating Council where she has served as president and treasurer.

Her efforts have not gone unnoticed. She was the recipient of the Lawndale Chamber of Commerce President's Special Award for 1969-70 for a nondirector. But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Johnson is a wife and mother. While she may not receive recognition in this area, I am sure that her diligence and conscious efforts are well received by those who know her best and have loved her longest.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to recognize Mrs. Sharon Johnson for her contributions to the community. I congratulate the Lawndale Coordinating Council in their choice and I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Mrs. Sharon Johnson for donating her time, and her efforts to improve our community.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART CALENDAR OF EVENTS, FEBRUARY 1971

HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the calendar of events of the National Gallery of Art for the month of February 1971.

Once again the National Gallery of Art has planned outstanding exhibits and events. The American people, and especially those living in our Nation's Capital are very fortunate to have this excellent gallery to visit and enjoy.

The calendar follows:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART CALENDAR OF EVENTS, FEBRUARY 1971

HOGARTH: PAINTINGS FROM THE COLLECTION OF MR. AND MRS. PAUL MELLON

This exhibition is the fourth in the series of works by British artists in the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon. Twenty-nine paintings by William Hogarth (1697-1764), the renowned pictorial dramatist and social commentator of the early 18th century, have been selected for this exhibition, on view on the main floor from February 12 through May 30. The most important picture shown is *The Beggar's Opera*, which reflects the artist's passionate interest in the theater. This painting will be the subject of the Sunday lecture, February 14 to be given in the National Gallery Auditorium by Ronald Paulson, Chairman, Department of English, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.

Also chosen from Mr. and Mrs. Mellon's collection for this exhibition of Hogarth works are portraits, genre scenes, a preliminary sketch for the Foundling Hospital altarpiece, and the set of twelve paintings illustrating *Hudibras*, a poem by Samuel Butler satirizing the Puritans. A fully illustrated, fifty-page catalogue of the exhibition (\$2.50) has been prepared and annotated by Ross Watson.

A selection of Hogarth's prints, to go on view in March in Gallery G-19, will complement the exhibition of Hogarth's paintings.

CONTINUING ON VIEW

Ingres in Rome, Special Exhibition Galleries, ground floor, through February 20; *Käthe Kollwitz: Prints and Drawings*, Gallery G-19, ground floor, through February.

A NEW DIRECTOR'S TOUR ACOUSTIGUIDE

J. Carter Brown has recorded a new *Director's Tour* of the National Gallery, which includes discussion of some of his favorite paintings and a number of personal anecdotes. This forty-five minute Acoustiguide will be available from the rental desk on the main floor at the Mall Entrance.

GALLERY AND CAFETERIA HOURS

The Gallery is open weekdays and Saturdays, 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and Sundays, 12 noon to 9:00 p.m. The Cafeteria is open weekdays, 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.; luncheon service 11:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.; and Sundays, dinner service 1:00 to 7:00 p.m.

A. W. MELLON LECTURES

"Vasari, the Man and the Book" is the subject of the 20th annual A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, to be delivered this year by the distinguished British art historian and educator, T. S. R. Boase. Dr. Boase's lectures will explore the life and influence of one of the most colorful personalities of the Renaissance: Giorgio Vasari (1511-1574), the biographer, painter, collector, and founder of modern art history. Since the 15th century, Vasari's often-amusing *Lives of the Artists* has been the major source book for students of Italian Renaissance painting. The series of six consecutive Sunday lectures will begin February 21 at 4:00 in the National Gallery Auditorium with a discussion of "Vasari, the Man." There is no admission charge to these lectures, which are open to the public.

Dr. Boase, Chairman of the British School at Rome since 1965, was educated at Rugby

School and Magdalen College, Oxford, and has served as a Professor of the History of Art at the University of London and Director of the Courtauld Institute of Art (1937-47). He was president of Magdalen College from 1947-1968. His publications include *Boniface VIII* (1933), *St. Francis of Assisi* (1936—new edition 1968), and numerous articles in the *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*. He is also editor of the *Oxford History of English Art*.

The A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts began in 1952 through grants from the Avalon and Old Dominion Foundations. Their purpose is to "bring to the people of the United States the best contemporary thought and scholarship bearing on the subject of the fine arts." The A. W. Mellon Lectures are published in the Bollingen Series by the Princeton University Press. Previous lecturers include Sir Nikolaus Pevsner, the British architectural historian, and Kenneth Clark, author and narrator of the "Civilisation" series, whose lectures in 1953 later were published as *The Nude: A Study in Ideal Form*.

EXTENSION SERVICE

A new slide lecture, "The Creative Past: Art of Africa," is now available to schools and community groups through the Gallery's Extension Service. Based on the highly-acclaimed African sculpture exhibition held at the Gallery in February 1970, this new program offers a basic introduction to the subject through text, recording and seventy-eight color slides.

Three revised slide lectures also offered through the Extension Service. "The Artist's Eye: Pictorial Composition," "The Artist's Hand: Five Techniques of Painting," and "Color and Light in Painting" are now available. The Extension Service, which reached over 3,000 communities last year, also provides movies, film strips and traveling exhibits with over sixty titles ranging from the Byzantine period to the 20th century.

Monday, Feb. 1, through Sunday, Feb. 7

Painting of the week.—(11' x 14' reproductions with texts for sale this week—15 cents each. If mailed, 25 cents each)—*ReDon. Evocation of Roussel* (Chester Dale Collection) Gallery 84—Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week.—*The Exhibition of Ingres in Rome*, Central Gallery—Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour.—*Introduction to the Collection*, Rotunda—Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture.—*The Styles of Ingres*. Guest Speaker: Robert Rosenblum, Professor of Fine Arts, New York University, New York—Auditorium 4:00.

"Civilisation," VI—Protest and Communication—Saturday & Sunday, 12:30 and 1:30.

Sunday concert.—Richard Morris, Pianist—East Garden Court, 7:00.

Monday, Feb. 8, through Sunday, Feb. 14

Painting of the week.—11'x14' reproductions with texts for sale this week—15 cents each. If mailed, 25 cents each—Vigée-Lebrun. *The Marquise de Pezé and the Marquise de Rouget with Her Two Children* (Gift of the Bay Foundation) Gallery 55—Tues. through Sat. 12:00 & 2:00; Sun. 3:30 & 6:00.

Tour of the week.—*View Painting Prior to Ingres*, Rotunda—Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour.—*Introduction to the Collection*, Rotunda—Mon. through Sat. 11:00 & 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture.—Hogarth's "Beggars' Opera." Guest Speaker: Ronald Paulson, Chairman, Department of English, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore—Auditorium 4:00.

"Civilisation," VII—Grandeur and Obedience—Saturday and Sunday, 12:30 and 1:30.

Sunday concert.—Elizabeth Kirkpatrick, Soprano Marjorie Yates, Flute, assisted by Meredith Little, Harpsichord; Loren Kitt, Clarinet; Glenn Garlick, Cello—East Garden Court, 7:00.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office.

Monday, Feb. 15, through Sunday, Feb. 21

Painting of the week.—8' x 10' black-and-white photographs with texts for sale this week—75c each. Vuillard, *Public Garden*, (Lent by Nathan Cummings) Gallery 76—Tues. through Sat. 12:00 and 2:00; Sun. 3:30 and 6:00.

Tour of the week.—*Artists in Rome.* Rotunda—Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour.—*Introduction to the Collection.* Rotunda—Mon. 11:00, 1:00 and 3:00; Tues. through Sat. 11:00 and 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture.—*Vasari, the Man and the Book: The Man, Guest Speaker: T. S. R. Boase, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts—Auditorium 4:00.*

"Civilisation," VIII.—The Light of Experience Saturday and Sunday, 12:30 and 1:30.

Sunday concert.—Shoshana Shoshan, Soprano, Allan Rogers, Pianist—East Garden Court, 7:00.

Monday, Feb. 22, through Sunday, Feb. 28

Painting of the week.—11' x 14' reproduction with texts for sale this week—15 cents each. (If mailed 25 cents each)—Gilbert Stuart, *The Skater* (Andrew Mellon Collection), Gallery 60B—Tues. through Sat. 12:00 and 2:00; Sun. 3:30 and 6:00.

Tour of the week.—*Ingres and Neoclassicism.* Central Gallery—Tues. through Sat. 1:00; Sun. 2:30.

Tour.—*Introduction to the Collection.* Rotunda—Mon. through Sat. 11:00 and 3:00; Sun. 5:00.

Sunday lecture.—*Vasari, the Man and the Book: The Book, Guest Speaker: T. S. R. Boase, A. W. Mellon Lecturer in the Fine Arts—Auditorium 4:00.*

"Civilisation," IX.—The Pursuit of Happiness—Saturday and Sunday, 12:30 and 1:30.

Sunday concert.—Sheila Henig, Pianist—East Garden Court, 7:00.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery Staff, are broadcast by Station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5).

A HOPEFUL SIGN IN POLAND: POLISH MILITANTS ESCAPE REPRISAL

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have been watching with great interest the recent developments in Poland under the new party leader, Edward Gierek.

It is, I believe, a cautiously hopeful sign that Mr. Gierek has ordered no state reprisals against the militant shipyard workers who struck recently to appeal their economic and political grievances.

Perhaps this gesture on Mr. Gierek's part signals the beginning of a new era of peaceful dissent in this strife-torn nation. We will continue to observe Mr. Gierek's policies with careful optimism.

Mr. Speaker, news articles about these possibly hopeful new policies follow:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Jan. 27, 1971]

POLISH MILITANTS ESCAPE REPRISALS

SZCZECIN, POLAND.—Militant shipyard workers who led last week's strike will suffer no state reprisals, by order of new party leader Edward Gierek, it was learned Tuesday.

Szczecin, badly hit by food price riots last month, swung into a second day of normal working. People lined up Tuesday morning to buy up the local paper which gave the first full account of Gierek's meeting with protesting workers here.

The men had struck to emphasize economic and political grievances, including a demand for the punishment of those who ordered militia and troops to shoot at civilians during the pre-Christmas clashes. Unconfirmed reports say scores of persons were shot and hundreds injured.

"The yardmen insisted that people who gave the order to shoot be severely punished, the newspaper Glos Szczecinski said.

Gierek, after promising strike leaders they would not be punished, warned that the nation was in a "blind alley" economically. There was no more money at present for further wage hikes.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 29, 1971]

ON WAY TO JOBS, POLES CHEER GIEREK

(By Eric Gourne)

VIENNA.—Poland's Baltic workers went back to work and Edward Gierek, the Poles' new party chief, returned to his desk in Warsaw after an exchange on an equal footing without parallel in 25 years of Communist rule in Eastern Europe.

For Mr. Gierek, his visit to the troubled northern ports was a notable success in a sedulously pursued effort to establish a meaningful dialogue between the regime and the people.

It goes much further—especially in its background of incipient revolt—than the rapport which the Hungarian regime has established with its workers through the modest "liberalization" of the labor unions in years of cautious reform.

Not even the independent Yugoslav Communists have had quite such a confrontation.

CHEERED BY WORKMEN

For the Polish workers it was an unique occasion because by bypassing their "establishment" representatives they constituted their own negotiating bodies and won their demand to put their case on their own terms and without inhibitions of any kind directly to the country's leader.

From all accounts Mr. Gierek's frank plea for "confidence, help, better work, understanding and patience," coupled with undertakings to adjust the new norm and incentive arrangements which finally sparked the December discontent was well received.

He was cheered at the end of a meeting with striking shipyard workers at Szczecin where he arrived when the yards had been idle for almost 72 hours and again at Gdansk which is Poland's biggest shipbuilding center.

At Szczecin the questions and his answers and his painstaking hearing of the many workers delegated by the rank and file went on into the small hours. A "working session" with the Gdansk workers lasted seven hours.

After it was all over, the return to normal working in the Baltic ports apparently was soon complete.

Both sides—the new regime and the workers in a branch of industry whose welfare is vital to economic growth—seemed to have gained appreciably from the exchange.

From early January the workers had in-

sisted that Mr. Gierek visit them for personal on-the-spot examination of their grievances. And they clinched their point with a succession of work stoppages, go-slows, and agitation at which their demands rapidly assumed a political as well as economic character.

Already in the wake of Mr. Gierek's visit some local officials who had lost the workers' confidence have been relieved of their posts. More are to follow and also, according to Warsaw reports, more changes at higher, national levels can be expected before the party's Central Committee plenum in early February.

Mr. Gierek's reputation and his popularity and acceptance are obviously all considerably enhanced. His principal aim on this tour was both to hear the workers and to bring home to them the serious nature of the country's economic problems.

He included a warning against allowing their understandable impatience for better things to be exploited by people still in places of influence. He said some of them were "causing difficulties."

HINT TO OPPOSITION

It was his first semipublic allusion to the continued presence in the leadership of potential opposition. But, according to informed observers in Warsaw, his sympathetic handling of men and events in Szczecin and Gdansk not only cooled a dangerous development there but also deflated any who hanker for a harder line.

At least for the present, his talks with the workers apparently reflected his own policies earlier—that is before he came to power as party chief in Silesia, Poland's rich coal-and steel-producing region. There consumer standards were never allowed to be overshadowed or overridden by production goals as elsewhere in Poland.

He set out to bring home to the workers the plain, inescapable fact that the economy at present has no reserves or slack in which living standards can be raised as rapidly as the workers would wish. His appeal was especially emphasized for the shipyard workers who have been responsible for Poland's biggest single area of economic expansion since the war.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1971]

POLISH PARTY PAPER ANALYZES, DENOUNCES GOMULKA REGIME

(By Dan Morgan)

WARSAW.—A close lieutenant of new Polish Communist leader Edward Gierek has published the first comprehensive, party-sanctioned critique of the government of Wladyslaw Gomulka, who was ousted from power in December.

Western diplomatic analysts here believe the detailed document may serve as the basis for a thoroughgoing purge of party elements loyal to Gomulka and his policies.

The author is Maciej Szczepanski, editor of the daily Trybuna Robotnica which is the main party paper of Gierek's home region of Silesia. His article took up more than a full page of the paper's Thursday edition.

It sharply attacked by name two of Gomulka's proteges, economic planner Boleslaw Jaszczuk and ideologist Zenon Kliszko, both of whom lost their posts on the politburo in last month's shuffle. And it referred to the "autocratic methods of the former first secretary"—Gomulka.

At the same time Szczepanski made a long and detailed analysis and critique of the economic, ideological and political faults of the old regime. In essence, he maintained that bad economic programs had squandered the hard work of devoted leaders.

Though party and non-party officials have

been outspokenly critical in private of the Gomulka regime since its demise, Western diplomats said this was the most sweeping condemnation to appear in an official publication here. Excerpts have been printed in the Warsaw press and read over television.

The article appeared to serve the double aim of enhancing the reputation of Gierek as man who had opposed faulty policies, and of preparing the party and country for the coming eighth plenum of the Central Committee and more sweeping personnel changes.

"Personnel policies are now undergoing major change," the article said. "Every man is being assessed as to his abilities. The party rejects the old system of Kliszko of picking 'his boys' regardless of whether they knew how or wanted to serve the party. We know now that birth, long years of work or past merits are in fact secondary. The main thing is the amount of ideological knowledge and political engagement, experience and professional qualifications."

Szczepanski wrote that party organizations have now been "given back their statutory duties, rights and functions."

No date has been announced for the Central Committee plenum, but it is expected to take place in the first half of February. Gomulka and his associates are still members of the Central Committee. It was clear from the Szczepanski article that, in the view of Gierek supporters, those men stand for policies that are completely discredited.

The writer described the "bungling inability of economic experts in the Jaszczuk style" and said that their erroneous policies meant that the "devotion of the working class brought no results in the sphere of productivity or social amenities."

The new leadership has still not revealed its own program for solving the country's economic difficulties, but some guidelines are expected to emerge from the coming meeting.

According to reports from Szczecin, the riot-struck Baltic city visited by Gierek a week ago, the party leader won enthusiastic applause when he said that the unpopular incentive program of the Gomulka Government was being shelved.

The object of the program was to encourage efficiency by rewarding profit-making firms. But managers and workers found the plan too complex.

The main objections of workers to the incentive plan were that the rewards were to be allotted on a yearly basis rather than in monthly paychecks, and that bonuses were tied to the efficiency of the enterprises as a whole rather than individuals.

Western economic analysts believe that Gierek may introduce his own incentive program in the future, taking into account the objections to the old plan.

In the context of "worsening standards of living," and other economic ills, the "bungling" price increases of December which triggered rioting were only the "last drop of bitterness," Szczepanski wrote.

"The working class was trying to work devotedly," he continued. "However, the engagement of the working people was not accompanied by wise economic policy and effective concepts. Voluntarism, interference with and paralyzing of the state administration and autocratic styles of governing led to this—that the hard work of our people did not bring expected results in either quantity or quality of production."

"Our party quite frankly admits that the workers are right when they say their life is hard. Whenever justified, we always confirm that real wages of some workers, relative to the prices, are low. Our party will not continue the old practice of trying to talk people into believing that the last price hike was no profit to the state and no loss to the workers. This is absurd."

FLAWS IN REVENUE-SHARING PLAN

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the tremendous interest in so-called revenue-sharing plans, I think it is valuable at this point to reprint the fine article by Carl T. Rowan published in the Washington Evening Star on January 27, 1971. I believe we can profit from the perspective of this acute observer. The article follows:

FLAWS IN REVENUE-SHARING PLAN

(By Carl T. Rowan)

I just can't work up an enthusiasm for giving huge sums of federal money to George Wallace of Alabama or Ronald Reagan of California, with no restrictions on how that money is to be spent.

I appreciate fully the financial crisis of most states and the near-bankruptcy of many cities, but "revenue sharing" as proposed by the Nixon administration does not strike me as an effective or proper solution.

When it comes to philosophy of government, I agree that power ought to rest with the people, that people at the very local level ought to have as much control over their affairs as possible, that our federal bureaucracy has become so big and unmanageable that the public has every reason to be fed up with waste and duplication.

But before we plunge blindly into a revenue-sharing binge, we had better remind ourselves that the reason why the states want to share federal money is precisely why the federal government has grown too big and unwieldy.

That reason is that the federal government can achieve things that people at the local level cannot or will not do because local governments lack the resources—or the political guts.

The federal government has grown fat and overpowered because of default at the local level.

Why should the federal government be paying to educate pre-schoolers in West Virginia, or educationally deprived teen-agers in Tennessee, or to build dormitories on a campus in Oregon? Because the states and other units of local government would never do it.

Why is the federal government involved in consumer protection, voter-registration, health care for the poor and the aged, or food and food stamps for the poor and hungry? Because state and local government long ago abdicated—or ducked—responsibility in these fields.

Special interest and special privilege have always operated with greater success on local politicians than on leaders at the national level. So local politicians have been more than happy to leave it to federal authorities to do the unpopular, controversial jobs.

Local officials naturally prefer to let the federal government levy taxes and pass money on to them. That is much less risky politically than asking the federal government to reduce its taxes substantially so states and cities can raise their taxes and in that way get adequate revenues.

The system now proposed would turn money and spending power back to local governments, but it would not turn back the responsibility and accountability that would exist if local units of government had to bear the onus of levying the taxes.

I am aware of a major flaw in the argument that federal taxes should be reduced,

leaving states and cities to raise money by increasing their taxes: That would still leave our poorer states in financial trouble because they simply do not have an adequate tax base.

So what revenue-sharing means is that the federal government will take money from rich communities and share it with poor communities to equalize the level of life from state to state.

That is an acceptable goal—as long as the revenues that are turned back are also used to equalize the level of life within the state or the city.

But that is where I have my deepest reservations about turning back to local governments several billions of dollars in unrestricted block grants. History suggests that the funds will not be used in a way that lifts everyone's level of life in many cities and states.

Even when Congress allocated a billion dollars a year with a clear stipulation that it be used for "compensatory education" of poor, underprivileged children, local officials were caught using the money on the well-to-do or to continued programs that previously were financed with regular local funds.

A similar misuse of funds occurred when Congress allocated millions to encourage and increase school desegregation.

Congress has every reason, then, to be dubious about handing over vast sums of "no strings" money to states and cities.

And President Nixon's revenue-sharing package probably will be even less appealing when we learn what federal programs he plans to reduce or abolish in order to free \$10 billion for local government.

What is more acceptable—and more likely of congressional approval—is that the federal government lift the \$5 billion welfare burden off the states and that it assume much more of the cost of education.

That would give the nation a reformed welfare program with national standards instead of the mish-mash of widely differing state programs. It would set us on the way toward an educational system where every child in South Carolina would have about the same chance of getting an education as the children of Michigan or California.

That would leave states and cities with adequate funds to meet other needs. And it would leave power to the local people—to the extent that local people are willing to pay for their power.

REVENUE SHARING—PASSING THE BUCK—IS ALBANY'S GAME

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a longtime newspaperman friend, Jerry Allan, whom I came to know well when he was covering municipal affairs in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., has shifted his base of operations to Albany, our State capital.

He is Albany bureau chief for the Buffalo Evening News and keeps tabs on the broad State picture while at the same time giving special attention to the interests of our western end of the State.

On the current controversial subject of Federal revenue sharing, Mr. Allan has taken the broad view of recent doings in Albany which he calls passing the buck.

For the information of my colleagues, here is Mr. Allan's article of January 30:

**REVENUE SHARING—PASSING THE BUCK—
IS ALBANY'S GAME**

(By Jerry Allan)

ALBANY.—Politicians, who delight in evasive language, call it "shifting responsibilities."

But "passing the buck" is a more descriptive term for what happened in Albany this week.

The setting was a dining room in a downtown hotel where about 200 mayors of villages and cities gathered for a legislative meeting of the State Conference of Mayors, a group that lobbies in Albany for small governments.

Gov. Rockefeller and Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York were the star attractions.

"I wish we had a mock fire," an observer said. "We could put Gov. Rockefeller at the end of the line, passing the first bucket of water. He hands it to Mayor Lindsay and so on up the line until we get to the fire and there is the mayor of the smallest village in the state, with the ultimate responsibility for putting out the fire."

The fire, of course, is the money shortage, or in polite terms "the fiscal crisis" that every government leader, from President Nixon to the little village mayor, claims is shoving municipalities into bankruptcy.

VILLAGE GOING DOWN DRAIN

A man with the improbable name of Milton Elezophn, the mayor of Newark, in Wayne County, said his village is going down the drain because of "double taxation," forced on the village because it is part of a town.

"We need help," Mayor Elezophn said.

John B. Walsh, the lawyer who runs the Buffalo lobby in Albany, said the city could do better if persons who live in the Erie County suburbs paid for services supplied by Buffalo.

"We are children of the state," said Mayor Erastus Corning of Albany.

"Cities, counties and villages in a fiscal crisis must turn to Albany," cried Lindsay.

After several hours of buck passing it was Gov. Rockefeller's turn to get in line.

"What we need desperately," Rockefeller said, "is Washington's help in meeting the crushing problems," a reference to the governor's plea for \$11 billion in revenue sharing money from the Congress.

"Several overlapping layers of government are represented here," one mayor said, "and when you get them all in one room you get a good idea of how one layer blames the other, or seeks help from the other."

IT'S THIS YEAR'S CATCHWORD

Revenue sharing is the catchword in Albany this year.

Reporters waited in vain this week for any discussion by the mayors or even Rockefeller of using the tax dollar more efficiently, obtaining more productivity from the millions of village, town, city, county and state employes.

Walsh didn't bother to explain why municipalities in Erie County need about 25 separate police departments.

Mayor Stephen May of Rochester saw a ray of hope in an 18-member, blue-ribbon commission appointed by Gov. Rockefeller to review the problems of local governments. It will spend about \$250,000.

The state, of course, already has an Office for Local Government which uses about \$6 million a year "to increase the capabilities of local governments to organize and manage collectively local functions and services."

In all the discussions of revenue sharing, either by villages, cities, counties, the state or the federal government, it is difficult to get at the truth and the politicians, even

Rockefeller and Lindsay, are not telling the complete story.

"The localities are virtually powerless" to find any new tax sources, Lindsay complained the other day.

Yet in the 11 years he has been governor, Rockefeller has persuaded the Legislature to give New York City authority to impose an income tax and to tap about 30 other tax levies.

STATE PAYS ITS SHARE

The Governor appears to be on solid ground when he claims that New York State taxpayers send billions to Washington and get back only 11 cents on the dollar.

Rockefeller is correct in that direct federal grants to the state total about \$2 billion.

But federal accountants are also correct when they say that the governor is not including, for example, New York's pro rata share of the cost of the Defense Department, which presumably watches over the security of New Yorkers as well as the rest of the nation.

A few state legislators feel that, even if a reluctant Congress approves revenue sharing, only a few years will elapse and local governments will plead poverty again.

"You could open Ft. Knox to Lindsay one day," said Assemblyman Vito B. Battista of Brooklyn. "He'd empty it and be back the next day for more dough."

Battista feels that New York City and all other local governments could obtain more revenue by overhauling property assessments.

ON TAXING REAL ESTATE

During his first term, 1958-61, Mayor Sedita of Buffalo began to review city property assessments with the idea of raising the tax base but there was tremendous property owner opposition and he abandoned the plan.

The Legislature last year adopted a law designed to remove property assessment from politics but it will be a long time before valuation of property for tax purposes reaches a state standard.

Revenue sharing from whatever source, all politicians agree, is another way of tapping the taxpayer since the private enterprise wage earner is the source of all taxes.

The collected speeches of William E. Miller, if the Lockport politician ever decides to collect them, will not rival the works of Winston Churchill.

But one of his remarks, made often during the 1964 Goldwater-Miller presidential campaign, is worth recalling, now that federal revenue sharing is seen as salvation. Said Miller:

"The federal government never gives you anything that it hasn't first taken away."

**LIBRARY TRUSTEES HONOR
ABE KOFMAN**

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Abe Kofman is not only an excellent newspaperman but an outstanding civic leader. He has been in the forefront of promoting projects to benefit Alameda County, and much of the space in his papers is devoted to extolling the virtues of library programs. This is just one example of his civic endeavors and it was justly recognized recently

when he was presented the first Trustees Award by the board of library trustees.

The following article outlines the part played by Mr. Kofman and his newspapers with respect to the San Leandro Community Library Center:

LIBRARY TRUSTEES HONOR ABE KOFMAN

(By Josephine Roberts)

SAN LEANDRO.—The policy of The Morning News as determined by its publisher, Abe Kofman, is to give extensive coverage to news stories originating in San Leandro. This policy brought Kofman a handsome bronze trophy and a commendation spelling out services rendered from the Board of Library Trustees on Saturday.

The first "Trustees Award" was accepted by Mort Kofman, assistant publisher, as The Morning News publisher was out of town receiving another award for community service.

The presentation was made by James P. Riley, president of the Board of Library Trustees during an open house and reception commemorating the 10th anniversary of the dedication of the San Leandro Community Library Center.

The commendation noted that the entire staff of The Morning News has given much time and effort to tell the Community Library stories, both for routine services and special events.

This coverage has benefited greatly those who use library services as well as those organizations and staff supplying these services.

In reviewing the excellent relationship that has existed between the Library Trustees and the entire Mornings News Trustees extended to the Morning News—Abe Kofman, publisher, its commendation together with the first "Trustees Award" trophy in sincere appreciation of valuable services rendered the library program.

The commendation carries the signatures of James P. Riley, Vernon T. Larson, Joseph W. Smith Carlos Almeida, Faith Frazier, and C. H. Lubker.

The Morning News and its publisher were lauded for strong support not only of library programs since the modern facility was dedicated but for support of the fight to acquire the library.

Riley mentioned that the Morning News had carried stories about the building of the library center when the project was simply a need and a dream.

Present at the anniversary open house were some members of the original "Big L Committee" that spearheaded the drive for the San Leandro Community Center Library. These ten people later worked closely with the architect during the planning and erection of the Estudillo Avenue facility.

Among Big L Committee in attendance were James P. Riley, Edmund (Ted) Cole and Helen De George. Mrs. De George was the only woman on the Big L Committee.

Numerous people who had worked on subcommittees were in the audience as well as members of the San Leandro City Council, various city boards and commissions.

Mayor Jack D. Maltester paid brief tribute to all the people and organizations who had supported the effort to build the library center. He remarked that front page stories in the Morning News had played a vital role in enlisting community support and bringing the library project to a successful conclusion. He noted that continuing newspaper support had made the library a true community center serving the people efficiently and well.

Present at the open house and reception are the six students from Riberao Preto, San Leandro's sister city in Brazil. They were introduced by Carlos Almeida, library trustee and chairman of the Town Affiliation Committee.

COURAGE, COMPASSION MARK
WEST CONSHOHOCKEN TRAGEDY

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, a devastating series of gas-fed fires and explosions wracked the Borough of West Conshohocken, Pa., in my congressional district on the night of January 17, 1971. The toll is appalling: Four dead, 35 injured, and 24 homes destroyed.

While there are many questions that surround the circumstances of this tragedy, there are other things which stand out quite clearly. These are the courage and compassion of the many people whose lives became intertwined when the rending blasts tore apart masonry walls, spewed fire over the street, and left families homeless.

In my county of Montgomery, we are served by volunteer firemen and that night proved once again that they stand with the best of professional firemen anywhere in competence, valor, and dedication to duty. Joseph Powers, 19, a volunteer with West Conshohocken's George Clay Fire Co., was playing a hose on a burning house after initial blasts in homes when the streets erupted in explosion. The concussion caused the house's front wall to collapse. He was crushed to death.

His twin brother, James, was further away and was fighting the fire. He was injured along with other volunteer firemen.

Two children, missing the night of the fire, later were found dead. They were Michael Pruitt, 14, and his sister, Michelle, 8. Their grandfather Albert Rupp, 66, had been blown out of the house by one of the explosions and died later in the hospital.

In West Conshohocken, a community of a little more than 2,000 people with less than a square mile of area, the flags fly at half staff. Neighbors, service organizations, officials of government at all levels, and individuals are working to ease the burden of the grieving and the displaced.

The courage and compassion that marked the early hours of the West Conshohocken tragedy are evidenced in the continuing efforts of countless groups and individuals. As the Congressman, and formerly the State Senator for West Conshohocken, my personal inspection of the site further convinced me of the widespread impact of this disaster.

Words are inadequate to comfort a mother who has lost two children and her father. Expressions of sympathy cannot console a mother who has lost a twin son. Even all our efforts to provide shelter, clothing, and food for the homeless somehow cannot make up for the terrible suffering caused these people.

The scars of the West Conshohocken tragedy will remain. But remaining also will be the indomitable spirit of the volunteer firemen of George Clay Fire Co., as exemplified by Joseph Powers' sacri-

fice, and of their hundreds of counterparts from volunteer companies in the county. The cooperation and courage of police, government officials, and individuals certainly displayed the highest degree of concerned citizenship. I cannot single out any individual or group, nor would they want this, except to be known that they were tested and did not fail in their obligations to their fellow men.

To deplore and commiserate is not enough, however. I intend to do my utmost to cooperate with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission and others involved in investigating the reasons for these series of blasts and fires. Within Federal jurisdiction, I will propose recommendations, if the probes reveal these are necessary, for tightening Federal laws on natural gas pipelines.

Preliminary information provided to me indicated the cause may have been a crack in a weld of a 50-year-old 16-inch steel, high-pressure pipeline. I wondered, as I viewed the devastation in West Conshohocken, just how many other pipelines might be just as old or older, might be just as susceptible to leaks or stresses, and might be just as vulnerable to circumstances which led to the incredible series of events that comprised the West Conshohocken disaster.

The very least we owe to those who died, to the sorrowing survivors, to the homeless, and to those brave citizens who were there that night is to review all regulations, making sure they are strong enough, tightening them up and enacting new ones if necessary, making certain we have stiff inspection procedures and remedies for deficiencies, instituting procedures for immediately cutting off gas to ruptured lines, and taking every possible step to prevent a reoccurrence of this type of disaster.

**SALUTE TO BRAVE UKRAINIANS—
53D ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE**

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Ukraine proclaimed their independence 53 years ago, but enjoyed very little freedom before they were crushed by Russian force.

For half of a century they have been victims of personal, religious, and political oppression, yet have never lost their spirit or desire to be free.

On this occasion, we in the Congress salute the brave Ukrainians and the work of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America who have done so much to sustain their fellow countrymen and to speak out against tyranny, not only in the Ukraine but wherever people are captive.

It is our hope—and our duty—to work for the day when all men will enjoy the right to choose their own way of life and their own government.

**OL' J. HENRY, CENTRAL TEXAS
CHRONICLER**

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a beloved and respected man passed into the realm of central Texas legend. Judge J. Henry Martindale was for 71 years a part of the heart of central Texas and was one of her greatest chroniclers.

Lovable, witty, plain spoken, and with a great love for the country and for the people, he regularly pounded out his thoughtful messages for his three newspaper columns on an old typewriter at the Caldwell County Courthouse.

Since I have been a Member of this body, I have been privileged to make many trips to Caldwell County—and my visits always started from the courthouse and J. Henry. His views of current events were always full of simple wisdom and a true mirror of the sentiments of his area.

An able Austin newspaperman, Mr. Nat Henderson, did a fine job of relating what J. Henry has meant to central Texas. I would like to reprint their story in the RECORD at this time:

JUDGE, REPORTER: OL' J. HENRY LAID IN
RESTING PLACE

(By Nat Henderson)

LOCKHART.—They laid ol' J. Henry to rest Saturday in the Lockhart Graveyard.

That's probably the way Judge Martindale would have written his own obituary if he could have pecked it out on his old typewriter down at the Caldwell County Courthouse, like he did for so many decades for the Austin American-Statesman.

He passed away Thursday in a Houston infirmary after being born 71 years ago on a farm in the sandy hill country halfway between Lockhart and McMahan and doing a lot of things in the time between.

John Henry Martindale was justice of the peace in Caldwell County from 1933-42 and county treasurer from 1942 until just last month. He became a legend with his homespun philosophizing and storytelling in his newspaper columns. He wrote "J. Henry Says" in the Austin American, "Uncle Si's Observations" in the Austin Statesman and "Under the Courthouse Clock" in the Lockhart Post-Register for many years.

He became a correspondent for the Austin American in 1930 and continued to gather news from the Lockhart area until the early 1960's.

Martindale made news himself as well as reporting it. As a correspondent, he sometimes had to quote himself as a county official. He never accused himself of misquoting himself in the newspapers.

Once upon a time, Justice of the Peace Martindale was presiding at an examining trial in a criminal case. The prosecuting attorney introduced some evidence which would have made news. The prosecutor advised Martindale the judge not to give the information to Martindale the reporter.

A headline the following morning in the Austin American said, "J. Henry Not Talking to Self."

Once upon another time, Judge Martindale got Reporter Martindale in a jam over a Christmas turkey on the courthouse lawn. Lockhart businessmen were giving away prizes, and the turkey gift flew the coop and roosted in a tree.

A young boy climbed the tree, captured the bird and came crashing to the ground when the turkey flapped its wings.

"The ambulance carried the boy off to the hospital," Martindale wrote later, "and I heard on the street the lad was dead on arrival. I beat it to the telephone and called the American. They printed the story the following morning. But when I got to town the next morning, I heard the boy had iodine spread over his cuts and was turned loose. "Guess I should have called the coroner to confirm the death, but, shoot, I was the coroner," Martindale said.

Martindale got a bang out of spoofing people, places and things including himself. "I attend a rural school. Got a diploma from Harmony Grove Rural High School and was salutatorian. The other member of the class was valedictorian," he wrote.

Being an honor graduate, Martindale often chided those who were against progress in the public schools. Once the Lockhart schools became the center of a controversy over money to be spent to improve the school buildings. He wrote a column about the cost of the proposed remodeling on the school restrooms.

"We didn't have all that fancy plumbing back in Harmony Grove School, and people got educated just the same. The girls went to the pecan mott on one side of the school, and the boys went to the oak grove on the other side."

After that, very few people objected to the building program in Lockhart.

Martindale's columns in several newspapers sometimes were poignant, sometimes hilarious and always full of thought. He had a simple explanation for nearly everything—including politics.

"My maternal grandmother was a young housewife with an infant son and lived near Gordon, Ga., when Sherman and his henchmen came marching by on their way to the sea. . . . She died at 96, an unreconstructed Rebel to the end," Martindale wrote in 1961.

"Had I voted for the GOP in November and had I died a few weeks later and had I made it to Heaven, I sure would have had a hard time explaining my vote to Grandma," he said.

AFL-CIO'S GOLDFINGER ASSAILS NEW DEPRECIATION RULES AS "TAX BONANZA" FOR BUSINESS

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the research director of the AFL-CIO, Mr. Nathaniel Goldfinger, had some cogent remarks about the administration's new depreciation rules in the course of a radio interview carried January 26 on Labor News Conference over the Mutual Broadcasting System:

LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE

Subject: Billion Dollar Tax Break for Business.

Guest: Nathaniel Goldfinger, director of the AFL-CIO's Department of Research.

Reporters: Eileen Shanahan, of the New York Times' Washington bureau and Frank Swoboda, labor correspondent for Business Week magazine.

Moderator: Frank Harden.

MUTUAL ANNOUNCER. The following time is presented as a public service by this station and the Mutual Broadcasting System.

HARDEN: Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL-CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL-CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Nathaniel Goldfinger, director of the AFL-CIO's Department of Research.

Early this month, President Nixon announced new federal tax procedures permitting business and industry a faster write-off of expenditures for equipment that would cut several billion dollars from federal tax revenues. Although implementation of the plan must be delayed until completion of hearings required by the Administrative Procedures Act, it is clear that the Administration intends to press for it. The AFL-CIO charged that the billion dollar tax break for business would "help those who need it least as the expense of those who need it most," and branded the move "incredible." Here to question Mr. Goldfinger about the AFL-CIO's views of that Administration-proposed tax break for business, chances for its adoption and other economic matters, are Eileen Shanahan, of the New York Times' Washington bureau, and Frank Swoboda, labor correspondent for Business Week Magazine. Your moderator, Frank Harden.

And now, Mr. Swoboda, I believe you have the first question?

SWOBODA. Mr. Goldfinger, could you give us a basic description of just what "liberalized corporate depreciation scales" means?

GOLDFINGER. Well, in a way, this is a technical issue. Mr. Swoboda—but, a technical issue that amounts to billions of dollars of tax write-off for business.

It's a strange and wrong-headed move, as I see it, for the President to make the first step of economic policy measures in the year 1971, a form of tax bonanza amounting to several billion dollars to corporate business.

The way it works, business will be permitted to write off the cost of machines and equipment at a rate about 20 percent faster than at present. The so-called "normal life" of a machine will be cut by about one-fifth. If under the present Treasury rules it is written off in ten years, the new Treasury rules will permit the company to write it off in eight years.

Now, this amounts to an awful lot of money, when you add the whole thing together. The Treasury Department's own estimates are, \$2.7 billion in the first full year of operation, running to more than \$4 billion five years down the road.

This is a huge tax cut to business. It's the equivalent of something like a seven percent tax cut for corporate business. But the Treasury did a few other things here.

They not only stepped up the regular write-off for business equipment by about 20 percent, they also provided an additional write-off in the first year. Then—and to me, this is utterly incredible—they propose to drop the reserve ratio test. This test, under the old rules, required the company to actually replace the machines at about the rate that they were writing them off. The Treasury now announces that it will drop this test.

By eliminating the reserve ratio test, the Treasury, it seems to me, is eliminating any rational basis for depreciation write-offs. It's simply saying to American business that from now on, depreciation is whatever the Treasury says it is, not the rate at which machinery wears out and is replaced.

SHANAHAN. Well, the Administration justifies the depreciation speed-up on the grounds that it would help stimulate business—purchases of equipment—and that this would help bring us out of what they are not yet calling a recession, but most economists are, by now, I think. What's the alternative? Isn't it a good idea to stimulate

that spending and other kinds of spending that would help pull us out of the recession?

GOLDFINGER. Well, we need expansionary policies, Miss Shanahan, certainly.

We've been in a recession for about a year and one-half.

Unemployment has risen to about five million people, or six percent of the labor force.

Additional millions of people are compelled to work part-time, and their weekly take-home pay is cut.

On top of that we have inflation.

The result is a combination of inflation and recession.

We certainly do need an expansionary policy—we do need a massive, expansionary stimulus to the economy—to stimulate sales, production and employment.

But it seems to me that this is the most fantastic way of doing it. This is the old "trickle-down" theory of the 1890's and 1920's—the economic theory of Presidents McKinley, Coolidge and Harding.

SHANAHAN. What would you do as an alternative?

GOLDFINGER. Well, the alternative is to increase sales and increase production by increasing government expenditures for vitally-needed social requirements, such as housing, hospital construction and school construction. That increases employment—and it also increases public investment. That, Miss Shanahan, would increase industry's operating rate.

It is true, as the Administration states, that business outlays—business expenditures for new machinery—are now leveling off. But, they are not leveling off because business doesn't have the money to spend—they are leveling off, because industry is operating at only about 76 percent of capacity. In other words, at present, almost 25 percent of American industry's machinery, equipment, and plants is standing idle, and standing idle because sales and production are insufficient. There aren't enough customers for the things that we can produce in this economy.

We have to increase the number of customers—we have to increase consumer spending power—we have to increase government spending and government investment. That way, you eventually increase business investments in new plants and machines, rather than to try to do it through the old "trickle-down" theory of handouts and tax-bonanzas to business.

SWOBODA. Mr. Goldfinger, what's the difference between this and President Kennedy's Investment Tax Credit in 1962?

GOLDFINGER. Well, the Investment Tax Credit for business investments in equipment, which President Kennedy put into effect back in 1962, was opposed by the AFL-CIO at the time.

There was a difference, however.

The seven percent tax credit did show up as profit. The gimmickry of the Administration's move here is technical, but it is very interesting. By stepping up depreciation write-offs, the way the Treasury is doing it at present, they are increasing the reported costs of doing business, for bookkeeping purposes. And on that basis, business gets a tax cut, because reported business costs are increasing and reported profits are declining, and business gets a tax bonanza.

The big corporation will get the lion's share of this, not the small businesses.

So, what's happening here is a form of gimmickry—speeding up depreciation write-offs, increased business costs—as reported on the books.

It could become—and may well become—an inflationary pressure on price levels, because the reported costs of business will increase and therefore the mark-ups will be higher.

SHANAHAN. You're saying that this thing makes profits look smaller, even though that actually isn't the case?

GOLDFINGER. That's right, Miss Shanahan. By increasing reported costs of doing business, this form of tax gimmickry—speeding up depreciation write-offs—reduces the reported profits of business. In fact, I wouldn't be a bit surprised if a year or two from now, we hear cries from individual companies, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, about a "profit-squeeze," about low profits. But the probable cries of poverty from those sources, under these circumstances, will be entirely—or largely—a fraud—the result of depreciation write-off gimmickry fostered by the Administration.

SWOBODA. Do you see it providing any immediate stimulus to capital spending?

GOLDFINGER. With unemployment at six percent of the labor force, and with industry operating at 76 percent of capacity, I see practically no impact on the economy, at this point.

In fact, your own magazine, Mr. Swoboda, *Business Week*, in the issue of January 16th, stated, quote "There is also scant evidence that liberalizing depreciation at this time will induce many companies to change investment plans."

I think this is reasonable.

Businessmen don't invest money just for the sake of investing money; they're not going to buy machines merely for the sake of buying machines.

Businessmen invest money in new machinery and new equipment in the hope that they will be able to use the machinery and equipment to produce goods and sell them at a profit.

It all gets back to the sagging economy—not enough sales—not enough customers. The sound way, in our judgment, to stimulate the economy is not through this old "trickle-down" theory of the 1890's, but through increased public investment in the kinds of things American society needs—hospital construction, school construction, rebuilding the cities, stepping up all of these kinds of activities, which would help American society create jobs, create customers. This not only creates jobs on the site—on-site construction—but also creates jobs and increases investment in such things as cement companies, steel companies, and all the other things that are used in public investment. This is the way to stimulate the economy on a sound basis, as I see it—not the old "trickle-down" theory and tax gimmickry.

SHANAHAN. Mr. Goldfinger, a couple of young lawyers who work for Ralph Nader have filed suit against this liberalization of depreciation on the grounds that the Treasury didn't go through the proper procedures of public hearings and so forth, and couldn't do it under existing law. I know it's really a question for a lawyer, but, do you think that's a serious charge? Do they have any chance of overturning this?

GOLDFINGER. Well, I don't know that they have a chance of overturning it, Miss Shanahan. I'm not a lawyer, and these are very technical issues.

But, one thing is clear; the Treasury did pull back from the immediate announcement, and they are now proceeding on the basis of providing special hearings on this issue, under the Administrative Procedures Act.

SHANAHAN. As I understand it, that's just on some of the details, like whether it's going to apply to utilities and so on, not on the basic issue, which is 20 percent faster depreciation.

GOLDFINGER. Well, I think that there is a question as to whether the Internal Revenue

Service or the Treasury Department has the discretionary authority, on its own, to eliminate the so-called reserve ratio test.

SHANAHAN. That's the one that said you actually have to replace your machinery at something like the rate that you're claiming for tax purposes?

GOLDFINGER. Yes, yes, Miss Shanahan, I think there is a real issue here as to whether the Treasury has the discretionary authority to eliminate the whole basis for depreciation.

If you drop the reserve ratio test, there is no longer any rational basis for depreciation. Once you drop that concept—the reserve ratio test, under which business is replacing machinery at the rate they are writing it off—once you drop that, you're saying that the Treasury Department determines, at its whim or on its quirks, what the depreciation is.

Now, this goes beyond merely the technical term of depreciation. It also means that the U.S. Treasury Department determines what profits are.

I think it is a fantastic move for the federal government to drop the reserve ratio test, in addition to the depreciation speed-up.

SWOBODA. Mr. Goldfinger, one thing the Treasury Department did do was to go to Chairman Wilbur Mills (D-Ark.) of the House Ways and Means Committee, and get his approval of this 20 percent figure. Doesn't that, in effect, negate a lot of congressional opposition?

GOLDFINGER. I don't know what Chairman Mills told the Treasury Department, Mr. Swoboda, but I believe there is considerable opposition among Members of Congress—in both the House of Representatives and the Senate—to what the Treasury Department has done here.

Just look at this—they are handling out this tax bonanza to corporate business at a time of a large and growing budget deficit resulting from the recession, and from low production, low sales, high unemployment and inadequate income, therefore producing low revenue receipts for the federal government.

Well, it seems to me that there are an awful lot of things that could be done first and foremost, rather than hand out a seven percent tax cut to business. At this time, what we need is a stimulus to the economy to increase sales production and employment.

SHANAHAN. I wonder if we could maybe get over into that general economic area a little bit . . .

GOLDFINGER. Sure.

SHANAHAN. I gather that rather than give business this \$2 to \$4½ billion in tax reduction, you would spend the money on important public services in the budget.

GOLDFINGER. Oh, most certainly, Miss Shanahan. Those are the things that are needed.

SHANAHAN. I wonder what your thoughts are about the Nixon budget policy, already announced, which is that we should run a budget deficit somewhere in the neighborhood of probably \$15 billion—what they call a "full-employment budget," basing expenditures on how much revenue you would collect if we had only four percent unemployment, instead of six. Do you agree with that basic concept? And, do you think that's a good-sized deficit?

GOLDFINGER. Well, I'm not sure of the exact numbers, and won't be, until we look at the details of President Nixon's budget, which, at this point in time—as we are talking now—is not yet out. We haven't had a chance to look at it.

I say that we need a large increase in federal, public investment outlays. We need it

in order to stimulate business, in order to stimulate employment, in order to stimulate production.

I'm not sure what President Nixon's budget will amount to. For example, one of the factors in President Nixon's budget will be this giveaway to business. Something like \$2,700,000 less tax receipts from corporate business is involved in that budget.

I think it would be much wiser and sounder, in terms of economic and social policy, to spend that kind of money on needed public improvements which American society needs. With the state of our cities, the state of our hospitals and schools and the lack of adequate urban mass transit in this country, many positive things could be done with that more than \$2.5 billion which could stimulate the economy.

SWOBODA. Mr. Goldfinger, this isn't the only change in Nixon's economic policies. Now that he's getting toward 1972, he's gotten into the area "jawboning." Where do you see him going now?

GOLDFINGER. I have no idea on that, Mr. Swoboda. I mean, we hear all kinds of talk from the White House and various areas of the Administration.

But, I see no evidence, thus far, of a clear-cut policy, in terms of the kind of expansion that the President spoke of a few weeks ago, when he was interviewed by several television newscasters.

I fall to see any evidence, thus far, of the expansionary policies that the President was talking about then. You have to recall that not only has the Administration come up with a tax bonanza of \$2.7 billion, in the first year, to corporate business, but this comes only weeks after the President vetoed a bill passed by both houses of Congress to create jobs for the long-term unemployed and seriously underemployed; this comes only weeks after the President vetoed appropriations for housing and urban development; it comes only weeks after he vetoed funds for education.

Now, I don't understand, logically, what the President means, when he speaks of "expansion," because, when you add these things up, they are inherently contradictory. On the one hand, there is a tax bonanza for business; on the other, he speaks of "expansion." Yet, he vetoes expansionary legislation.

The Manpower Bill, for example, would have created several hundred thousand jobs—badly-needed jobs in public service-type employment—for the long-term unemployed and the seriously underemployed.

SHANAHAN. Interest rates are suddenly coming down very fast. Is that going to help the economy expand?

GOLDFINGER. Well, it will help housing a bit, Miss Shanahan, and it has already helped housing a bit.

But, the decline in interest rates—as you know from your expertise in watching the economy, Miss Shanahan—the interest rate decline is not because the Administration is driving interest rates down.

Interest rates are falling because of inadequate business loans and inadequate business.

There is just inadequate demand.

HIGHER EDUCATION INHERENTLY "CONSERVATIVE INSTITUTION"

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, few professions today are more challenging than

that of chief administrator of an institution of higher education. Of the positions they fill, perhaps none requires greater skill and flexibility than the presidency of community colleges. In addition to harmonizing the interests of student bodies with those of local communities, they must insure that their colleges serve post-high school students of all ages in a broad range of circumstances—persons wishing to enhance occupational skills, degree holders updating their knowledge, people exploring new avocations. It is gratifying that this Nation has young men with the qualities of foresight and courage that these jobs demand.

The Macomb County Community College in Michigan has the very good fortune to be led by just such a man. Dr. John R. Dimitry has been its president for the past 3 years. The MCCC is already one of the largest community colleges in the country. Its enrollment is expected to more than double to 40,000 students in the next 10 years. Under Dr. Dimitry the college is serving truly as a college for the community. The youthful president thinks the school's vocational program, already the most comprehensive in the State, should provide the same degree of instruction for persons in non-professional occupations as it does for degree candidates.

A personal profile of this outstanding college administrator appeared recently in the Macomb Daily. I commend it for reading to my colleagues:

HIGHER EDUCATION INHERENTLY "CONSERVATIVE INSTITUTION"

(By Christos N. Kassaris)

WARREN.—During a period when a college president's job is most difficult to perform, and several presidents have resigned from "presidential fatigue," John R. Dimitry, president of Macomb County Community College, faces the future with a fresh outlook.

Dr. Dimitry, who took command of the school three years ago, has created one of the most stable campuses in Michigan.

MCCC, one of the largest community colleges in the nation, presently has two campuses and approximately 18,000 enrolled students. Plans call for the building of a third campus within the next two years and a 40,000 student enrollment is expected by 1980.

When Dr. Dimitry was appointed acting president of MCCC in December, 1967, after the resignation of Robert E. Turner, he was named the only "logical man to be given the post."

The board of trustees did not ask for applications from any other candidate for the position when they considered naming a permanent president.

The board justified its action of naming Dimitry for the post by stating that he had worked for the college for five and a half years and did not need a period of familiarization with the school, which another candidate might have needed.

Dr. Dimitry has, according to faculty members and students, performed in an excellent manner as president, and has significantly contributed to the growth of MCCC.

Dimitry has an unusual degree of optimism for the future of the school.

"The future of MCCC is assured," Dimitry said. "We have the full support of the community and we can prove it by their attendance."

He went on to explain that presently the school is attracting more residents over 30 years of age.

Statistical figures recently released show that 52 per cent of the students are now enrolled in technical and vocational education.

"Our vocational program is the most comprehensive in the state and perhaps in the nation," Dimitry said.

The college, according to Dimitry, must help individuals help themselves in every sector of life. "We should provide a janitor as well as an engineer with the same degree of instruction so that they both perform accurately," the president said.

When asked about campus unrest and disorders Dimitry said:

"Too much is expected today of higher education, because some people see it as the agent of social change.

"Higher education should be an institution that transmits the culture. When you transmit the culture you perform a conservative function, you add new things, apply power of analysis and carry it to the new generation."

What has happened, Dimitry explained, is that some of the young generation want a drastic change and they like an inherently conservative institution to change drastically.

"Social activists want to change the world around," Dimitry said, "higher education is not equipped to and should not do that.

"In effect, some try to turn us into political and social action groups and we should resist it."

In as much as Dimitry believes that academic freedom can be destroyed by the fanaticism of the left, as well as the right, he feels that students should have an advisory voice in the decision-making process of running the school.

"Policy-making should be the responsibility of elected officials," Dimitry said. "Students, through the student senate and a variety of committees, should have only an advisory role."

In explaining why the students should only have an advisory role in the running of the school Dimitry said:

"Because they don't own the institution, but the people of Macomb County do."

The college newspaper called the "Last Issue" fascinates Dimitry and the views in it interest him, despite the fact that they are critical of him most of the time.

The only thing that troubles the president about the paper is that the people who run it "are not representative of the student body.

"It presents a distorted view of student opinion," Dimitry said. "Distortion is never worthwhile and I personally believe in diversity." I do not believe in a minority distorting the views of the majority.

"There is room for all to be heard, but no one's view should ever drown out other views," he added.

Educated in Detroit public schools Dimitry attended Spring Hill College and received his B.S. degree from Wayne State University in 1952 and his master of education degree there in 1954.

In 1966, he completed his doctor of education degree at Wayne State University, specializing in community college administration.

His Kellogg Foundation Fellowship in Community College Administration was awarded in 1961 and extended for a second year.

In addition to his activity with the Michigan Education Association and American Association of University Professors, he has served on the Michigan Curriculum Research Committee, research committee of the Michigan Association of Junior Colleges, and as a

consultant to Iowa Western Community College in Council Bluffs and Area II Community College in Des Moines.

Dimitry, 41, has been with the community college since October 1962 when he was employed as a part-time research associate. Since then he has served as administrative assistant, assistant to the president, director of the division of research and development, and director of the Center Campus.

As research director he was instrumental in designing the "House concept" for the Center Campus, which adopted Oxford University's system of small colleges in a larger complex of the community college.

Before coming to MDCC he taught at Highland Park Junior College and Wayne State University. He was employed as a recreation leader for Boys Clubs of Detroit and North Congregational Church of Woodward.

He is currently active on a state and local level in the Kiwanis Club, is a member of the Detroit Camp Fire Girls Board of Directors, a Sunday school teacher at Drayton Avenue Presbyterian Church, and a member of the Oakland County Democratic Organization.

REPRESENTATIVE MOORHEAD SALLUTES FLAG POEMS SENT BY FOURTH GRADE CLASS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, once again, a fourth grade class, taught by Miss Roberta Feldman of the John Minadeo School in Pittsburgh, has sent me a booklet of poems which they wrote in honor of our flag.

I marvel at the insight and ability that these youngsters evidence in their verse. I wonder how well some of their elders could perform if called upon to do the same chore.

Their total product, as explained in a letter from Master Bobby Gorby, is dedicated to "world peace," a very commendable objective.

When I introduced a similar book of poems last session, my office received comments from all over the country, attesting to popularity and worth of the children's effort.

I would like to introduce these poems into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information and pleasure of my colleagues.

I am sure you will enjoy reading them as much as I did:

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
January 12, 1971.

DEAR MR. MOORHEAD: In our reader Ventures, a unit on "Bold Beginnings" introduces the fourth grade student to the "American Story." After reading and discussing "The Rockets Red Glare" and "The Star-Spangled Banner" we decided to write poems expressing our patriotic feelings about our flag.

All of us did not agree on what the flag is or what the flag stands for, but we all voiced our opinions verbally and in writing. We decided to dedicate our booklet to our country, our flag, and our desire for world peace which has yet to be achieved.

Thank you for taking the time to read our booklet.

Sincerely,

BOBBY GORBY,
ROBERTA FELDMAN.

OUR FLAG

Our flag symbolizes our country's unity, strength, and growth from 1776 to 1971.

How can we as Americans help but be reminded of the men who have fought then (1775) and are still fighting now (1970) to preserve our great country of which Our Flag is a most important symbol.

We as the fourth graders of the John Minadeo Elementary School in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania feel that our flag is something special.

Our wish is to dedicate this poetry booklet to our country, our flag, and our desire for world peace in the year 1971.

"Oh, thus be it ever when free men shall stand Blest with vict'ry and peace."

ROBERTA FELDMAN.

OUR FLAG

(By Elise Byer)

Our flag waves high in the North American sky.

With its stripes of red, on its field of blue.

It symbolizes courage to me and courage to you.

In the night our flag waved high, Like twinkling diamonds in the sky.

Today and always our flag is true.

With its stripes of red on field of blue.

THE AMERICAN FLAG

(By Karen Neller)

Our flag, known as the Red, White and Blue, Stands up so proudly and so true.

Through many a perilous fight, While we waited anxiously through the night,

We finally saw Old Glory's stars and stripes of white.

The colors, white, blue and red, Might symbolize blood, the sea, sky, and the dead.

The flag means a lot to me,

I'm one of the proudest Americans that could ever be.

STARS AND STRIPES

(By Brenda Anderson)

On Our Flag there are stars and stripes.

Those stars and stripes are so bright.

Our Flag can be seen at night,

That is why ours is so bright.

The brave men had to fight,

For all our countries rights.

They fought so we could be free,

They did this all for you and me.

MY FLAG

(By Patty Lynch)

My flag means freedom

For all who shall stand

Be they in Alaska, Florida, New Jersey

All over our great land.

My flag is bright

With colors, blue, red and white.

These colors waved all through the night

While men fought a perilous fight.

As man watched in fright

So horrified we lost the fight

He looked very hard

Until he saw the flag in the break of light.

The men fought throughout the night

In such a horrible fight

Some men did die

In graves they now lie.

Yet Old Glory waved forever.

OUR FLAG

(By Janet Danko)

Our flag is strong and true

Its colors are red, white and blue

Maybe the color red

Means the blood that was shed

So maybe the blue

Means the flag is true

Also maybe the white

Means that there was horrible fight.

OUR FLAG

(By Scott Makrauer)

The Stars and Stripe so

Wave through the night,

Like a glowing candle

Every star that

Glows so bright

Twinkles out in gay delight.

Our flag stands for our country,

So nice and bright.

OUR FLAG

(By Brian Feldman)

I love my flag so very true

I love those colors red, white and blue,

I'm very proud of my flag.

The red for blood,

The blue for ocean,

The white for snow,

That's what I know.

I think I have the very best flag

That is why I shall brag.

OUR FLAG

(By Richard Goldstein)

Our flag means more to me,

Than my most prized possession,

My bike or even a tree.

So you can see,

Our flag means much to me.

Our flag stands for loyalty,

Our flag that waves so bright and free.

OUR FLAG

(By Andrew Margolis)

Our stars and stripes on our flag, May make many people proud to brag.

The red and white stripes,

Gave men bravery to fight.

Then there was a man whose name was Key.

He wrote the Anthem at the sea.

Key saw the red, white and blue in the air.

He saw that our flag was still there.

OLD GLORY

(By Edye Berman)

Old Glory was on top of Ft. McHenry

You could see it through the fog,

It was so strong that you could see

Red, white and blue showing through the smog.

The rockets red glare, the bombs bursting in air

The soldiers were giving a big fight,

But when they saw Old Glory

It was a wonderful sight.

OUR FLAG

(By Scott Holzer)

Our flag so blue,

So red, white and true,

In the perilous fight,

It lasted through the night.

The ramparts were there,

Watching the rockets red glare.

As Francis Scott Key wrote

A poem, our "National Anthem" on a boat.

Little did he know,

The flag would always be a symbol of love and Liberty.

THE FLAG

(By Ed Brinkley)

The flag is very bright indeed,

To honor it we should do good deeds.

The red and white across the night,

Showed we won the fight.

MY AMERICAN FLAG

(By Martin Roth)

My American flag is red, white and blue. It is always up waving before the morning dew;

Its nickname is "Old Glory", Always a beautiful sight, Old Glory never poor or in fright; It represents our country,

America is the name, But Old Glory is known throughout the world

For all its honor and its fame.

THE STAR SPANGLED BANNER

(By Andy Powell)

The flag that flew over Fort McHenry all night.

The flag that encouraged our men to fight. A man named Francis Scott Key was watching in fright,

Because he thought that the flag might get captured that night.

Until by a burst of light he saw, that the flag was still there.

Waving in the air.

O'GLORY

(By Cynthia Neft)

O'Glory throughout the night, Which our soldiers' had a fight.

Then at Fort McHenry,

There was a great flash of silent.

O'Glory our flag still there,

That was great thing to hear.

When our country grew,

Our flag still flew.

We respect it with thoughts,

We never drop it.

O'Glory I'm glad

For our flag is still here.

IT IS MY FLAG

(By Amy McNellis)

It is my flag,

For a country so free,

Although the British,

Tried to take it away,

When it waved over Fort McHenry,

In a colorful fight,

When the twilight gleamed it's last

The men and the women saw with triumph,

The Americans had won,

That bloody war

O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

MY FLAG

(By Todd Slegel)

My flag has thirteen stripes and fifty stars.

The fifty stars stand for all the states.

The thirteen stripes stand for the thirteen original colonies.

Our flag stands for freedom, that everyone knows.

When they see it wave,

Our countries freedom shows.

My flag represents our country,

I like my flag and that is true.

Its colors of red, white and blue.

THE STARS AND STRIPES

(By Francis Dusch)

The stars and stripes were very hard to see. But one great man could see.

His name was Francis Scott Key.

The fog was too thick to see through.

But he could see it better than you or me.

So he wrote a poem about that famous day. When the flag of our country waved and waved.

OUR FLAG

(By Kathy Kramer)

Our flag known as the red white and blue Standing there anxiously proud and beautiful too.

Waving so proudly clear and bright,
It waved all through the night.
It stands there waving pretty and bright.
All through the twilight's dawn's early light.

OUR FLAG

(By Howard Elinoff)

Through the fight
The flag stood bright.
The flag was red, blue and white
On that perilous night.
The flag still waves.
So very brave.
The bombs bursting in air.
Gave a noise everywhere.

OUR FLAG

(By Craig Frischman)

Our flag is great
Best at any rate
On it there are fifty states.
Our flag is nice and bright
It stands for all our rights
Our flag has 13 stripes
To keep our flag we had to fight.

OUR FLAG

(By Susan Robbins)

Our flag's colors of red, white and blue are
very bright.
The fifty stars make it just right
It followed Washington all through the war
Through all this, it was never torn
But today, many people have no honor for
the flag
They throw it around as if it were a rag.
When the flag waves, it hardly makes a
sound
The flag isn't allowed to touch the ground
But still people do not care
They flop it
They plop it
Until it will tear
I am proud to see my flag wave
It makes me feel proud and brave.

OUR FLAG

(By Barry Haffner)

Our stars and stripes
Waved through the night
Our flag is great
The best of any rate
The colors of our flag are red, white and blue
Every American should be proud and true
For our great flag, the red, white and blue.

OUR FLAG

(By Todd Arenson)

Everyone loves our flag
Because the colors are so bright
Our flag means freedom
The colors that mean this are blue, red and
white.
Oh maybe the red
Means blood that was shed
Men have all bled
So now they are dead.
They fought for our country
Now the flag stands
The flag means freedom
For every man.

OUR FLAG

(By Vicki Morris)

Our flag is red, white and blue,
It can be old and it can be new.
Our flag is one of pride,
It will never never hide.
Through the day and through the night,
Old glory shines all through the light.

OUR FLAG

(By Bobby Gorby)

When I see the flag it's blue, white and red,
I try to think of those who are dead.
The Americans who traveled to make us a
shield

On our side of the battlefield.
When I see the airplanes I think of the lands,
I think of the frightened sons of moms,
Who were terrified at every noise,
They were so frightened they lost their poise.
When I see the flag, its blue, white and red,
I think of the people who fought and laid
dead.

OLD GLORY

(By Amy O'Toole)

Old Glory waved both day and night,
All through the perilous fight.
Old Glory waves so true,
With her colors of red, white and blue.
Old Glory's colors are red, white and blue
And to her we should always be loyal and
true.

Old Glory has stars,
That stand for every state.
When we see her,
We should feel proud and great.
Old Glory is our country's flag
That I have to brag.
So if our country is ever in a fight,
Just call on Old Glory,
She'll wave both day and night.
So remember my friend,
Old Glory will never come to an end.

OUR FLAG

(By Rose Ann Pugliese)

Our flag red, white and blue
Brings joy to me and to you.
The flag waves so high,
High as the birds that fly in the sky.

OUR FLAG

(By Bonnie Smith)

Our flag has its colors of red, white and blue.
Our flag has fifty stars all dressed in blue.
There are many different kinds of flags.
There is one for every state.
I think our country's flag is so great.

OUR FLAG

(By Dana Harris)

When our flag waves,
Our people feel brave
Our flag is red, white and blue
We feel loyal and true.
Our flag has stars and stripes
We are all lucky it waves through the night.
It stands for our country which right
It stands for America and all of its might.

OUR FLAG

(By Gregory Knight)

Our flag is the greatest to me.
Other flags look beautiful but I think our
flag is the best.
I think the red stands for blood coming from
our men.
White stands for freedom.
Blue stands for water or our sky.
Our flag shows that brave men have died.

THE STARS AND STRIPES

(By George Kacsuta)

The stars against the dark blue sky.
It looks like dots across the sky.
The red and white stand out too.
But I like the stars against the field of blue.
The rockets through the air.
But the flag was still standing there.
The men that fought to keep our country's
pride.
Defending our flag, the Stars and Stripes.

OUR FLAG

(By Gil Lee)

Our flag is red, blue and white
It never comes down at night.
It will always be up and never down.
You can find it in every town.

Nothing can defeat it.
Because our flag is the strongest
It will wave over the land of the free,
And the home of the brave.

OUR FLAG

(By Todd Levow)

The flag is red;
The flag is white;
The blue on the flag,
Is so very bright;
Through the perilous fight,
Our flag was so right.
It proudly waved;
Through the dark cold night.

OUR FLAG

(By Sanford Kauffman)

Our flag is a symbol of the red, white and
blue.
Everybody salutes it no matter who.
I'll never forget it,
No, not at all.
For it's a symbol of liberty Love and Justice.

THE STARS AND STRIPES

(By Michael Neft)

The stars are white on a blue field.
The stripes are red and white.
The stripes can symbolize many things.
The stars stand for the country's fifty states.
The red stripes can stand for the blood
That was shed in the wars.
The red could also stand for bravery.
The white stripes could stand for peace.
Or they could also stand for victory.
The white stripes could also stand for the
Snow the soldiers fought in.

MY FLAG

(By Pamela Segal)

My flag is red, white and blue.
It has starts on it too.
It is so bright
You can see it at night
That is such a beautiful sight.
The red stands for blood,
Which was shed over the mud.
The blue stands for the sky,
Which was up very high.
The white stands for liberty,
For you and for me.

OUB FLAG

(By Christine Broderick)

Our flag, the red, white, and blue.
Let us behold our flags stars and stripes.
The red stands for the blood the men shed.
The white is for the freedom that we have.
The blue stands for the sky.
The flag is ours for ever, ever more.

OUR FLAG

(By Lisa Bingaman)

Always be true to the red, white and blue.
Don't forget the stars in the field of blue
The red stands for blood that soldiers did
shed
The white stands for the battlefield where
soldiers lay dead.
The blue stands for the sky, where bombs
burst in air.
That gave proof through the night
That our flag was still there.
The stars mean the states all fifty of them
white
They too gave proof
Through the night
That our country was right.
So always be true to the red, white and blue,
Its my flag and yours and our country's too.

THE STARS AND STRIPES

(By Michael Slotsky)

There was a man by the name of Key.
Who wrote our anthem of liberty.

He could hardly see the flag through the misty fight.
He heard mysterious calls all through the night.
Then the Star Bangled Banner was written.

OUR FLAG

(By Ellen Silverman)

Our flag waving proudly in the air,
The sky is beautiful and clear.
Boldly, the flag stands high up stright,
To represent our country America so great.
The Children were waiting for their clue,
To stand straight and salute the red, white and blue.

MY FLAG

(By Debbie Wedner)

I love my flag
It will always wave
It will stand for
The land of the free and the home of the brave.
My flag is also great
It has one star for every state.
It has waved all through the night.
While men fought a battle and fight.
My flag is also red and white
With colors very bright
The red white and blue
Will always be true.

OUR FLAG

(By William Forrest)

The flag was bright,
On that perilous night.
Every bomb that struck that night.
Gave everybody a terrible fright.
The flag could wave,
Because it was brave,
We won the war,
So we'll fight no more.

OLD GLORY

(By Becky Giffen)

The red, white and blue of our country.
We are thankful for our flag.
We are thankful for the men
Who fought to save our flag.
The red, white and blue is our freedom.
That we as Americans have the red, white and blue,
of our country is something to make us glad.

MY FLAG

(By Jill Grinberg)

It's very true
Our flag is red, white and blue.
When we look at the soldiers,
They have bullets in their shoulders.
It's sad to see
The dried blood on their bodies
When we look
We see the Star Spangled Banner flying.

MY FLAG

(By Jimmy Bernstein)

Our flag is a great one.
The flag shall never be touched by an enemy hand.
It will always stand.
It will never go down.
This is my country home of the brave.
This is my country land of the free.
I think our flag spells out liberty.

MY STAR SPANGLED BANNER

(By Debbie Rosenthal)

When our flag waves,
Our people feel brave.
There is the red, white and blue
It's colors of our flag are true.
When our flag waved

The people were so brave.
That's why our flag still waves,
Over the land of the free and the "home of the Brave."

OUR FLAG

(By Dale Sloan)

Our flag is bold,
With many strong colors,
It's waved in the fight of the Revolutionary War.
Today it still waves
When anyone dies,
Or in a parade it proudly flies.
I like our flag because it's true.
Its colors are red, white and blue.

OUR FLAG

(By Christy Cappella)

We love our flag,
It's red, white and blue,
We love our flag,
It's so mighty and true.
There are all kinds of flags,
But I think ours is the best.
Our flag is red, white and blue,
That's how our flag is dressed.

OUR FLAG

(By Fredric Weisberg)

There is red, white and blue,
It has been sewed so very new.
The stars and stripes,
Are full of white.
A perilous fight,
Was fought that night.
There shall be peace,
Throughout the land.
Freedom, democracy and love so grand.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERT DOLE OF KANSAS

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, for a man to have enough energy and talent to successfully hold two vitally important jobs is a rarity today. Yet, my State of Kansas has a man who has enough energy and drive to do any job and to do it well.

As my colleagues know, Senator BOB DOLE of my home State of Kansas has become the new chairman of the Republican National Committee. That is certainly good news for Kansas and as Republicans of all persuasions throughout our Nation come to know BOB DOLE, I am sure they will recognize it is certain good news for the Republican Party as well.

BOB DOLE's energy, drive, and ability to get things done have almost become a legend in his origin home district, the First Congressional District of Kansas that I am now privileged to represent. Regardless of party, the people of the "Big First" know BOB DOLE gets things done and works tirelessly for his constituents. The Republican Party, as well as the State of Kansas, are now the Senator's constituency and I am sure party members will come to know and

appreciate BOB DOLE's leadership as we do in Kansas.

The following editorials, one from WIBW in Topeka and the other from the Kansas City Kansan, say very well what I am trying to point out. I commend these editorials to the attention of my colleagues and especially to the Republican Members of Congress:

WIBW EDITORIAL

This week, Senator Robert Dole of Kansas officially became the Chairman of the Republican National Committee. We think that's good news for Kansas. After weeks of speculation, President Nixon made his choice known. Dole, 47, serving his first term in the Senate has made his mark. He served as President Nixon's spokesman on the Senate floor during much of the last session. His choice by the President solidifies his position as the Senate's White House spokesman for election. Dole, a Conservative, is one of the Senate's more forceful debaters.

We believe Dole's new position is one Kansans should welcome. Kansas . . . compared to giants like New York, California, Ohio and Pennsylvania . . . is small in population. We have 5 Congressmen compared to New York's 41. In Presidential elections, the state has 7 electoral votes compared to 40 for California.

For years, Kansans . . . and citizens of small population states like Oklahoma, Nebraska, Colorado and the Dakotas . . . have fretted about the fact that their viewers carry little weight . . . that politicians pay attention to the states and areas with the big votes.

Dole's new role . . . while certainly a partisan one . . . puts him in touch with the highest levels of administrative thinking. With a Republican President in the White House, this is important to Kansas. Dole, for example, will sit in on cabinet-level discussions. He'll have the ear of the President and his leading aides when he calls with a problem.

We view Senator Dole's new appointment as somewhat similar to the role of the businessman or civic leader who agrees to spend a year as Chamber of Commerce President or United Fund Chairman or as President of the State Association of his profession. In the case of Senator Dole, his business is politics. In the American system of two major parties, it sometimes takes political weight to get things done. And Senator Dole has accepted the challenge of wearing two hats—just like many able and energetic men continue to run successful business enterprises and still devote time to civic, church and other public service work.

He's agreed to do this work because he believes in it . . . and he's taking the additional job at no increase in pay. But . . . his new job can mean much to the Kansans he represents. It will, indeed, make him a major voice in Washington. Anybody who thinks this new job will keep Bob Dole from doing his duty as a Senator from Kansas doesn't know him very well. He's an 18-hour-a-day worker. He seems to almost never tire. He works at his job as Senator, and he'll work at the job of being Republican Chairman. Somebody once said . . . "If you want to get something done, get the busiest man in town, and he'll get it done." That applies in the case of Bob Dole.

Not because it's a Republican job . . . but because it means so much to Kansas, all Kansans should applaud the new honor for Senator Dole. Kansas has had influential men in the Senate before—but seldom if ever has Kansas had a Senator with this kind of voice with the party in power—and that's good for Kansas.

[From the Kansas City Kansan, Jan. 18, 1971]

KANSAS SHARES IN DOLE'S SPOTLIGHT

Kansas is in the spotlight of national attention with the election of Sen. Robert Dole as chairman of the Republican National Committee. He was the personal recommendation of President Nixon.

Senator Dole is to be congratulated upon his selection and is deserving of its honor and responsibility. He has supported the President's position in Congress and fought formidable opposition from the Democrat ranks and in some cases from within his own party to further Mr. Nixon's goals.

This position could become a step to even higher levels in his chosen field of political endeavors. His ascendancy on the ladder of national prominence will depend upon his degree of success in the development of the Republican party on the national level—upon his ability to attract good people to work with him to build a strong and viable party.

He has already taken the initial steps and made the first appointments to develop this team that his predecessor stated was going to be so necessary in the next few years to preserve the two-party system.

Senator Dole's record indicates that he has the talent, drive and personal qualifications to meet the forthcoming challenges of his new office. With his capacity for hard work, he will be able to handle his senatorial duties as well as his new political duties. The proper teamwork can make him effective in both areas.

The state of Kansas can be pleased to have one of its own in this position—a position of close association to the very highest levels of the federal government.

Kansas is doubly fortunate to have both its senators—Dole and James E. Pearson—so highly regarded by their peers. Neither is following the other, but each is striking out in his own particular area of expertise.

Dole is the aggressive partisan in solid support of the President's program and his political party.

Senator Pearson is more closely associated with the group within the Republican party that carried the senatorial leadership role during the past Congress. He can be expected to rise in that area and receive further recognition of his efforts and abilities.

Yet both these leaders are working closely together for the nation, their state and constituents. Kansas voters can be proud of their own discernment in electing them.

THE WOES OF PUBLIC HOUSING—PROJECTS TURNED INTO GHETTOS—THIEVES OBSTRUCT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WORK

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, reports have multiplied of how scores of public housing projects have been turned into slums and ghettos. These units are so often treated as objects for destruction and vandalism. The decent tenants who take pride in their quarters are plagued by others who practice deterioration and ruin.

A good example of this is found here in the District of Columbia where tax-

payers are taking a beating. Instead of providing urgent housing needs for deserving low-income tenants, public housing has been one big headache. That fact is well illustrated by what is happening at the Frederick Douglass Dwellings, and there are others. Slums and ghettos arise from beautiful structures.

What is happening in the District is reported in other metropolitan areas. Perhaps the committee which handles public housing legislation should undertake a full scale investigation of what is happening. American taxpayers have much at stake.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the January 29 issue of the Evening Star:

LOW-RENT PROJECT HIT: THIEVES PLAGUE HOUSING WORK

(By Harvey Kabaker)

The District's public housing agency was making some headway fixing up the 303 low-rent apartments at Frederick Douglass Dwellings, 21st Street and Alabama Avenue SE.

With many of its 10,500 apartments deteriorating, and assorted financial and managerial woes, the National Capital Housing Authority has gained the reputation—fairly or not—of "the worst slumlord in the city."

So it was important—for the Douglass residents as well as the NCHA—that visible progress be made in modernizing the buildings. The \$1.5 million project is the most thorough one ever undertaken by the housing authority and could result in a better place than when Douglass was new—in 1941.

SCHEDULE IS FULL

Agenda: New roofs, complete rewiring, all-new heating system, new plumbing, garbage disposals, refrigerators, kitchen cabinets, ranges, plaster, painting, doors, windows, tile floors and brick veneer. Work around the present tenants, don't force them to be relocated. Fill the 50 vacant units when they're finished.

The job is perhaps half done.

Last week, boards were torn off five vacant apartments, which were then systematically stripped and vandalized. NCHA officials guessed it took three hours each time—two apartments one night, three the next.

All the plumbing is gone, so are garbage disposals, cabinets, copper tubing from the heating systems—everything including, literally, the kitchen sink.

Monteria Ivey, Sr., NCHA acting executive director, estimated the loss in dollars at around \$5,000.

But the loss in time, effort and morale is priceless.

"It's frightening, very disheartening to me, to say the least," Ivey commented.

500 UNITS HIT

D.C. police and the FBI—NCHA property is federally owned—have been called in, but so far nothing has been found.

Theft and vandalism are not unknown in public housing. Last month, city housing officials announced a \$1.1 million program to reclaim some 500 units—mostly ground-floor garden apartments—that were broken into hard on the heels of vacating tenants, and remain easy game for break-ins.

Not long ago a pool table was placed in a northeast project. It took a half-dozen men to move it into a basement recreation room. Now it's gone.

At a new project, the contractor recently made the miscalculation of equipping the kitchen several weeks before tenants were scheduled to move in. Despite the pressure of a night watchman, several refrigerators disappeared

Officials are at a loss to know how to prevent it. The tenants themselves, for a long time, have asked for guards, better door locks, and other security measures. But the NCHA is strapped for cash, and Ivey says guard services are among the most expensive items one can imagine.

Then, too, the Departments of Housing and Urban Development doesn't normally approve of such expenses in family units—housing for the elderly is guarded at night—although Congress last year spoke of the need for better security, perhaps with tenant cooperation.

Meantime, Ivey said, the authority will press on and seek new bids for the final phase of work at Douglass, the brick facade and window frames. It seems NCHA's three-year-old, 900,000 estimate was only half of what the bidders said the work would cost and new plans were out for bids this week.

The stripped apartments will be redone. No one, though, is willing to predict when the modernization at Douglass will be finished.

TIME TO RETURN POWER TO PEOPLE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a veteran and therefore knowledgeable observer of the Washington scene is Walter Trohan, Washington bureau chief emeritus of the Chicago Tribune. Mr. Trohan has the rare facility to properly analyze the complex problems on the Washington scene. His column of Wednesday, January 27, 1971, which follows, commenting on the President's state of the Union message is, in my judgment, as sound a commentary as has come to my attention:

IT IS TIME TO RETURN POWER TO PEOPLE

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON.—The safest political prediction of our day is that President Nixon will not get the six goals he outlined to Congress in his state of the Union message. Yet the most important problem of our day is the return of power to the people.

For 38 years power has been flowing from the people to Washington, where it has intoxicated generations of politicians and bureaucrats. But it must never be forgotten that the flow of power was directed by vote of the people. It was not seized here, as it was abroad, by dictators. Concentration of power is not an American problem but a world problem, even tho the President has asked America to tackle it first.

Mr. Nixon called for a "peaceful revolution" by which power would be returned to the state and local levels so that the people might be given a chance to solve their problems, something the promises of politicians, the arrogance of intellectual planners and the dictates of bureaucrats have failed to do.

'Tis a consummation devoutly to be wished, and yet we can wonder whether the people have the will or the capacity to solve the problems.

The States failed to solve the Depression and came to Washington to surrender power for doles. The states failed to solve the race problem and left its solution to the federal government. And now the states want the

federal government to be their tax collector. They are calling not for a return of the sources of revenue but for a share in the federal collections.

It is safe to say the six goals suggested by the President will be bogged down in the mires of Congress. Politics, procrastination and personal ambition will exact their toll. This is the year before the Presidential campaign year and many will not be able to see clearly thru the maze of Presidential lightning rods.

Already it is being charged that the program is nothing more than a campaign document. It is said that Mr. Nixon has presented an array of pious platitudes and incantations calculated to blame the Democratic Congress for all that is wrong in 1972. Even if the program were perfect—which it is not—many would be against it for political and selfish reasons.

Only a few years ago, Lyndon B. Johnson tried to consolidate the departments of labor and commerce, but the plan was wrecked by labor leaders jealous of their power. It is certain many will not support the currently proposed reshuffling of the Cabinet. Many will attack for various reasons, but mainly for votes, the program to reform skyrocketing welfare.

They will resist the Nixon effort to promote prosperity, improve the environment and advance health, but most of all they will oppose any drive to strengthen state and local governments.

The American way has been changed markedly of late. Now murmurs of dissatisfaction are growing louder. Streets have run red and skies have glowed with violence. The clenched fist of angry revolution is being raised. Campuses have become incubators of protest and pulpits have become forums for political and sociological change, rather than havens of spiritual regeneration.

In all this ferment many good and true citizens have weltered in agonies of fear and frustration. They want to oppose a world they feel they never made. Most of all, they want to be heard. There is growing talk of a tax strike, even tho the power establishment has seen to it that most taxes are collected before they even become due.

Now the President has recognized that the people are dissatisfied. Let us make a start at turning promises into performances at the local level.

THE PRESERVATION OF WESTERN CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION IS A HEMISPHERIC EFFORT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, numerous individuals and organizations in the United States undertake to thwart the conspiratorial attempts of those directing the international Communist conspiracy to subjugate and control the remaining nations of the free world. The counterparts of these anti-Communist groups operate in Latin American countries. One such organization is the Brazilian Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Society—Sociedade Brasileira de Defesa da Tradição, Família e Propriedade—known simply as TFP. Its address is Rua Martin Francisco, 669, Sao Paulo (3)—S. P., Brazil.

The TFP labors for the preservation of the basic values of Western Christian civilization. Its concern is concentrated mainly on three related problems: Communism, the widespread tendency toward socialization, and the movement to destroy strong family ties and to destroy the morals of youth.

The TFP is interested in getting in touch with patriotic people in America who are fighting as they are for the preservation of Western Christian civilization. A communication link uniting the many anti-Communist peoples in different countries may be useful in a defense against the enemy's strategy of knocking off one country at a time.

I insert at this point a TFP press release:

THE CHILEAN ELECTIONS: A FORSAKEN KERENSKY

SANTIAGO, CHILE—The sunset of the government of president Eduardo Frei of Chile has been marked not only by a rising leftist terrorism, but also by numerous commentaries of the south American press, in which this government has been accused of having failed in its program of social reforms.

President Frei is busy getting ready to leave his government in the midst of an agitated electoral campaign, which will end on September sixth, when the Chilean people will choose their new president.

Well informed circles in this capital say that the Christian Democrat candidate, Radomiro Tomi, is the least favored of the three candidates for the office.

The criticisms of the government of President Frei are being made by the liberals, the conservatives, and even by the extreme left. It is interesting to note that even some of the organs which greeted with enthusiasm the beginning of the socialist reforms of this government, now are sadly recognizing the failure of that program.

This is exactly the case of the ultra liberal newspaper "O Estado de S. Paulo", which recently published an analysis of the present Chilean situation, written by N. Bosch, from which we will quote some lines.

During the last six years, Mr. Frei tried to convince the world, especially Latin America, that the Latin American political problems were the exclusive result of the archaic social economic structures which the old oligarchies were trying to preserve.

During that time, it was systematically denied the fact that foreign powers had an influence in the sudden rise of such problems in the continent. Also during that time, the thesis that subversion, terror and violence were a natural revolt against a situation of exploration of the poor people was heatedly defended.

"Get rid of the causes and the effects will disappear," the Christian Democrat president of Chile said.

By this token, he labelled the so-called "Revolution with liberty", which came to be the theme of his government.

He then presented a plan of radical reforms, designed to eliminate the motives of social dissatisfaction, and in consequence, eliminate the attitudes of rebellion.

Although he tried to inspire himself in the German and Italian Christian Democracies, the Chilean Christian Democratic Party (CDP) elaborated on a program of government in the most pure socialist style, in which the nationalization of foreign companies and the agrarian reform were the main points.

The Chilean Christian Democracy coincided in many aspects with the materialistic theories of Marx. "We intend to reform the

regime of property whose basis still is the individualist concept of the right of dominion. This way we assure the widest diffusion of property, including the communitarian type of property", said President Frei at the beginning of his government.

His basic premise was that social justice was the distribution to all men of the goods produced by the society, and that the government was the only institution able to make this distribution.

With this sort of vision of life, the CDP situated its actions on the same level with the Marxist Leninist parties, with which, although he was separated by the democratic forms which he maintained, he came to constitute an ideological community.

This community does not make itself manifest only in the enunciation of their purposes. In practice, the government of President Frei tried to accomplish, through other means, the postulates which the lefts struggled to accomplish.

He tried to eliminate the causes of violence, but the more he advanced in the direction of his objectives, the more violent the lefts became.

Today, on the eve of the end of his mandate, the Chilean president has before him a country shaken by subversion, by terror and by the shadow of civil war.

This proves that it does not pay to compromise with the lefts.

It shows that the causes pointed out by the lefts as the motives for the violence were not more than a mere pretext. It is obvious that the Marxists are not interested only in social reforms.

Today the Chilean people have three choices. Who will win the next elections? The anti-Communist right, the Castro-Communist guerrillas, or will it be a military coup?

Whatever is the result, it will be the end of a traditional democracy which was in the past an example for the whole of Latin America. This democracy generated its own destruction through permissiveness.

President Frei will enter history as a Kerenky (as Fabio Vidigal Xavier da Silveira called him in his best-seller "Frei, the Chilean Kerenky"). Or will he enter history as a visionary?

Perhaps he was just a "well-intentioned" man, but who was profoundly mistaken in his understanding of the lefts . . .

IN DEFENSE OF THE CHILEAN TFP

SAO PAULO, BRAZIL.—Several newspapers recently published what obviously was slanted news about the activities of the Chilean TFP.

The newspapers clearly insinuated that the Chilean TFP was responsible for rural agitations in opposition to the agrarian reform of President Eduardo Frei of Chile, and that the TFP participated in an incident which caused the death of a member of the federal department in charge of the execution of that reform.

Juan Gonzalo Campbell, member of the Council of the Chilean TFP denied the charges during a press conference in Sao Paulo, where he came to undergo a health treatment.

He explained to the Brazilian press the true methods of action of the organization which he heads.

To that end, he wrote a letter to Professor Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira, the President of the National Council of the Brazilian TFP.

His declarations were later condensed in one of Prof. Oliveira's famous weekly articles. In it Campbell made clear three points:

1. The Chilean TFP has always been a law-abiding organization both in its deeds and actions, which are always performed through public campaigns.

The TFP has always been a defender of the legal methods of action, and has condemned agitations and terrorism. The TFP is presently engaged in a campaign in support of free and orderly elections, and is warning the country against the dangers of a possible dictatorship.

2. The Chilean TFP was not involved in the incident which resulted in the death of the federal employee. All the TFP activities in the rural areas have been known by their respect to law and order.

TFP has refused to promote violence, even in the face of the unjust expropriation of the farm of its president.

3. Any comparison between the TFP and the leftist extremists is malicious and without any real basis.

The leftist extremists are groups of armed terrorists and criminals, who make use of violence, and who have, in the past, attacked several times members and militants of the TFP during its campaigns, with various types of weapons. Such elements have already inflicted grave wounds in various members of the TFP.

"To compare their methods with the activities of the TFP is to confuse the spirits and gravely damage a Society which bravely but peacefully struggles to save Chile from a red regime", concluded Mr. Campbell.

UNJUST APPROPRIATION PROVOKES A POPULAR REACTION IN CHILE

SANTIAGO, CHILE, July.—The administration of President Frei of Chile appropriated a farm which was a property of Mr. Patricio Larrain Bustamante, according to reports which reached this city.

The unjust appropriation proved once and for all that the agrarian reform of President Frei and of the Chilean Christian Democracy does not have in mind the social welfare of the workers nor the economic development of the country.

The agrarian reform has been implemented with the political objective of persecuting the adversaries of the socialist policies of the Christian Democratic Party.

Therefore, in addition to instituting an agrarian reform which has for its basis the complete suppression of the right of owning a property, the Chilean Government did not hesitate in breaking the very same laws which it established to persecute the adversaries of the regime.

The appropriation of the property of Mr. Larrain was violent, unjust and arbitrary, even taking into account the present law of confiscation of the Chilean agrarian reform.

The act shocked so many people that, as soon as the news about it became known, Mr. Larrain began receiving numerous manifestations of solidarity as well as demonstrations of repugnance for the injustice which he had just suffered.

These manifestations and demonstrations came from legislators, owners of property, leaders of associations, the people of the region, residents of the area, peasants and workers.

This support was made more evident through a declaration with some 900 signatures of workers, farmers, and others who deplored the situation. This declaration also stated the reasons why they were against the agrarian reform, the communism and the class struggle.

Mr. Larrain also received the support of leaders of the "National Party" (the opposition party), in which Deputy Gustavo Monckeberg made statements to the press condemning the appropriation.

The high point of the demonstrations was a peasants parade as a sign of unsupport to the government action. In the parade, about 500 persons carried the image of Our Lady

of the Carmel (the Patroness of Chile), which was in the appropriated property, to a public oratory in Curacavi, the neighboring district.

Among the group which carried the image, was a number of militant members of the Chilean Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property.

The TFP members, who rode horses during the parade, wore red capes and berets, and carried both the Chilean and the TFP banners.

Religious hymns were sang throughout the tract.

In Curacavi, the image was set for the worship of the public, and Msgr. Berrios, the Diocesan Bishop, who was present at the ceremony, blessed the place.

At the occasion, Mr. Larrain spoke about the importance of this act and asked the Virgin to prevent Chile from falling into the communist hands.

Mr. Angel Salinas, a worker in the appropriated land, also spoke at the occasion, explaining the antagonistic feelings of the peasants for the socialist regime which was contrary to the interests of the rural population, and destructor of the Christian Civilization.

Mr. Lorrain is the President of the Chilean Society for the Defense of Tradition, Family and Property, an organization which for many years has led the struggle against communization of Chile, which is the number one objective of the Christian Democratic Party.

One of the most important steps to achieve this communization is the implementation of a socialist agrarian reform. Such reform always received from the Chilean TFP the loudest critics, which have never been refuted by Frei's regime.

Therefore, one can understand the efforts of the leaders of the Christian Democratic Party to punish the president of such organization. This characterizes the political objectives of the reform, which is one of hatred, and which will always be used against the enemies of the Christian Democracy.

PRESIDENT OF POSTAL UNION WRITES AN EDITORIAL

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Mr. James H. Rademacher, has made some interesting editorial comments in the February 1970 edition of the Postal Record, monthly publication of his union. Following is the text of his editorial:

TWO WRONGS DO NOT MAKE THIS RIGHT

(By James H. Rademacher)

Suddenly it becomes apparent that all the advocates of a Postal Corporation were only kidding when they were talking about true postal reform. They apparently have sold the American people a pup, and a mighty mangy pup it is.

We started to become disenchanted with the practical aspects of the quasi-corporation idea when the President appointed nine totally management-oriented persons, none of whom had ever been inside a post office except to mail a package, to serve as the Governors of the new Postal Service. Our sense of uneasiness grew when the Governors, rather sneakily, were sworn in on an interim basis, before Congress could convene.

Then, to top it all off, these nine political appointees, as their first official act, chose as their Chairman, Winton M. Blount, the Republican politician who has, in the past two years, presided over the most drastic deterioration of the postal service since the days of 1950, when Jesse Donaldson was running the mails.

Once he lowered his arm after taking the new oath of office, Chairman Blount remained totally in character. With an arrogance which would have brought a blush to the cheek of Louis XIV, he announced that he intended to lead the Postal Establishment straight back to 1902, when the infamous "Gag Rule" was born. He said that from now on postal employees will be forbidden to communicate with their Congressman concerning postal matters. If we have any complaints we must direct them to the Congressional Liaison Officer at headquarters, who will be the "sole voice of the Postal Service in communicating with Congress." Since this Liaison Officer will be appointed by the managers and will be beholden to them for his sustenance, it is not very likely that he will transmit to the Congress any complaints against his employers, or any information that will make his employers seem to be less than geniuses.

The P.O. Department spokesmen have been mouthing pious platitudes about taking the Post Office out of politics ever since the present administration came to power. They deceived a lot of people into thinking they were serious. So now we find these nine politically appointed Governors appointing as Chairman the Republican politician who, by all accounts, is itching to run for the Senate next year in Alabama. (However, we cannot see how Mr. Blount can make any political hay out of his record of having been party to further deterioration of the postal service and of having helped mightily to precipitate the first postal strike in our history.)

Certainly, both parties have been playing this game for generations, jumping up a likely political candidate and giving him a job which will keep him before the electorate until it is time to get out on the hustings. This has been Standard Political Procedure. But never before has the stratagem been carried off with such blatant hypocrisy. Never before has it been conducted to the accompaniment of solemn organ music, and pietistic hymn-chanting, and such fervent cries of "holier-than-thou." The performance has been nauseating.

The new Chairman of the Board celebrated his appointment with a press release listing 31 major "achievements" carried out during his two years as the final Postmaster General of our history. The release should be set to music. It covers almost everything conceivable—economy, pornography, structural planning and so on, except service. Not one of the 31 so-called achievements has anything whatsoever to do with the principal mission of the Post Office—the moving of mail swiftly and surely from sender to recipient.

As for the ridiculous decree forbidding postal employees to communicate with their Congressmen, the National Association of Letter Carriers intends to ignore it. We propose to continue operating in the same honorable, straightforward way we have always operated. We believe in the Lloyd-LaFollette Act, not in arbitrary decrees of a politically inspired Chairman of the Board. We believe the decree is unconstitutional in that it would deprive postal employees of the right of free speech and the right of petition. If Chairman Blount chooses to contest this point in court with us, we would be delighted to accommodate him.

And as for the new Postal Service, we have not quite given up on it yet, but, unless attitudes and personnel are drastically altered in the near future, we predict that

Congress will vote itself back into authority within two years. Maybe it will take less time than that.

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS—FEBRUARY 1, 1971

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

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

COMMENTARY ON THE PRESIDENT'S PLANS FOR REORGANIZATION

The President struck a responsive chord in his State of the Union Message when he asserted that most Americans . . . "are simply fed up with government at all levels." My conversations and correspondence with Ninth District residents have pointed up increasing impatience with government which is not responsive to the individual, promises too much, and delivers too little.

With this kind of an introduction, the President then proposed a broad and ambitious reorganization of Federal departments to end what he called "hopeless confusion of form and function." He proposed making eight Cabinet departments out of the present 12. The Departments of State, Treasury, Defense and Justice would remain, while the following new departments would be created:

1. A department of human resources, which would take over the function of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), and some of the programs now administered by the Labor and Agriculture Departments. Its primary responsibility would be in dealing with people as individuals and as members of a family.

2. A department of community development, which would take in the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the Community Action Program, which is now administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). This department also would deal with rural communities.

3. A department of natural resources, which would absorb the Interior Department as well as some functions of the Agriculture and Commerce Departments which now deal with the control and conservation of our natural resources.

4. A department of economic development, which would take in functions of the Agriculture, Commerce, Labor and Transportation Departments, as well as such independent agencies as the Small Business Administration and the Tariff Commission. Its primary function, obviously, would be the maintenance of a healthy national economy.

The reaction of the Congress to the President's proposals has been cautious. Several of the leaders of the Democratically-controlled Congress have charged the President with "political grandstanding" in attempting to present his Administration as an agent of reform and innovation. Most, however, have taken a "wait and see" stance.

Reforms of the magnitude outlined by the President would touch many levels of government, not the least of which is Congress itself. Congressional committees are organized to oversee the present departments. Eliminating some of these departments would also mean the elimination of some Congressional committees, whose members have built up enormous power and control.

Special interest groups, which have established lines of communication with the Departments and Congressional committees

which look after their needs, may be expected to voice bitter opposition to so sweeping a reorganization. Farm groups, labor and business all may be reluctant to see departments familiar with their concerns merged with other areas of responsibility.

It has been this kind of opposition which has scuttled earlier plans of reorganization. President Johnson's proposal to merge the Labor and Commerce Departments fell through largely because of the opposition of organized labor. The concept of a natural resources department also has been discussed for several years, but never acted upon because of the opposition of Congressional committees, trade associations, citizens' groups and state governments.

The President has painted his proposal in broad strokes, indicating he would spell out in greater detail the specifics in the next few weeks. His proposals are, on the whole, bold and imaginative and deserve a careful hearing by the Congress.

An automatic rejection of the President's proposals by the Congress, at a time when many have doubts about the responsiveness and efficiency of government would be unwise. The government needs to spend all the time and effort it can muster to the task of improving its structure.

The taxpayer wants his government to work better. He believes that it can, and he is likely to think that a little "shaping up" might just improve things considerably.

COMMUNISM AND REVOLUTION IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when too many Americans tend to forget basic truths about communism—or do not want to remember or admit—the voice of Winston Churchill comes to us loud and clear. Written 41 years ago, Reader's Digest's current condensation of Sir Winston's message from his book "Great Contemporaries," is a reminder that Americans must not, should not, and cannot afford to overlook or push aside these truths as Congress and the executive branch fashion foreign and domestic policy in the 1970's.

As Churchill says, "To be forewarned is to be forearmed." Let us not forget:

WINSTON CHURCHILL ON REVOLUTION

(By Winston S. Churchill)

CONDENSED FROM "GREAT CONTEMPORARIES"

Communism is not only a creed. It is a plan of campaign. A communist is not only the holder of certain opinions; he is the pledged adept of a well-thought-out means of enforcing them. The anatomy of discontent and revolution has been studied in every phase and aspect, and a veritable drill book prepared for subverting all existing institutions. The method of enforcement is as much a part of the communist faith as the doctrine itself.

At first the time-honored principles of liberalism and democracy are invoked to shelter the infant organism. Free speech, the right of public meeting, every form of lawful political agitation and constitutional right are paraded and asserted. Alliance is sought with every popular movement toward the left.

The creation of a mild liberal or socialist regime in some period of convulsion is the first milestone. But no sooner has this been created than it is to be overthrown. Woes and scarcity resulting from confusion must be exploited. Collisions, if possible attended with bloodshed, are to be arranged between the agents of the new government and the working people. Martyrs are to be manufactured. An apologetic attitude in the rulers should be turned to profit. Pacific propaganda may be made the mask of hatreds never before manifested among men. No faith need be, indeed may be, kept with non-communists. Every act of goodwill, of tolerance, of conciliation on the part of governments or statesmen is to be utilized for their ruin.

Then when the time is ripe and the moment opportune, every form of lethal violence from mob revolt to private assassination must be used without stint or compunction. The citadel will be stormed under the banners of liberty and democracy; and once the apparatus of power is in the hands of the brotherhood, all opposition, all contrary opinions must be extinguished by death.

Democracy is but a tool to be used and afterward broken; liberty but a sentimental folly unworthy of the logician. The absolute rule of a self-chosen priesthood according to the dogmas it has learned by rote is to be imposed upon mankind, without mitigations, forever.

All this, set out in prosy textbooks, written also in blood in the history of several powerful nations, is the communist's faith and purpose. To be forewarned should be to be forearmed!

RAILPAX AND THE FUTURE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Chicago is the rail center of our Nation and thus has an obvious interest in the issue of the proposed Railpax operation. It is essential that we scrutinize the Railpax plans thoroughly and permit its establishment as a practical plan. This point is well made in an editorial carried over WBBM radio Chicago on January 19, which follows:

RAILPAX AND THE FUTURE

For years, railroads have been having a rough time of things. Transportation experts say that they expect some improvement this year, based on a possible increase in business conditions. And it is further supported by the government backed National Railroad Passenger Service Corporation—commonly called Railpax.

Starting next May, Railpax is supposed to provide better and reasonably priced transportation over intermediate distances. But it would be wrong to say that everything is going to be better. This is going to be a very lean operation with only about 200 runs throughout the country. Many areas can make a good argument for adding train runs.

To expand Railpax, the public is going to have to show acceptance of rail travel between cities on the proposed runs and the railroads will have to invest more of their revenues in the program.

Railpax has yet to prove itself. But if it does, it may help to improve our entire transportation industry. Actually, Railpax will mean a reduction in some services at

the start. But if the Department of Transportation planners are right, they will have cut out money losing runs in favor of those with a good potential for growth. We certainly hope that this proves to be the case.

MAN OF THE YEAR—JACK PELLERIN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to recognize and pay tribute to a man in my congressional district who has rendered many years of service to his community—Lawndale, Calif.

On January 29, the Lawndale Coordinating Council recognized the achievements of Jack Pellerin by awarding him the Man of the Year Award.

An active leader in the Red Cross, Jack Pellerin was chairman of the Lawndale-Hawthorne Red Cross Executive Board, chairman of the Southwest District Board of the American Red Cross, and is a member of the gallons club of the Red Cross.

In addition to his duties as branch manager of the Security Pacific National Bank in Lawndale, Mr. Pellerin has found time to work with our youth. He is a cofounder of the Lawndale Youth Council and, today, he is chairman of the advisory board. In showing his desire to help youth, he was one of the organizers of the South Bay "25" Club to help children at Christmastime. Mr. Pellerin served as director of the South Bay "25" Club for 2 years. He also played Santa Claus, seeing more than 5,900 children as Santa this year. In 1959, Jack Pellerin was the chairman of the Youth Day Parade.

This year's recipient of the Man of the Year Award is a past member of the board of directors of the Centinella Valley YMCA. He has driven a truck in the cleanup campaign for the last 2 years. Mr. Pellerin played in the 1970 golf tournament for the Children's Hospital benefit. He was the coach of the Rotary Club baseball team for 2 years, and also is a member of the Alondra Golf Men's Club.

Mr. Pellerin has served on the board of Rotary in Lawndale for 1 year. He was international service director and, also, bulletin editor for his club and won first place in District 528 for bulletin publishers at the district conference.

Mr. Pellerin, married and the father of three children, attends the Maria Regina Catholic Church. He has served as secretary, first vice president, and president of the Lawndale Chamber of Commerce. This year, he is serving as treasurer of the Lawndale March of Dimes.

Mr. Speaker, Jack Pellerin has served his fellowman and his community for many years. I take pleasure in congratulating the Lawndale Coordinating Council in their choice for the Man of the Year Award, and I commend Mr. Jack Pellerin for his outstanding con-

tributions to improve our Nation and our society.

REPRESENTATIVE BARBER B. CONABLE SAYS REVENUE SHARING IS INEVITABLE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is much discussion these days on Federal revenue sharing with the States and local communities.

My distinguished upstate New York colleague, Mr. CONABLE, who is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, has given his views in a verbatim interview with Lucian C. Warren, the able Washington bureau chief for the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News and a former president of the National Press Club.

Since Mr. CONABLE considers revenue-sharing to be inevitable, I believe his rationale may be of interest to all Members and I include the January 30 interview as follows:

WNY'S MAN ON WAYS AND MEANS SAYS REVENUE SHARING IS INEVITABLE

(By Lucian C. Warren)

(NOTE.—Enactment of some form of revenue-sharing is "inevitable," despite the opposition of top men on the House Ways & Means Committee. This is the view of GOP Rep. Barber B. Conable, Jr., of Alexander, who in the following interview tells why he favors it and how it will work. In addition to belonging to Ways & Means, Rep. Conable is also on the Congressional Joint Economic Committee and was recently named to the House Republican leadership as chairman of its House Republican Research Committee.)

WASHINGTON.—Q. Congressman Conable, you have made a statement on revenue sharing in which you seem to embrace the concept and say that Congress will have to act on it.

I wonder on what you base your optimism considering the fact that the chairman of your committee, Rep. Wilbur Mills (D., Ark.), and the ranking Republican on the committee, John W. Byrnes of Wisconsin, are both against it.

A. I think revenue sharing is inevitable, an idea whose time is come. If this is so, even the opposition of the powerful leaders of my committee will not be able to stop it, but will only be able to change its form.

I think the idea is one whose time has come because of the inevitable increases in local and state government costs, as long as they continue to participate in significant problem solving on those levels.

The cost of federal government is not going up as fast as is the cost of local and state government. To finance problem-solving on the state and local government levels we have for the most part used taxes that are regressive when compared to the federal income tax.

REALLOCATION OF TAX RESOURCES

An important part of tax reform, therefore, has got to be reallocation of tax resources, so that the unfair and inequitable regressive taxes, which are the backbone of taxes on the state and local level, can be reduced in importance.

I think real estate taxes in our area have gone about as far as they can go. A lot of the

opposition of my committee leadership to revenue sharing is philosophical in that they don't believe the taxing and spending functions should be separated, although they are already separated to a substantial degree, even here in the Congress, where we have a Ways and Means Committee to raise the money and an Appropriations Committee to spend it . . .

Q. I am interested in the practicalities. Have you counted noses on the Ways & Means Committee and do you have a rough estimate as to how many of your committee would approve some form of revenue sharing?

A. I think it would be very difficult to tell at this point. It is clear we are going to have hearings on revenue sharing. Despite their opposition, both Mr. Mills and Mr. Byrnes have said that we will have hearings on this issue.

They say the result of the hearings will be to kill the idea once and for all. I doubt it . . .

Q. Have you worked out with the White House who would undertake the leadership in supporting revenue sharing among the Republicans, inasmuch as Mr. Byrnes is opposed? Who on your side would take the responsibility? Would you be the one?

A. I have told the White House I will help in every way I can. But I suspect the nominal leader will be the senior Republican in favor of revenue-sharing, and he probably is Rep. Jackson Betts of Ohio.

He has not committed himself fully and said he would sponsor the bill for study purposes only. I think his attitude is more typical of the Ways & Means Committee than my attitude, which is one of outright advocacy of the bill.

HELP MUCH AS HE CAN

Q. But if he doesn't grab the ball, you'll be there to help as much as you can.

A. Yes. But I'd have to say that while I will do what I can to advance an idea I believe in I don't have any illusions about my ability within the committee to meet on equal terms the leaders of the committee in both parties . . .

I think the hope we have for advancing this idea legislatively has got to be based in the creation of a climate of support in the Congress itself . . .

Q. So you're optimistic?

A. I'm optimistic in the sense that I think revenue-sharing is inevitable. I don't mean that I think it's going to be easy and that Mr. Mills and Mr. Byrnes are going to change their minds overnight or that they are necessarily going to accept in detail the President's recommendations.

I don't think Congress should accept the President's recommendations in detail on anything without considering it carefully and without studying alternatives.

OPEN MIND ON DETAILS

I'm not for a rubber stamp Congress and I myself have an open mind as to the details of the proposal. I think the President has made an ingenious proposal here and we should consider it very seriously and in a positive frame of mind because of the inevitability of the idea.

Q. Do you think revenue-sharing will pass Congress this year in some form?

A. I don't know. I think that it should and I'm going to work for it myself. I think the chances of its passing are considerably better than you might feel in the light of the statements made by Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Mills.

Q. Have you got any indications as to when the hearings would be held?

A. I think it will be in June, in all probability. The first item of business for the 92d Congress, once the Ways & Means Committee is organized and functioning, will doubtless be social security and welfare reform . . .

I think then we'll have problems of the interest equalization tax, which will expire shortly, and the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling is obviously going to have to be reassessed in the light of the proposed actual deficit, as opposed to the full employment deficit.

EXPECTS LENGTHY HEARINGS

I expect the revenue-sharing hearings will be rather protracted. In light of the great presidential interest in this and in light of the tremendous pressures that are generating in state and local governments, I am sure Mr. Mills and Mr. Byrnes will not want to shut off the testimony in any peremptory fashion.

Q. The hope of the Administration was to get this legislation approved so they could start paying the states and local communities beginning in October. If you were to counsel Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, would you say—"don't expect it by October 1st"?

A. I'd say—"don't count on it." This is going to be a tough issue and it is going to require a good deal of chewing over.

Q. Mr. Mills has said that revenue-sharing won't help the places that need it the most. He said that states such as New York, Connecticut and New Jersey are the ones that will get the short end of the horn.

A. I don't know why he says that. It must be that Mr. Mills does not think the President's proposal for distributing money on the proposition of both population and tax effort is likely to be enacted.

NEW YORK'S TAX EFFORT

New York, of course, has the major tax effort in the country. That will give New York a premium quite contrary to most federal aid programs . . . with respect to many of the categorical grant programs, New York will also have a premium in the special revenue-sharing aspects of the proposal.

Such things as transportation money, for example, which are to be included in the special revenue-sharing funds, are much more likely to go to the Northeast corridor than anywhere else.

Q. How about the pass-through money for local governments?

A. The communities will share only in respect to their tax effort in the pool of money that goes to the state as a whole . . . the high-tax communities will get a bigger proportion of the state pool of revenue-sharing money than they would if they didn't have high taxes . . .

New York usually comes out poorly on federal aid formulas, because they usually are weighted to give advantage to the low per capita income states.

This particular formula, however, is weighted more on the basis of tax effort and population than anything else. It is my impression that New York would do pretty well.

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]