

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE ARMY
AND NAVY ACADEMY OF CARLS-
BAD, CALIF.

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the Army and Navy Academy of Carlsbad, Calif., which is in my congressional district, was founded in 1910 and has continuously been training young men, ages 12 through 18, in old-fashioned, basic, classical secondary education; old-fashioned in that they include respect for our form of government, its concepts and history; pride in individual worth and accomplishment; academic endeavor and achievement for its own sake; and respect for the established order of things, but above all, love and respect for our great United States and its traditions.

As an extension of their efforts in this regard, the cadets have established a hall of flags at the academy and have obtained a flag from each State of the Union, along with a copy of each State's official history. They have requested and have been promised flags from a number of foreign nations, some of which are the Republic of France which they will honor for the assistance given to our forebears in our struggle for independence; the Government of Spain to mark that nation's contribution to the discovery of our country by Christopher Columbus and their influence in our Nation's history; and Great Britain which will be honored for England's initial venture in our Nation in the establishment of Jamestown, Va.

Mr. Speaker, this free enterprise, patriotic organization, and its president, Col. W. C. Atkins, deserve every commendation for their excellence through the years and for their contributions to our military might, to our civic accomplishments, and to the defense of moral integrity which has been under so much attack in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I include the President's words of appreciation and congratulations to this deserving academy.

MAY 28, 1971.

To the cadets of the Army and Navy Academy:

On June 14, 1777—only months after the Declaration of Independence, and with four bitter years of the Revolutionary War still ahead—the Continental Congress adopted the Stars and Stripes as the flag of the United States of America. Like the Declaration itself, our flag began as an audacious assertion, crying out for proof.

With the passing decades the proof has come. One new freedom after another has enriched the flag's symbolism. But our vision of ideals to be realized has expanded as well, so that even now the flag speaks more of promise than of pride and looks more to tomorrow than to yesterday. And as long as America is a young Nation, this is the way it must be. Each generation must do its own proving.

The American flag today means what today's Americans make it mean. We have in our power to make it abroad the banner of peace, honor, generosity—at home the ensign of liberty, justice, opportunity. In these goals, all Americans can unite. To this work, each of us can dedicate himself—resolving that, on whatever else we may differ, the flag and its challenge are ours in common.

I am happy to send my congratulations as you gather to dedicate this Hall of Flags. I know it will always be a source of pride and inspiration for each of you and for generations of cadets to come.

RICHARD NIXON.

DRUG ADDICTION AMONG VIET-
NAM SERVICEMEN AND VET-
ERANS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we have all been shocked by the recent revelations about the extent of drug addiction among our Vietnam servicemen and veterans. As the author of a bill to require mandatory medical treatment for known addicts, under the supervision of Public Health officials, I have long been concerned about the situation already confronting us.

Now it is evident that unless speedy and effective action is taken, the heroin epidemic in the United States will be drastically increased with the return of addicted veterans. Unfortunately, their habit is fed with high-quality heroin readily available in Southeast Asia and upon return they will be seeking to supply their need on the vastly inferior heroin here in the United States. It is imperative, therefore, that Congress and the administration give the highest priority to finding effective measures that can detect and rehabilitate our veteran addicts, not only from the viewpoint of protecting society and preventing a serious increase in the domestic addiction problem, but also because of our responsibility for placing these young men in an unpopular war under conditions that have led them to addiction. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a column by James Reston in the New York Times of June 2, and an editorial from the Washington Daily News of June 1, commenting on this tragic situation.

The column and editorial follow:

THE HANGOVER OF WAR

(By James Reston)

The quickest way for an American soldier to avoid combat in Vietnam and get back home these days is to take to drugs. If he's hooked on heroin, he's finished—finished with fighting, finished with the Army, a casualty of the war, finished with everything but the drug habit.

This is one of those tragic consequences of war where, in Nikita Khrushchev's vivid phrase, the living may envy the dead. Re-

tiring Army Secretary Stanley Resor recently testified that between 10 and 15 per cent of the American troops in Vietnam have a serious heroin habit, and this is at best an official guess—at least 20,000 and maybe twice the number in the American Expeditionary force are now in danger of drug addiction.

The facts and military regulations of this problem are alarmingly vague. President Nixon has conceded that the problem exists. The military authorities have established a rehabilitation program to deal with it. Extreme cases of drug addiction are compelled to join the program, but the easy way in dubious cases is merely to get the man home and out of the service.

Getting them out of the service at least blurs and disperses the problem. If the soldier wants out and does not volunteer for the drug rehabilitation program, the veterans hospitals are not full of addicts, but the soldier is thrown back on his own with an expensive habit he cannot cure or afford.

Divided as the nation is about the war, confused as it is about past and present war objectives, the country ought to be able to agree about rescuing the men who were drafted into the battle, and giving them the health and jobs essential to a decent life. This is not being done now. Rehabilitation and employment centers are being established, the problems of the veteran drug-addict and the veteran unemployed are recognized in Washington, but the sick and unemployed casualties of the war are not really being dealt with effectively.

One of the major drug problems of the American soldier in Vietnam is that heroin in Southeast Asia is strong, easy to get and taken by smoking, rather than by needle, and cheap. It eases the agony of combat, and promises home-leave if it gets beyond control. But hooked on this powerful, cheap stuff in Vietnam, a discharged veteran in any normal American community has the means neither of curing the habit nor of affording the habit, without stealing.

The Nixon Administration has not been indifferent to the menace of drugs in America. It has tried to get at the problem at the source. It has used its political and economic power to cut off the supply of drugs in Turkey, Lebanon and elsewhere in the Middle East. It has worked effectively with the Pompidou Government in Paris to break up the processing of drugs in Marseilles and elsewhere in the Mediterranean. It has trebled the number of agents watching the drug trade across the Mexican border and through customs at the international airports in this country, and it has poured Federal money and manpower into breaking up the drug peddlers in this country.

But in Vietnam, where it has much more control over both the peddlers and the soldiers, the Nixon Administration has not been effective. In Saigon, at least, it has much more authority than it has used to attack the source of drugs, to intervene in the drug corruption, which reaches into the highest levels of the Saigon Government, and to insist that the American soldiers, who are the casualties of the war-drug culture, go into the drug-rehabilitation program.

More than that, the Administration has not cooperated in a serious, private examination of the Vietnam drug problem with the Congress. Nobody on Capitol Hill expects the President to approve public hearings on the question, but serious men in the Congress, both critics and defenders of the President's Vietnam policy, have urged him, without success, to get at the facts of drug addiction among the soldiers, and cooperate in legisla-

tion to deal with the drug casualties of the war.

This is so serious a problem that, unlike most political issues in Washington, it is beyond politics. Both parties, all factions for and against the Nixon policy of "winding down the war," agree on the human tragedy of drug addiction among the soldiers in Vietnam, and the dangers of sending them back home before they are cured, but this is what is happening. To save their lives by avoiding combat, many of the Americans in Vietnam are ruining their lives by drugs, and are being sent home to families and communities that have no means to cure or even understand the tragedy of their returning sons.

HOOKED ON SKAG IN VIETNAM

To the long catalog of horrors associated with the war in Southeast Asia has been added the numbing realization that thousands of young Americans are becoming heroin addicts in Vietnam.

No one knows exactly how many of our 262,000 troops in Vietnam are hooked on heroin—or skag, as the Vietnamese call it—but the estimates are that at least one soldier in 10, and perhaps one in five, is a hard drug user.

The situation is so serious that Congress is considering four separate bills to keep addicts in uniform until they're cured. One would require three years of rehabilitation by the Veterans Administration if in-service treatment fails.

Heroin is nothing new in Southeast Asia. It's cheap and easy to get. But the scope of the problem wasn't appreciated until several congressmen visited Vietnam and came back with reports of epidemic addiction.

Since last year the Army has been offering "amnesty" to soldiers who admit they have a drug problem. About 1,300 men a month have been turning themselves in.

But this only scratches the surface. Neither the Army nor the VA is equipped to provide the intensive and continuing care that many addicts need.

This overlooks the fact that American participation in the war is rapidly being wound down—and the immediate problem is to do something about the addiction that already exists.

There are three things to be done.

No soldier returning from Vietnam should be discharged from the service without a test to determine whether he's using heroin.

Facilities to treat drug addicts, both in and out of the service, should be expanded as quickly as possible.

Our allies should be pressured to take prompt action against the heroin traffic in Southeast Asia, much of which seems to be carried on with official complicity.

Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard has asked for a report by Friday on how addicts can be identified and treated before they slip back unnoticed into civilian life.

Delay of any kind could have tragic consequences.

IN PRAISE OF J. EDGAR HOOVER

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1971

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the following resolution passed by the Louisville, Miss., chapter of Patriotic American Youth concerning the outstanding service of J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

A RESOLUTION COMMENDING THE HONORABLE J. EDGAR HOOVER

Whereas, it appearing that many organizations or people of the United States of America are waging unfounded attacks upon the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, and the organization of dedicated investigators, and,

Whereas, as in the opinion of this group, the Internal Security of the United States of America depends upon the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and since this very Bureau is under attack by a group of radicals whose main purpose is to destroy the United States of America, and

Whereas, never before in its history has the work of the Federal Bureau been so necessary for the safety of the United States,

Be it resolved that we, the members of the Louisville, Miss. Chapter of the Patriotic American Youth of Mississippi, endorse by this resolution the work of the said J. Edgar Hoover and want him to know it. We want him to know that he has stuck to the rule he set for his organization and that it has as its main purpose the duty of investigation leaving the decision to bring action up to the Attorney General and the Department of Justice.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to Mr. Hoover and also that copies be sent to the President of the United States, to the Senators from Mississippi, and to our Representative, G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery.

This the Seventeenth day of May, Nineteen Hundred and Seventy One.

STEVE QUINN,

President, Patriotic American Youth,
Louisville, Miss., Chapter.

TERESA MILLS,

Secretary.

ESSAY WINNERS

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the Knights of Columbus' Cardinal O'Boyle General Assembly has conducted an essay contest on the theme, "What Does Patriotism Mean to Me?"

All the entries were good and the two winning essays were especially well written. I think the meaning of patriotism to these youngsters, both eighth graders at the Little Flower School, is of interest and value.

One winner, Nancy Smigel, wrote:

There is a feeling men have about their homeland that inspires them to defend their country and the rights and ideals attached to the national governmental system. This feeling is called patriotism. It led Nathan Hale and countless other American men toward unselfish sacrifice in the name of their country.

Patriotism is not complex, but it is also not simple. It is the type of loyalty and love a man might feel for his family. Though it may have faults and plenty of them, it is still his family, and he feels toward it a certain pride and love. Patriotism is this kind of feeling for your country. It includes devotion, a feeling of belonging, and a willingness to give of yourself to help or benefit one's country.

Today some of our citizens are directing a great deal of criticism toward our country and its policies. But man is not perfect, and since our democracy is the product of men, it also cannot be expected to be perfect. This

is inevitable. Dividing the country with riots and dissension is not the way to remedy our problems. By overcoming the bad with constructive efforts the country can profit and become better. This must be done through a peaceful process, not one of violent protest and unthinking emotion. The true patriot understands this and works through the Constitution and the legal processes, using his vote and a quiet voice to improve his country.

A person who has no patriotism—no feeling of love and pride for his country—is truly a sad and abnormal being, for there is not within him that mutual love and fellowship, the willingness to work together to solve common problems, that makes an individual a happy and useful member of his society.

The other winner, Michael Tigani, wrote:

Patriotism. What does it mean to me? For most people it means a love and loyal support of one's country, but to me it means much more than just a love of country. Patriotism, to me, is a feeling that I have for my country, a feeling of devotedness and faith so strong that I am willing to die for this nation. I am not only willing to die for my country, but also for all it stands. It stands for human rights and freedoms, for power enough to defend its people, and for religious freedom, so that I may be able to worship the one, true God.

This "love" is not only for my country, but also for the symbols that represent it, such as the flag of the United States of America. This is the flag that represented faith in our democracy during all our battles. Another symbol is the famous American Bald Eagle. When this mighty bird is pictured in flight, the nobility and proudest of this eagle, which stands for strength and freedom in America, can easily be seen.

However, as a whole, patriotism is courage. It is honesty. It is a strong, steadfast, and undying affection which I hold for my country. This is the true meaning of patriotism to me.

OPPOSES CORPS OF ENGINEERS FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Arizona Chapter of the Wildlife Society has forwarded to me a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by its board on May 4, 1971, opposing the proposed Corps of Engineers' flood control project on the lower Gila River in Arizona.

So that my colleagues may be aware of the Arizona chapter position on this matter, I include the text of its resolution at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

POSITION OF THE ARIZONA CHAPTER, THE WILDLIFE SOCIETY, RELATIVE TO THE FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, GILA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES DOWNSTREAM FROM PAINTED ROCK RESERVOIR, ARIZ.

Be it resolved, that the Arizona Chapter, The Wildlife Society oppose implementation of the Lower Gila River Project for the following reasons:

Whereas, the effects of this project will result in a considerable loss of game habitat for resident and migratory species and,

Whereas, this loss of game will result in the loss of many recreational hours of Arizona and California sportsmen and,

Whereas, the effects of this project will result in the elimination of many nongame species, including the rare and endangered Yuma clapper rail, from the lower Gila River and,

Whereas, the professional wildlife biologists of this chapter believe that the effects of the proposed project and its ramifications on wildlife and the ecology of the area have not received adequate consideration,

We therefore, support the many conservation organizations, groups and individuals including the Governor's Commission on Arizona Environment, the Arizona Wildlife Federation, Audubon Society, Sierra Club and the Yuma County Natural Resources Committee in opposition to this project.

CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING—THE PERIL IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, childhood lead poisoning, a killer across the Nation, is taking its toll in Washington, D.C. Of some 350 children recently tested for lead poisoning in the District's model cities area, 10 percent have higher lead concentrations in their bodies than is considered safe. Five of these youngsters have been hospitalized.

The city's Environmental Health Director, Malcolm C. Hope, has said that at least 20,000 District of Columbia children under the age of 6 have been exposed to leaded paint and should be examined for possible lead poisoning. One of every four children in the District of Columbia between the ages of 2 and 3 has elevated blood lead levels.

Some 11,000 children in the District are to be screened for lead poisoning this year. But, as Mr. Hope has said, screening of all youngsters in the city would be an overwhelming physical task much to costly for the District government to be able to afford.

Childhood lead poisoning is preventable, if funds are available to conduct screening, treatment, and eradication programs. The Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, Public Law 91-695, authorizes \$30 million for fiscal year 1972, of which \$25 million is authorized for grants to States and local communities for just such programs.

At this point, I am inserting a news-story from the June 3, 1971, edition of the Washington Evening Star, written by Walter Taylor and Ned Scarff, discussing the problem of childhood lead poisoning in Washington, D.C.:

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 3, 1971]

STANDARD HOUSING BLAMED IN POSSIBLE LEAD POISONINGS

(By Walter Taylor and Ned Scarff)

At least 20,000 District children under the age of 6 have been exposed to leaded paint and should be examined for possible lead poisoning, the city's environmental health director said yesterday.

Malcolm C. Hope of the District's Community Health Services Administration, said this exposure has occurred in the estimated 28,000 substandard housing units in the city built before World War II, when leaded paint was used extensively.

CXVII—1167—Part 14

The walls in many of these homes are still covered by paints with injurious lead contents, outlawed for interior use by both the federal and District governments in recent years, he said.

Hope said one of every four children in the city between the ages of 2 and 3 have "elevated" blood lead levels—more than 40 micrograms of lead per 100 milliliters of blood. In some ghetto areas, he said, the rate may be as high as three of every 10 children in that age group.

HUGE TASK

Under a program started last October by the Community Health Services Administration, neighborhood health centers were opened to all parents who wanted to have their children tested for chronic lead poisoning. Children seen regularly at selected city-operated "well baby clinics" are tested routinely.

But Hope said screening of all youngsters in the city would be an "overwhelming" physical task "much too costly" for the already financially overburdened District government to undertake.

Testing of about 11,000 children up to 6 years of age is being conducted by the health agency, however. A mobile screening unit has found about 10 percent of those children tested so far have unusually high levels of lead in their bloodstreams.

The District had 127 reported cases of lead poisoning in 1970, Hope told newsmen at the conference. So far this year, 33 cases have been diagnosed.

Plumbism can result in a number of physical and mental disorders, ranging from blindness to severe mental retardation, and sometimes death. The last recorded fatality was a 3-year-old Northeast Washington boy last July.

In the District, he said, it is estimated that 50 to 60 percent of infants 18 months to 2 years of age have some pica tendencies.

IN HOUSING AGENCY BUILDING

Five children have been hospitalized as a result of tests being administered in the Model Cities area. It was learned yesterday that one of them, 18-month-old Janette Hardy of 11 Q Street NE, lives in a building leased by the District's public housing authority.

Deputy Director Monteria Ivey of the National Capital Housing Authority said lead paint has never been used in the agency's own housing, but 220 houses are leased from private owners. He said NCHA is surveying the leased houses to see which were built before 1940 and house infants with pica.

Ivey said a test to determine the lead content of paint in the Hardy infant's home will be conducted today. If it is found to exceed the maximum standards allowed by District law—1 percent by weight—the paint will be ordered removed, he said.

REVENUE SHARING PALES IN PUBLIC SPOTLIGHT

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, when brought out into the light of day, the administration's so called revenue sharing plan pales. It fails to live up to the great promise of salvation for our States and communities.

The most effective means we in Congress have to bring much needed help to these levels of government is to lift from them the burden of increasing welfare costs. I have been a firm advocate that

welfare is a national problem and as such must be dealt with at the national level.

The House Ways and Means Committee has taken a first step with its report on H.R. 1. But much more must be done.

Many people supported the idea of revenue sharing when it was first presented but are coming to realize the deficiencies which I and other Members of Congress have been pointing out. I would like to share with my colleagues an editorial from the Middletown, N.Y., Times-Herald-Record in my district:

REVENUE SHARING

Almost two years have gone by since President Nixon first proposed sharing federal revenues with the states and municipalities. Mr. Nixon's modest initial program involving only \$500 million the first year, became this year a \$5 billion cornerstone for a "New American Revolution."

Hearings start tomorrow before the House Ways and Means Committee on the \$5 billion plan, except that Chairman Wilbur D. Mills, D-Ark., has in mind to kill, not approve, the plan.

Mills has described the Nixon scheme as "the blunderbuss . . . 'cure-all-ills' proposal currently being bloodhooed across the country." He found it filled with "technical deficiencies, flagrant inequities, capriciousness, and fundamental flaws, both in principle and in implementation" and called it a "very bad and very dangerous proposal."

The appeal of no-strings-attached revenue sharing is strong and obvious: A substantial amount of money, maximum discretion for state and local officials, and a disguised burden for taxpayers.

Witness after witness can be expected to describe the very real fiscal crises they face. Most cities and some states are indeed on the threshold of bankruptcy.

We were impressed by the idea of revenue sharing at first. Now we see it as potential pork barrel in the hands of officials of varying sagacity.

Congress could do the country a much bigger favor, and prevent squandering at the same time, by simply assuming all costs of welfare, which is a national problem. This step alone would perk up the economy of every state, county, and city.

Mr. Mills and others may be quite right in looking this revenue-sharing gift horse in the mouth.

SOUTH DAKOTANS SUPPORT FEDERAL DECENTRALIZATION

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1971

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, I was pleased to take part in a special order sponsored by my good friend and colleague, TENO RONCALIO. The subject of this special order was the decentralization of Federal Government and dispersal of Federal agencies. The interest which this topic generates is well expressed in a letter I recently received from Dr. Shu-t'ien Li, professor emeritus and consulting engineer, of Rapid City, S. Dak., and in an editorial from the Rapid City Journal.

I call both of these to your attention:

ABOUREZK-RONCALIO'S DISPERSAL OF FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY

The United States of America has outgrown the circumstances of 1790 under which

the Congress directed the selection of a capital site when the Union was confined to the north and middle Atlantic seaboard. Today, the nation has huge interior and international interests on both the Atlantic and the Pacific. The mammoth government, its building mania, and concentration of federal bureaucracy with unprecedented number of federal employees, are all beyond the vision of the original planner, Pierre Charles L'Enfant. His creative planned beauty has been gradually lost through piecemeal annexes and additions.

Even the movement of people through the District of Columbia and adjoining areas of Virginia and Maryland has necessitated the building of a 98-mile metro rapid transit system now under construction at the huge cost of \$5,800 per linear foot.

Whether "Will Washington recognize opportunity to save itself?" as queried by the Rapid City Journal editorial (5/27/71, p. 4), the Abourezk-Roncalio's dispersal of federal bureaucracy deserves the support of all concerned. It does not need a plan for governmental reorganization, but rather a relocation of all routine-execution agencies. Governmental-deployment common sense can tell:

1. Only the Congress of the United States, the Judicial Branch, and the Executive Branch with cabinet-level departments and their policy-making officials need have offices in Washington, D.C.

2. All commissions, administrations, and agencies created heretofore for the routine execution of Congressional Acts signed into law can be dispersed into a number of satellite sub-capitals of their own kind.

Before the advent of air transport, the location of capitals on the seaboard, like Jordan, St. Petersburg (former capital of Russia), Tokyo, Rio de Janeiro (former capital of Brazil), etc. had their 19th-century significance. In the present jet age, Moscow, Paris, Madrid, Johannesburg, New Delhi, Ottawa, Mexico City, etc. are just as politico-functional capitals as Buenos Aires, Stockholm, Copenhagen, and Lisbon.

The bold scheme of Brazilians to move their capital out of Rio de Janeiro in 1960 to an everything-newly-created Brazilia in the interior deserves an in-depth consideration by Abourezk, Roncalio, and their Congressional colleagues.

It is Wichita, Kansas that is near the geographical center of the United States, rather than on the Northeast Corridor nor Southern California. Instead of separately crowding in Baltimore and New York, the Social Security Administration can better move to Wichita, Kansas City, or Denver. The Oahe irrigation project has not been benefited by having the nerve of USBR in the capital instead of all in Denver.

The nation can reverse the rural-to-urban population migration and its contingent evils through a far-sighted relocation of the capital and a dispersal of federal agencies into a number of strategically situated functional federal centers. The Congress of 1971 should take a different overview of the 50 states and possessions than the Congress of 1790 with only 13 states on the Atlantic seaboard.

WILL WASHINGTON RECOGNIZE OPPORTUNITY TO SAVE ITSELF?

Question: Will Washington's bureaucracy recognize the offer being made to save the nation's capital from strangling itself?

If not and nothing comes of the rescue attempt by Congressmen Jim Abourezk of South Dakota and Teno Roncalio of Wyoming, let it never be said they didn't try to hasten decentralization of federal government and dispersal of federal agencies. Six pages in the May 17 "Congressional Record" tell about it.

Abourezk and Roncalio were joined by Mo Udall of Arizona, John Melcher of Montana, Gunn McKay of Utah, Ed Jones of Tennessee

and John Blatnik of Minnesota. Their states would all benefit from a plan for governmental reorganization aimed at a healthier and more economic distribution of the population.

The imbalance is dramatically evident in Washington which is becoming overcrowded to the point that Roncalio wants a moratorium on federal construction in the capital. Population density per square mile exceeds 12,000 persons because of government overcentralization, and Roncalio is asking for new criteria for federal site selections to "end the building mania in Washington."

Proof that Washington is in trouble was a recent 10-week moratorium on building permits because its workers could no longer handle the additional load. Because of the proliferation of buildings, Washington's classic beauty is diminishing. Clutter, chaos and claustrophobia are overtaking the capital when a remedy is available through dispersal.

Fine examples of government escaping the metropolitan octopus are the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs and the Atmospheric Research Center in Boulder. They prove that orderly placement of research and training centers can encourage reasonable growth without damaging the environment or the basic life style.

Abourezk makes the point that as the population moves to the West, the concentrations of people become further removed from their center of government. Yet the concept of democracy is based on the premise that the people can govern themselves and keep track of what the government is doing. Placing government facilities in smaller and middle-sized communities throughout the nation would both stabilize the rural to urban population migration and bring government back closer to the people. The former would help solve problems of urbanization and the latter would revitalize our democracy.

From here, the proposition makes sense. Perhaps the powers that he will comprehend it all before Washington sinks under the weight of concrete and marble that just keeps getting heavier.

FULL VOTING REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1971

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I launched a drive for self-determination for the people of the District of Columbia. As I have indicated, this effort has two equally important parts. The first is home rule which involves a broad congressional delegation of authority over local matters to an elected municipal government chosen by the people of this city. The second part of the struggle for self-rule requires full voting representation in both Houses of the Congress for the citizens of the District.

With respect to home rule, I have prepared a tentative draft of proposed home-rule legislation that provides for an elected mayor—city council form of government, having complete legislative authority over local matters and fiscal autonomy coupled with an automatic Federal payment. I submitted this draft proposal to the people of this city in a series of hearings held in each of the city's eight wards. The testimony given

by citizens at the hearings was uniformly of high caliber and provided me with a number of excellent suggestions that I am now evaluating. I expect to introduce a home-rule bill, reflecting this process of citizen involvement, within the next 2 weeks.

Today, I will introduce in the House of Representatives a joint resolution amending the U.S. Constitution to give the people of this long-denied city full voting representation in the U.S. Congress. The constitutional amendment, which must be approved by two-thirds of the Members of both the House and Senate and then ratified by three-fourths of the States, has several key provisions:

The District of Columbia would elect two Senators and as many House Members as it would be entitled to if it were a State, which according to a letter I have received from the Director of the Census Bureau, would result in two Members.

Each Senator or Representative would possess the same qualifications as to age and citizenship and have the same rights, privileges, and obligations as other Senators and Representatives.

A vacancy in the representation of the District in the House or Senate would be filled in a special election by D.C. voters.

The amendment would have no effect on the provision in the 23d amendment for determining the number of Presidential and Vice-Presidential electors the District is entitled to. Each District representative would be able to participate in the choosing of the President or Vice President.

That the District has no voting representation in the Congress is a mockery of the democratic process. Citizens of the District carry all the burdens and obligations of national citizenship but they have no vote in Congress in establishing national policies. Even worse, while Congress sits as a local city council for the District, I, as the Representative of these 764,000 people, have no vote, and only a small voice, in the decisions about the adoption of local legislation. The people of the District pay taxes of hundreds of millions of dollars each year, send their sons and brothers to die in useless Asian wars, and serve as host to millions of Americans who each year visit Washington, the seat of Western democracy. But the people of the District, who are profoundly affected by the judgments of this Congress, are given only the smallest opportunity to shape those decisions. This is unjust and directly contrary to the principles upon which this Nation was founded and has existed for the last 180 years.

As the swamplands and the cow-pastures that were the District of Columbia in 1800 evolved into a dynamic metropolis, the injustice of denying the residents of the Nation's Capital became all too clear. As early as 1818, President James Monroe expressed the view that the District should have representation in the National Legislature. The first resolution calling for the required constitutional amendment was introduced in Congress in 1877. Since 1915, every President, both Democratic and Republican alike, has supported congressional representation for the District. In 1967,

President Lyndon B. Johnson submitted a proposal calling for a single District of Columbia voting representative in the House and giving the Congress authority to establish additional Senators and Representatives by statute up to the number the District would have if it were a State. This measure received full and thorough hearings before the House Judiciary Committee. The committee overwhelmingly approved and reported out a broader proposal than that submitted by the President constitutionally guaranteeing the District two Senators, and as many Representatives in the House as it would have if it were a State. The House Rules Committee refused to send the bill to the floor and no further action was taken by the House.

Both in the 91st Congress and now in the 92d, President Richard Nixon, carrying out the commitment made in his party's 1968 platform, urged the Congress to adopt a constitutional amendment granting voting representation to the people of this city.

It is difficult to conceive of any valid reason why the District of Columbia should be denied full voting representation in the Congress. Eleven States are less populous than the District but are fully represented in the Congress:

	Population (Preliminary 1970 Census Estimated)
No Senators, No Representatives District of Columbia.....	764,000
<i>Two Senators, Two Representatives</i>	
Hawaii.....	748,000
New Hampshire.....	722,000
Idaho.....	698,000
Montana.....	682,000
South Dakota.....	661,000
North Dakota.....	610,000
<i>Two Senators, One Representative</i>	
Delaware.....	542,000
Nevada.....	481,000
Vermont.....	437,000
Wyoming.....	328,000
Alaska.....	294,000

These States have 39 congressional representatives—22 Senators and 17 Congressmen. It is amazing to consider that these 11 States possess almost 25 percent of the votes in the U.S. Senate. Yet the District has no voice in the Senate, voting or otherwise. The District is treated differently from these States even though it, with almost 800,000 residents, is more populous than any State was at the founding of the Republic.

What is most tragic about this appalling injustice is that numerous nations with their national capital under Federal jurisdiction grant representation in the national legislature to the inhabitants of that city. In the British Commonwealth, both Australia and India give voting representation to the people of the national capital. In Latin America, Argentina, Mexico, and Venezuela grant representation to the citizens of the capital city, which, like the District, is under Federal control.

It is difficult to see how we as a nation can proclaim our democratic institutions to the people of the world while a colonial refuge, such as the District of Columbia, exists—not in the far reaches of an empire, but at the seat of National

Government. This must surely shame the people of this Nation. I am convinced that if this Congress were to adopt a full representation proposal and submit it to the States, it would be overwhelmingly and speedily approved. The 23d amendment, giving District of Columbia residents a vote in Presidential elections, was approved in near record time of under 1 year.

Great strides have been made since the establishment of the American Republic toward expanding the right to vote to an ever-growing number of Americans. Beginning after the Civil War, the States ratified the 15th amendment prohibiting denial of the vote on the basis of race. The 17th amendment took from State legislatures and gave to the people the right to elect U.S. Senators. The 19th amendment eliminated sex as the basis for denying the vote. More recently, the 23d amendment gave residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote in presidential elections, and the 24th amendment abolished the poll tax. The 1965 Civil Rights Act provided the weight of the Federal Government to enforce the protections provided under the 15th amendment, and the Supreme Court established the 1-man, 1-vote principle in order to make the right to vote equal among all citizens. In this very session of Congress, additional historic steps were taken to provide 18-year-olds the right to vote by constitutional amendment. The denial of the right to representation to the people of the District stands out as a glaring piece of unfinished business in this Nation's drive toward a more perfect democratic government. It is unfinished business that I am placing on the agenda of this Congress.

I am hopeful that we will see action this session of Congress. A subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, headed by Congressman ROBINO of New Jersey, has announced that hearings will be held on representation for the District sometime later this month. A measure substantially identical to mine has been introduced by the District's long-time friend and chairman of the full Judiciary Committee, EMANUEL CELLER. With this kind of support, I am confident that a broad proposal will be reported out of committee soon. The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION

To amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The people of the District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall elect two Senators and the number of Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State. Each Senator or Representative

so elected shall be an inhabitant of the District and shall possess the same qualifications as to age and citizenship and have the same rights, privileges, and obligations as a Senator or Representative from a State.

"SEC. 2. When vacancies happen in the representation of the District in either the Senate or the House of Representatives, the people of the District shall fill such vacancies by election.

"SEC. 3. This article shall have no effect on the provisions made in the twenty-third article of amendment to the Constitution for determining the number of electors for President and Vice President to be appointed for the District. Each Representative or Senator from the District shall be entitled to participate in the choosing of the President or Vice President in the House of Representatives or Senate under the twelfth article of amendment as if the District were a State.

"SEC. 4. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

CAREER PROGRESSION LEGISLATION FOR AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1971

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from the First District of Oregon (Mr. WYATT) and I, along with 23 other Members, are introducing legislation which will provide an equitable system of retirement and the opportunity for secondary careers within the Federal Aviation Administration for the Nation's air traffic controllers. As most of the Members of this body know, the air traffic controllers have been the subject of considerable controversy in recent years—a controversy which happily seems well on its way to being resolved. Nevertheless, two of the remaining areas which have not been remedied to date are the right for early retirement and a second career for air traffic controllers. The legislation that we are introducing today, I believe, deals fairly and effectively with these areas.

I would like to point out that, with only minor differences, this legislation parallels a bill that has already been introduced in the Senate by the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the senior Senator from Wyoming, Mr. MCGEE, S. 1904. At this point I would like to acknowledge our appreciation to the Senator from Wyoming for his cooperation in our campaign to seek equity for the controllers.

The Department of Transportation has already sent to the Congress its version of retirement legislation for the controllers. We have studied the FAA/DOT bill carefully. It contains a number of features which we have incorporated into the bill we introduce today; but in other areas it is deficient and it is for this reason that we have introduced our bill.

One of the principal features of the legislation provides for a new retirement formula for air traffic controllers. Under section 5(a), the controller would be given 1.4 years credit toward retirement for every year he works as a controller.

This formula is based on the recommendations made by the Air Traffic Controller Career Committee, headed by Dr. John J. Corson, which was created by Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe in September 1969 to study the various problems of air traffic controllers. After an in-depth inquiry, which consumed several months, the Corson Committee unanimously recommended the 1.4 formula for retirement, which we have incorporated into this legislation.

When the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee holds hearings on this and other controller retirement bills, we intend to further review the recommendations made by the Corson Committee on controller retirement and other aspects of the problem. In this brief statement, however, suffice it to say that in the retirement formula we are directly following the recommendations made by the committee that Secretary Volpe himself appointed.

Another significant feature of our legislation is the procedure for personnel actions for controllers. The significant difference between our bill and the one proposed by the FAA/DOT is that we provide a safeguard to the unlimited authority of the Secretary of Transportation in controller personnel actions by providing for an independent appeal board to his decisions. While we have no specific objection to the clearly defined powers of the Secretary of Transportation, we seek to redress the obvious lack of appeal procedures for the controller in the FAA/DOT bill.

Under our bill, if the Secretary demotes, releases, or involuntarily separates a controller from service, the controller may seek review of the Secretary's decision on reconsideration by a Board of Review to be composed of a hearing examiner designated by the Civil Service Commission—who shall be the Chairman—a representative of the Secretary, a representative of the Federal Air Surgeon, and two air traffic controllers. The Board's decision, either in support or reversal of the Secretary's action, would be final. Establishment of such a Board, Mr. Speaker, we believe would eliminate a major cause of friction between the FAA and the controllers, which are well documented in the report of the Corson Committee.

Another significant area that is not covered by the FAA/DOT legislation is the problem of job-connected medical problems, which are an acknowledged outgrowth of stresses and strains of the air traffic controllers career. Section 6 of our legislation entitles an air traffic controller to receive such additional sick leave as might be necessary over and above his regular sick leave, if a flight surgeon and at least three medical doctors certify that the controller is temporarily unable to perform his duties.

Mr. Speaker, a number of studies made by surgeons and doctors on various groups of controllers has shown that controllers suffer from ulcers, hypertension, heart diseases, and other malfunctions that could be directly associated with the stresses of their employment. Allowing these controllers, if the medical evidence warrants it, sufficient sick-leave time to recover from these job-connected ail-

ments would seem to us to be a basic matter of equity and justice.

The final significant area of this legislation involves the issue of secondary careers for controllers who are, in the words of the Corson Committee, "burned out." The Corson Committee determined that the average length of a controller's useful period of service is far less than that of the ordinary civil service employee in a nonstress job. For these controllers, opportunities for a secondary career within the FAA itself should be provided. Most of these controllers, even though they may be "burned out" for work in towers and centers, nevertheless have valuable skills that should be utilized by the FAA. For this reason, our legislation provides for the retraining of these controllers for other employment within the Federal aviation system.

Specifically, our legislation proposes that the Department of Transportation would pay the controller his regular base pay while he is training for new employment and would also pay the expenses of that training. Mr. Speaker, not only will this provision of our legislation give a decent break to those controllers who have served the Nation's aviation system faithfully and well; it will help provide a valuable group of expert career employees for important new jobs within the Federal aviation system.

REVENUE SHARING

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the first 2 days of hearings on the administration's program for general revenue sharing, the critics have continually returned to one central point: namely, that the distribution formulas scatter funds indiscriminately, aiding affluent and poor communities with equal measure. Therefore, so the critics argue, revenue sharing is nothing more than a giant political boondoggle aimed at courting favor with officials and taxpayers all across the country while paying short shrift to the pressing needs of our crisis-stricken central cities.

Mr. Speaker, I would not deny the existence of certain aberrational cases in which wealthy suburbs, with the advantage of a high personal-income base and high tax effort, receive a disproportionate share of funds. I am certain that every member of this body could find one such example in his own district. But I also know that these are exceptions not the rule. The facts clearly and unequivocally demonstrate that our central cities have considerably higher tax efforts per capita than their surrounding suburbs and consequently are slated to receive considerably higher per capita portions of the revenue-sharing money.

To be specific a recent study by the Advisory Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations showed that per capita tax burdens in the central cities of the 37 leading SMSA's averaged \$200 per capita while the average for their subur-

ban peripheries was \$159 per capita. Since these SMSA's account for 50 percent of the local tax revenues nationwide, the fact that the central cities have a 33-percent higher per capita tax effort means that the administration's intrastate distribution formula, indeed, targets the money where it is needed, all the aberrant examples of the critics notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate enough that the critics of revenue sharing persist in ignoring these basic facts. What is worse, they are not even consistent about their own argument in favor of a progressive allocation of burdens and benefits. For the simple fact is, if we do not supplement State and local treasuries with funds from the progressive national income tax base, these governments will be forced to draw even more heavily on their own strained, regressive tax systems.

Consider the following basic trends. In the years between 1950 and 1967, combined State and local tax receipts increased by \$47 billion or about 280 percent. According to a recent study about 76 percent of this growth resulted from property, sales, consumption, and other regressive taxes. Thus about \$36 billion annually of these additional State and local revenues is being raised from regressive sources. During the same period by contrast there have been five Federal income tax cuts amounting, according to the estimates of one prominent economist, to \$35 billion annually. Together these two developments amount to a massive shift of the tax burden toward lower income groups.

In light of the critics much trumpeted concern about fair distributions of tax burdens, it is interesting to note that almost 25 percent of State and local taxes are raised from families with less than \$8,000 in annual income, whereas less than half this much—11 percent—of Federal income tax revenues are raised from these families. Put another way, almost 16 percent of the income of families in the \$4,000 to \$6,000 range is taken by State and local taxes, while only 3.5 percent is taken by Federal income taxes. And, of course, conversely, those with incomes above \$50,000 pay nearly 20 percent of their income in personal income taxes but only 2 percent in State and local property taxes and 1 percent in sales taxes, the two primary sources of funds for these units of government.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the foregoing, I am afraid that all this concern about fair distribution burdens and benefits on the part of revenue-sharing critics sounds more than a little bit hollow. I believe we need to halt the steady erosion of our tax systems away from a progressive base toward regressive ones. I believe revenue sharing can be the vehicle for this reversal and I challenge the critics to show otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, the perceptive syndicated columnist, David Broder of the Washington Post, recently addressed himself to these points in a most provocative column entitled "Subject of Taxes Slips Into the Open." He wrote that in light of ever-rising public demands for more health, welfare, educational and environmental services and programs, "the

only honest answer is that someone is going to have to pay higher taxes if the widely accepted social goals of this decade are going to be met." Yet he noted further that unless the trend toward reliance on a regressive tax base is reversed, "it is clear enough who is going to pay: The low- and middle-income families who have been socked with most of the tax rises in the past two decades."

I commend this article to my colleagues and ask that it be reprinted at this point in the RECORD:

SUBJECT OF TAXES SLIPS INTO THE OPEN

(By David S. Broder)

It has remained for Andrew F. Brimmer, an appointive official with a 14-year term on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to let slip the "dirty little secret" that every politician in elective office in Washington has tried to keep hidden.

Taxes are going up, Brimmer told an audience in a widely reported commencement speech last weekend. Taxes have to go up in this decade if we are going to meet the demands on this society.

Already there has been what Brimmer called "a serious deterioration" in the quality of the basic services the public relies on government to provide, as witness the condition of the education, transportation and law enforcement systems in almost any of our major metropolitan areas.

Meantime, the backlog of demands for new governmental services—from universal health insurance to child-care centers to pollution abatement—is growing steadily. How are these to be paid for, Brimmer asks. The supposed "Vietnam peace dividend" has vanished. Programs already on the books will consume virtually all the "normal growth in federal revenues."

The answer, the obvious answer, the only honest answer, is that someone is going to have to pay higher taxes if the widely accepted social goals of this decade are going to be met.

The politicians prefer to play hide and seek with the voters on the tax issue, because the folklore of politics is that any candidate who talks about tax hikes is doomed to defeat.

But their ostrich act cannot conceal the fact that taxes are going to rise. All it can do is deprive the country—and the taxpayers—of intelligent discussion of who should pay the bill.

Unless such discussion and debate begin, it is clear enough who is going to pay: the low- and middle-income families who have been socked with most of the tax rise in the past two decades.

As Walter Heller noted in his congressional testimony on revenue-sharing the other day, the federal income tax—which, for all its loopholes, is the one major tax that hits the rich man harder than the poor—has been cut five times since the Korean War, for a cumulative tax break of \$35 billion a year.

Meantime, there have been steep increases in those taxes that hit the less affluent family hardest: local property taxes, state sales and excise taxes, and federal payroll taxes. (As a result, our national tax system is measurably less fair, less progressive now than it was two decades ago.)

How can this have happened without stirring a major political controversy? The only answer one can give is that there has been something like a conspiracy of silence among the politicians to keep the voters from discovering what has been going on.

The game is still being played. It is newspapermen, not politicians, who have publicized the fact that the social security-welfare reform bill Wilbur Mills has sent to the House contains an 86 per cent hike in the payroll taxes a \$200-a-week factory worker will pay in the next six years—an increase so

big that it will, in many instances, wipe out the supposed gain he has received from his recent income tax cuts.

Similarly, it is not politicians but two career men in the Census Bureau who have set forth in the clearest fashion the facts on who pays taxes in this country today.

Back in April, the Bureau's Herman P. Miller and Roger A. Herriott published a scholarly paper that might well be the most important political documents of the year—except for the fact the politicians have acted as if they did not want to know it exists.

With great care and detail, the two statisticians demonstrated two stunningly simple points:

1. For all the advertised social programs of the Fair Deal, the New Frontier, the Great Society and the New American Revolution, the distribution of incomes in this country has hardly changed one iota since World War II. The top one per cent of the families still receive more than the bottom 20 per cent; the top five per cent, more than the bottom 40 per cent. If greater equality was a goal of the past 25 years' social policies, they have not achieved their objective.

2. Despite the widespread notion that we have a progressive tax system, there is almost no relationship between tax burdens and ability to pay. In 1968, by the careful calculations of Miller and Herriott, the effective tax rate was just about level (varying only between 30 and 33 per cent) on families from the \$2,000-a-year income level all the way up to \$50,000-a-year.

Rich families faced steeper rates on their income taxes, but paid a much smaller proportion of their income in sales, excise and payroll taxes. Overall, the \$50,000 family gave the government no higher proportion of its income than the family with one-tenth as much earning power.

One would think there would be political temptation—if not a moral imperative—for some presidential hopeful to tell the American people these facts, to confirm their suspicion that the vast majority of them have good reason to be dissatisfied with the deal they are getting on taxes.

But they are all tongue-tied about taxes—with one exception. In almost every speech he makes, George Wallace says that taxes will be the main issue of his 1972 campaign. Is this really an issue the other candidates want to leave to him?

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Reinhold Niebuhr died this week. He was a giant of the 20th century. I shall always be intensely grateful that I had the opportunity to know him as a friend.

I am inserting herewith the articles and editorials about him which appeared in today's Washington Post and New York Times. Understandably, the articles emphasize his years of incredibly full activity before illness struck him in 1952. In the almost two decades since that time he bore a series of job-like afflictions with stunning courage and grace. It should be noted too that, over this long period of suffering, Reinhold Niebuhr's family, especially his wife Ursula, showed equal courage and grace in their unflagging devotion.

The Post and Times articles and editorials follow:

THEOLOGIAN REINHOLD NIEBUHR

(By William R. MacKaye)

Reinhold Niebuhr, who died Tuesday in Stockbridge, Mass., at 78, was one of the intellectual giants of the 20th century, a man who shunned the titles of theologian and political philosopher but was those and more.

He came as close as any man of his time to marrying the immiscible strands of the American past—the society's biblical, Christian inheritance and the secularist, utilitarian origins of its political institutions—into a unified view of the world.

He was one of those rare church leaders who spoke with power not only to the church on churchly matters but also to the world on worldly matters.

Dr. Niebuhr's principal pulpit during his long public career was as professor of applied Christianity at New York's Union Theological Seminary, on whose faculty he served for more than 40 years. But even as he taught new generations of ministers and academic theologians, he took on such assignments as adviser to the State Department's Foreign Policy Staff and officer of the Liberal Party, a political third party in New York state.

An early Socialist and pacifist, he abandoned these positions in the 1930s in favor of staunch support of the New Deal and a conviction that the United States was morally obligated to intervene internationally to put down Nazism.

The nature of his times, an era that saw the rise of a multiplicity of totalitarianisms, and his own reading of the Bible and of history stimulated in Dr. Niebuhr a skepticism about man and society that he called "Christian realism." His understanding of man was in effect an emphasis on human limitation and fallibility that set him in opposition to the easy optimism preached for opposite reasons by both theological liberals and by fundamentalists.

Dr. Niebuhr's dark vision of the human situation is illustrated in typical fashion in the closing paragraphs of his major work, "The Nature and Destiny of Man," a two-volume essay that grew out of his delivery of the Gifford Lectures at the University of Edinburgh in 1939:

"The freedom of man transcends the flux of nature in such a way that the hope of completely severing the spirit from the integuments of nature is an understandable illusion. The processes of growth in history are furthermore, so obvious that the modern error of confusing growth with progress may be regarded as an equally inevitable mistake.

"Yet both these mistakes also rested upon a willful disregard of some of the obvious evidences.

"It is obvious that man does not have the power to extricate himself from flux and finiteness, as idealists and mystics of the ancient and the modern world believed.

"It is equally obvious that history does not solve the basic problems of human existence but reveals them on progressively new levels.

"The belief that men could solve his problem either by an escape from history or by the historical process itself is a mistake which is partly prompted by the most universal of all 'ideological' taints: the pride not of particular men and cultures, but a man as man."

The rolling sentences of this passage also illustrate the sonority that was characteristic of most of his writing, lecturing and preaching. One Niebuhr admirer recalled that a woman rushed up to him at the conclusion of one of his appearances saying that she couldn't understand a word he said but that she would be content to hear him recite the alphabet.

Reinhold Niebuhr—his friends called him "Reinie"—was born in Wright City, Mo. He was the son of an immigrant father who was a pastor of the Evangelical Synod of North America, a denomination of German origin that is now a part of the United Church of Christ.

Of the Niebuhr children, three achieved exception ecclesiastical distinction. In addition to Reinhold Niebuhr there were also H. Richard Niebuhr, for many years a professor at Yale Divinity School, whose theological impact on American Christendom was nearly as profound as his brother's, and Hulda Niebuhr, a sister, who had a long career as a teacher at McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago.

Reinhold attended Eden Theological Seminary, a seminary of this denomination, and graduated from Yale Divinity School in 1914.

After receiving a Master of Arts degree in 1915 he was ordained to the ministry of the Evangelical Synod and thereupon took up the only pastorate of his career, a 13-year stint as minister of Bethel Evangelical Church in Detroit, a struggling congregation composed principally of laborers on automobile assembly lines.

Before long the young minister found himself locked in struggle with Henry Ford. Mr. Niebuhr's outrage at the conditions under which auto workers of that era labored led him into his temporary espousal of socialism, an embrace, he later confessed, that preceded his reading the works of Karl Marx.

In 1928 he moved on to the faculty of Union Seminary, where he spent the remainder of his life.

The multifariousness of Dr. Niebuhr's interests and activities and the prodigiousness of his energy led him over the years into close associations with such disparate figures as diplomat George Kennan, Episcopal Bishop William Scarlett, Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, historian Arthur Schlesinger Jr., Scottish theologian John Baillie, Jewish scholar Rabbi Abraham Heschel, lawyer and public figure Dean Acheson and a list that could run on much longer.

Many of these men kept up with the unfolding of Dr. Niebuhr's thought by following his writing in "Christianity and Crisis," a Christian journal of opinion he founded in 1941 to promote the activist, interventionist stance he espoused.

During World War II and thereafter, Dr. Niebuhr relied more and more firmly on historical analysis of issues he saw confronting his nation and world.

Ronald H. Stone, one of his students and the collector of the most recent volume of his essays, noted:

"As his thought became more historically oriented, it also grew more pragmatic. The results of the New Deal and Franklin D. Roosevelt's pragmatic foreign policy convinced Niebuhr of the dangers and irrelevance of ideology to the problems confronting the United States . . .

"His influence on purging Protestantism of absolutisms in social ethics has been one of his more important contributions in American life. No man or political idea was good enough to be trusted completely; both had to be checked by other men and ideas and continually evaluated in the light of their contribution to the common good."

Dr. Niebuhr suffered the first of a long series of crippling strokes in 1952, when he was only 60, and physically he was a semi-invalid thereafter.

But if his body was weakened, his mental energies remained undaunted, and commentary and analysis continued to flow from his pen at a scarcely lessened pace.

In addition to innumerable articles in newspapers and magazines, Dr. Niebuhr was the author of more than 20 books. Besides "The Nature and Destiny of Man," some of the more memorable are "Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Critic," "Moral Man and Immoral Society," "Beyond Tragedy," "The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness," "Faith and History," "Irony and American History" and "The Structure of Nations and Empires."

Dr. Niebuhr's participation in the exchange of ideas covered so long a span of years and grappled with such a variety of

public issues that that at least one younger scholar forgot too soon that he was still alive and active.

This writer imprudently suggested a few years ago that Harvard Divinity School theologian Harvey Cox was "this generation's Reinhold Niebuhr." The scholar was promptly assailed by an angry swarm of Niebuhr disciples who retorted that "Reinhold Niebuhr is this generation's Reinhold Niebuhr."

Dr. Niebuhr's funeral will be conducted at 3 p.m. Friday in the United Church of Christ in Stockbridge, Mass., the western Massachusetts town where he died. Friends said a memorial service would probably be conducted later in New York.

He is survived by his wife of 40 years, the former Ursula Keppel-Compton, a son, Christopher, Albany, N.Y., and a daughter, Elizabeth Sifton, Brooklyn.

Large numbers owe large debts to the teaching of Reinhold Niebuhr. For secularists who sought to make sense out of the mysterious ways of politics—never mind the mysteries of religious faith—he was a careful explainer of the creative role that law can play in causing positive social change. For believers, whether in God, Christianity or some form of metaphysical truth, he insisted that the religious experience should be less a form of parochial loyalty than a commitment to values that help men to overcome hate, injustice, ignorance. For pragmatists who wanted here-and-now results, he was the pastor of a Detroit church who, more than 50 years ago, daringly spoke out against what he considered the callous management practices of Henry Ford.

All these different roles might suggest a man on the run, a part-time specialist touching many bases but never fully covering any. Yet diversity was a main reason for Mr. Niebuhr's excellence, because essential to anything he did or thought was a tie-in to Christian realism. He wrote:

"The finest task of achieving justice will be done neither by the Utopians who dream dreams of perfect brotherhood nor yet by the cynics who believe that the self-interest of nations cannot be overcome. It must be done by the realists who understand that nations are selfish and will be so till the end of history, but that none of us, no matter how selfish we may be, can be only selfish."

Because his writing and preaching on religion had little or none of the revival tent to it, Mr. Niebuhr attracted a wide following in those seminaries where students demand that the church help solve the problems of war, racism and poverty. More than a few of the clergymen jailed in recent years for civil disobedience, or those who work to organize the poor or the ethnic communities, were first nudged that way by Niebuhr. He disdained what he called "a simple pietistic version of the Protestant faith" by which celebrity-preachers try to prove "that prayer can harness divine power to human ends, particularly to the ends of business success and happiness."

Although he could be as abstruse as the next theologian when the moment was right, Mr. Niebuhr's writing and speaking style generally remained simple. A tribute many will pay him is not only to go back and re-read his better-known works, but make the effort to go forward and apply them to one's daily life. His notions of Christian realism apply so well, perhaps because they are needed so much.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, PROTESTANT THEOLOGIAN, DIES

The Rev. Reinhold Niebuhr, the Protestant theologian who had wide influence in the worlds of religion and politics, died Tuesday evening at his summer home in Stockbridge, Mass., after a long illness. He was 78 years old.

Mr. Niebuhr had been under orders from his doctors in recent years to cut down on his sermons and lectures.

Throughout his long career he was a theo-

logian who preached in the marketplace, a philosopher of ethics who applied his belief to everyday moral predicaments and a political liberal who subscribed to a hard-boiled pragmatism.

Combining all these capacities, he was the architect of a complex philosophy based on the fallibility of man and the absurdity of human pretensions, as well as on the Biblical precepts that man should love God and his neighbor.

The Protestant theology that Mr. Niebuhr evolved over a life-time was called neo-orthodoxy. It stressed original sin, which Mr. Niebuhr defined as pride, the "universality of self-regard in everybody's motives, whether they are idealists or realists or whether they are benevolent or not."

It rejected utopianism, the belief "that increasing reason, increasing education, increasing technical conquests of nature make for moral progress, that historical development means moral progress."

As influential as he was in the disputatious world of religion, it was in the arena of practical politics that the effects of his thought were most apparent to the general public. He was the mentor of scores of men, including Arthur Schlesinger Jr., who were the brain trust of the Democratic party in the nineteen-fifties and sixties. George F. Kennan, the diplomat and adviser to Presidents on Soviet affairs, called Mr. Niebuhr "the father of us all" in recognition of his role in encouraging intellectuals to help shape national policies.

In addition to Mr. Kennan and Mr. Schlesinger, the "all" included such well-known intellectual movers and shakers as Paul H. Nitze, Dean Acheson, McGeorge Bundy, Louis J. Hale, Hans J. Morgenthau and James Reston.

"I suppose the thing Niebuhr has done for me more than anybody else," Mr. Reston once said, "is to articulate the irony of our condition as a country in the world today."

Mr. Niebuhr advocated "liberal realism."

"The finest task of achieving justice," he once wrote, "will be done neither by the Utopians who dream dreams of perfect brotherhood nor yet by the cynics who believe that the self-interest of nations cannot be overcome. It must be done by the realists who understand that nations are selfish and will be so till the end of history, but that none of us, no matter how selfish we may be, can be only selfish."

"The whole art of politics consists in directing rationally the irrationalities of men," Mr. Niebuhr said. He thought of intellectuals as a "collective leaven" in a democratic society, men and women who could apply their learning to the practical problems of power and social justice. To them Mr. Niebuhr often served as an adviser, as when he lectured to the Policy Planning Staff of the State Department.

Mr. Niebuhr was himself active in politics, as a member first of the Socialist party, and then as vice chairman of the Liberal party in New York.

ACTIVE IN AD HOC GROUPS

He was an officer of Americans for Democratic Action and active in numerous committees established to deal with specific social, economic and political matters. He was a firm interventionist in the years before United States entry into World War II. He was equally firm in opposing Communist goals after the war, but at the same time he was against harassing American Communists.

Much of Mr. Niebuhr's political influence was subtle, embodied in a virtually continuous outpouring of articles on topics ranging from the moral basis of politics to race relations to pacifism to trade unionism to foreign affairs. He did not offer pat solutions, but what he called "Christian realism," which emphasized the importance of arriving at approximate, rather than absolute, answers to public questions. Public morality, he ar-

gued, differed from private morals in this respect.

Mr. Niebuhr had been associated with Union Theological Seminary, Broadway and 121st Street, since 1928. He was, successively, associate professor of the philosophy of religion (1928-30); William E. Dodge Jr. Professor of Applied Christianity (1930-55); and Charles A. Briggs Graduate Professor of Ethics and Theology from 1955 to his death. He was vice president of the seminary after 1955.

Hundreds of seminarians jammed lecture halls for his courses, and thousands of laymen heard him preach or lecture. He spoke at many colleges across the country, preached at scores of churches, large and small, and appeared on innumerable public platforms. He was a sparkling talker, exerting a magnetism that kept his listeners excited and alert through lengthy and profound expositions.

Mr. Niebuhr possessed a deep voice and large blue eyes. He used his arms as though he were an orchestra conductor. Occasionally one hand would strike out, with a pointed finger at the end, to accent a trenchant sentence.

He talked rapidly and (because he disliked to wear spectacles for his far-sightedness) without notes; yet he was adroit in building logical climaxes and in communicating a sense of passionate involvement in what he was saying.

Many who heard him lecture on secular matters were incredulous when they found that he was a clergyman, for he wore his erudition lightly and spoke in common accents. When he preached, one auditor recalled, "he always seemed the small-town parish minister, able to relate the Christian faith simply to contemporary problems."

A high forehead and premature baldness, except for a ring of hair above his ears, made Mr. Niebuhr appear taller than his 6 feet 1 inch. His frame was large and his hands were big-knuckled.

OFFICE FILLED WITH BOOKS

He looked outsize in his snug office on the seventh floor of the seminary, which he occupied during his teaching years. Its walls were so hidden by books, mostly on sociology and economics, that there was space for only one picture, a wood engraving of Jonah inside the whale. On his desk, amid a wild miscellany of papers, was a framed photograph of his wife and children. When students dropped in, as they frequently did, he liked to rock back in his swivel chair, cross his legs, link his hands on top of his head and chat.

In those informal moments he was a gay and witty talker, tossing off ideas in virtually every sentence and drawing upon a seemingly inexhaustible store of quotations from books he had read. Some students were disquieted by his eyes.

"He didn't really look at you," one of them recalled, "so much as measure you."

Mr. Niebuhr had an easy way about him, one that dispelled barriers of communication. He was "Reinie" to friends and acquaintances in public references he preferred "Mister" to the honorific "Doctor." His highest earned academic degree was Master of Arts, which he received from Yale in 1915, but he collected 18 honorary doctorates, including a Doctor of Divinity from Oxford.

Mr. Niebuhr's diversions were few. He was fond of walking on Riverside Drive with his wife and his large black poodle, but the family conversation was mostly about religion. Mrs. Niebuhr was a lecturer on that subject at Barnard College for a number of years. Otherwise Mr. Niebuhr worked from 7:30 A.M., when he had breakfast, until he retired at midnight.

His writing appeared in the most diverse publications. For several years in the nineteen-thirties he edited and contributed to *The World Tomorrow*, a Socialist party organ; from the forties on he edited and wrote for

Christianity and Crisis, a biweekly magazine devoted to religious matters. In an ecumenical spirit, he wrote for *The Commonweal*, a Roman Catholic magazine; for *Advantage and Christian Century*, Protestant publications; and for *Commentary*, a Jewish publication.

Because Mr. Niebuhr did not employ Biblical citations to support his political attitudes, some associates were skeptical of the depth of his faith.

"Don't tell me Reinie takes that God business seriously," a political co-worker once said.

The remark got back to Mr. Niebuhr, who laughed and said:

I know. Some of my friends think I teach Christian ethics as a sort of front to make my politics respectable."

Troubled agnostics, Catholics, Protestants and Jews often came to him for spiritual guidance. Only half facetiously, one Jew confessed: "Reinie is my rabbi."

Men and women of other faiths felt equally close to him, for he did not seek to convert so much as to counsel.

FRANKFURTER AN ADMIRER

Among Mr. Niebuhr's admirers was Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter. After listening to one sermon, the late Justice said: "I liked what you said, Reinie, and I speak as a believing unbeliever."

"I'm glad you did," the clergyman replied, "for I spoke as an unbelieving believer."

Although Mr. Niebuhr was acclaimed as a theologian, the closest he came to systematizing his views was in his two-volume "The Nature and Destiny of Man," published by Scribner's in 1943. He began an "intellectual biography" issued in 1956 by saying:

"I cannot and do not claim to be a theologian. I have taught Christian Social Ethics for a quarter of a century and have also dealt in the ancillary field of apologetics. My avocational interest as a kind of circuit rider in colleges and universities has prompted an interest in the defense and justification of the Christian faith in a secular age . . .

"I have never been very competent in the nice points of pure theology; and I must confess that I have not been sufficiently interested heretofore to acquire the competence."

There was, nonetheless, a Niebuhr doctrine. In its essence it accepted God and contended that man knows Him chiefly through Christ, or what Mr. Niebuhr called "the Christ event." The doctrine, in its evolved form, suggested that man's condition was inherently sinful, and that his original, and largely ineradicable, sin is his pride, or egotism.

"The tragedy of man," Mr. Niebuhr said, "is that he can conceive self-perfection but cannot achieve it."

He argued also that man deluded himself most of the time; for example, he believed that a man who trumpeted his own tolerance was likely to be full of concealed prejudices and bigotries.

Mr. Niebuhr asserted that man should not passively accept evil, but should strive for moral solutions to his problems. He urged man to take advantage of his finitude, to deal realistically with life as it is and to have Biblical faith.

In the ceaseless battle between good and evil, man must "recognize the heights," for there is "no sinful life in which there is not a point where God's grace may find lodgement."

"The Christian faith cannot deny that our acts may be influenced by heredity, environment and the actions of others," he once wrote. "But it must deny that we can ever excuse our actions by attributing them to the fault of others, even though there has been a strong inclination to do this since Adam excused himself by the words, 'The woman gave me the apple.'"

Mr. Niebuhr also insisted that "when the Bible speaks of man being made in the image

of God, it means that he is a free spirit as well as a creature; and that as a spirit he is finally responsible to God."

In struggle for the good, institutional change is likely to be more effective than a change of heart, Mr. Niebuhr suggested. He declared clergymen who offered salvation on what he considered simplistic terms.

Billy Graham, the evangelist, and the Rev. Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, the expositor of "the power of positive thinking," were among the clergymen Mr. Niebuhr contradicted. Their "wholly individualistic conceptions of sin," he said, were "almost completely irrelevant" to the collective problems of the nuclear age.

Mr. Niebuhr objected especially to the notion that religious conversion could cure race prejudice, economic injustice or political chicanery. The remedy, he believed, lay in societal changes spurred by Christian realism. In this sense, man could be an agent in history by coming to terms with it and working to alter his environment.

Mr. Niebuhr's own life illustrated his beliefs. He was born June 21, 1892, in Wright City, Mo., the son of Gustav and Lydia Niebuhr. His father was pastor of the Evangelical Synod Church, a German Lutheran congregation, in that farm community. At the age of 10 Reinhold decided that he wanted to be a minister because, as he told his father, "you're the most interesting man in town." At that point his father set about teaching him Greek.

From high school Reinhold went, with his brother Richard, to Elmhurst College in Illinois, a small denominational school, and from there, after four years, to Eden Theological Seminary near St. Louis. After the death of his father in 1913, Reinhold was asked to take his pulpit in Lincoln, Ill. He declined in order to enter Yale Divinity School on a scholarship. He received his Bachelor of Divinity degree there in 1914, and his Master of Arts a year later.

ONLY PASTORATE IN DETROIT

Upon his ordination by the Evangelical Synod of North America, he was sent to his first and only pastorate, the Bethel Evangelical Church of Detroit. He remained there 13 years, nurturing the congregation from 20 members to 650, and becoming the center of swirling controversy for his support of labor, and later for his espousal of socialism.

"I cut my eyeteeth fighting Ford," Mr. Niebuhr said in recollection of his Detroit years. Whereas Henry Ford was usually praised in those days for his wage of \$5 a day and the low price of his automobiles, he was condemned by Mr. Niebuhr as ravaging his workers by the assembly line, the speedup, periodic layoffs for retooling and by summary dismissal of men in middle age.

"What a civilization this is!" Mr. Niebuhr said. "Naive gentlemen with a genius for mechanics suddenly become arbiters over the lives and fortunes of hundreds of thousands."

Mr. Niebuhr not only preached against what he regarded as Mr. Ford's callousness, but he also wrote stinging articles in *The Christian Century* that were read by Mr. Ford, among others. Mr. Ford was neither amused nor converted. Mr. Niebuhr emerged as a public champion of social justice and as a Socialist.

A SOCIALIST WITHOUT MARX

Recalling this phase of his career in after years, the clergyman said:

"Mr. Ford typified for my rather immature social imagination all that was wrong with American capitalism. I became a Socialist in this reaction. I became a Socialist in theory long before I enrolled in the Socialist party and before I had read anything by Karl Marx.

"I became the prisoner of a very cute phrase which I invented, or it seemed to me at least to be cute. That phrase was, 'When private property ceases to be private, it no longer ought to be private.'"

"The phrase, which was prompted by the unprivate character of these great motor companies, does not seem to be so astute in the light of subsequent history in which justice was achieved by balancing various types of collective power."

For a number of years Mr. Niebuhr preached what was termed "the social Gospel," a jeremiad against the abuse of laissez faire industrialism. He was a much-prized speaker at labor and liberal gatherings and on college campuses.

He castigated capitalists not only for their inhumanity to man but also for their spiritual blindness. He called for labor brotherhood, and racial and religious brotherhood as well.

At the same time, he tolled the doom of capitalism. "Capitalism is dying and it ought to die," he said in 1933. He was then teaching at Union Theological Seminary and agitating for the Socialist party. He was a founder, in 1930, of the Fellowship of Socialist Christians, whose membership included Paul Tillich, the theologian.

All during the thirties, however, Mr. Niebuhr was reassessing his ethical, social and political beliefs. He had never been a thoroughgoing Marxist, an advocate of class struggle and revolution; and now he turned from Socialism. He was never a Communist; indeed, he was a vigorous critic of the Soviet Union for the "brutality" of its economic system.

Mr. Niebuhr's dispute with Socialism, and his ultimate break with it, was on religious and ethical grounds, and later on realistic grounds. It was idolatry, he thought, to suggest that human beings could blueprint and bring forth the Kingdom of God on earth. He also had mounting doubts about the inevitability of progress.

In 1939 Mr. Niebuhr was invited to deliver the Gifford Lectures at Edinburgh University. This offered him a further opportunity to refine his views, which came more and more to be centered on man's pretensions about himself.

"A Christian justice will be particularly critical of the claims of the self against the claims of the other, but it will not dismiss them out of hand," he said. "A simple Christian moralism counsels men to be unselfish. A profounder Christian faith must encourage men to create systems of justice which will save society and themselves from their own selfishness."

Although Mr. Niebuhr recanted his Socialism, he did not lessen his interest in social change. Instead, he saw it in a different light—as a continuous adjustment of tensions between power groups in society. Nor did he diminish his concern for the plight of minorities and the rights of labor. Their cause, he contended, was part of a grander social adjustment within the general framework of American capitalism.

At the outset of World War II Mr. Niebuhr favored American intervention.

"The halting of totalitarian aggression is a prerequisite to world peace and order," he declared. He headed the Union for Democratic Action, a committee formed in 1941 by liberal former pacifists to encourage participation in the war.

In the war period Mr. Niebuhr worked with the World Council of Churches' Commission on a Just and Durable Peace. He also joined the Liberal party in 1944, and was an untiring spokesman for the anti-Communist left.

Mr. Niebuhr was a member of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, a group of 50 distinguished Americans. He received the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1964.

Mr. Niebuhr's principal writings were "Does Civilization Need Religion?" (1927); "Leaves From the Notebook of a Tamed Critic" (1929); "Moral Man and Immoral Society" (1932); "Reflections on the End of an Era" (1934); "An Interpretation of Christian Ethics" (1935); "Beyond Tragedy" (1937); "Christianity and Power Politics" (1940); "The Nature and Destiny of Man" (1941-43);

"The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness" (1944); "Discerning the Signs of the Times" (1946); "Faith and History" (1949); "The Irony of American History" (1952); "Christian Realism and Political Problems" (1953); "The Self and the Dramas of History" (1955); "Pious and Secular America" (1958); "The Structure of Nations and Empires" (1959); and "Man's Nature and His Communities" (1965).

He leaves his wife of 40 years, the former Ursula Keppel-Compton; a son, Christopher Robert of Albany, and a daughter, Mrs. Elizabeth Sifton of Brooklyn.

A memorial service will be held in the First Congregational Church of Stockbridge tomorrow at 3 p.m.

The Rev. T. Guthrie Speers, minister of the First Presbyterian Church of New Canaan, Conn., a close friend of Mr. Niebuhr's, will lead the service, assisted by another friend, the Rev. John Crocker of Andover, Mass., a former headmaster at Groton School.

Mrs. Niebuhr said that at the express wish of her husband, Rabbi Abraham Heschel of the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York, also would take part. Rabbi Heschel read Old Testament lessons at the funeral service for the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

[From the New York Times]

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

Reinhold Niebuhr blended theology and practical politics as articulator of the concept of "liberal realism." His writings provided the intellectual underpinning for much of what was most constructive in the antitotalitarian left.

Beginning in the late 1930's, Dr. Niebuhr was profoundly influential in moving American Protestantism away from pacifism and a utopian view of politics toward a more complex, more tragic and politically more realistic view of man and society. In his masterpiece, "The Nature and Destiny of Man," and in his lesser books, he brought to bear old Christian insights into man's fallibility and pride and made them relevant and convincing in this secular age. Because of his great gifts as public speaker and lucid, forceful writer, there were few within the Protestant community who did not feel his influence, while many who shared other beliefs or rejected religion also responded to his arguments.

Not one to be a theorist only, Dr. Niebuhr tested his concepts in the arena of electoral politics. He was among the founders of New York's Liberal party in 1944 and an architect of Americans for Democratic Action. In the years following World War II his influence on the thinking of many key Government policymakers was so profound that George F. Kennan saw him as "the father of us all"—the "all" being the liberal trendsetters of the fifties and sixties.

Dr. Niebuhr's ideas were not, of course, always accepted with the grace and facility with which he propounded them. But even his adversaries of the right and the left cheerfully conceded the effervescence of his mind and the humanitarianism of his philosophy. Dr. Niebuhr helped infuse vigor into the American democratic process. In a time of moral confusion and rapid political change, he was a frequent source of political wisdom and an illuminating spokesman for the moral values that sustain human freedom.

AUDIE MURPHY'S REMARKABLE RECORD

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, when Audie Murphy was killed recently in a tragic

plane accident, America lost its foremost combat war hero of World War II. His record of unsurpassed gallantry and courage speaks for itself. I include as a part of my remarks an article from a recent issue of the New York Times, written by Deirdre Carmody. Entitled "Alone Against the Enemy," the article follows:

ALONE AGAINST THE ENEMY

(By Deirdre Carmody)

On Jan. 26, 1945, an American infantry company fighting in the huge Colmar pocket in eastern France was besieged by six tanks and waves of German infantry. The baby-faced second lieutenant in charge of Company B, 15th Infantry Regiment, Third Division, ordered his outnumbered men to withdraw to the cover of a nearby wood. The lieutenant, Audie Murphy, remained and gave fire directions to his artillery on a field telephone.

Behind him an American tank was hit and burst into flames as its crew fled for shelter. The young lieutenant leaped to the top of the burning tank, grabbed its .50-caliber machine gun and stood there, a lone figure exposed on three sides to the enemy, firing into the German lines.

For more than an hour, despite a leg wound, he continued his barrage of fire until he had killed or wounded about 50 Germans. Finally, the enemy began to retreat, the lieutenant rejoined his men, organized a counterattack and secured the woods.

The scene was to become as familiar to American audiences as the wavy brown hair and freckled face of its 20-year-old hero. He received the Medal of Honor for his bravery, and, by the time he was released from the Army, he had become the most decorated hero of World War II.

Lieutenant Murphy received 24 decorations, most of which he gave away to children. They included also the Distinguished Service Cross, the Legion of Merit, the Silver Star with Oak Leaf cluster, the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart with two Oak Leaf clusters and the Croix de Guerre with palm. He was commended for having killed 240 German soldiers, although he said that no one could be sure of the exact number.

WOUNDED THREE TIMES

After having been wounded three times young Audie Murphy returned home to a nation eager to venerate its war heroes. His face appeared on the cover of news magazines, he marched in parades to bloodstirring music, he spoke to cheering audiences and finally—motivated more by a need for money than a need for glory—he laboriously wrote out his memoirs in longhand.

Some years later the autobiography, "To Hell and Back," was made into a movie with Mr. Murphy playing himself. He described it as "the first time, I suppose, a man has fought an honest war, then come back and played himself doing it."

After the movie came out in 1955, Mr. Murphy described to an interviewer his feelings about making the movie:

"This strange jerking back and forth between make-believe and reality," he said. "Between fighting for your life and the discovery that it's only a game and you have to do a retake because a tourist's dog ran across the field in the middle of the battle."

He told about one incident that he particularly dreaded reenacting. It was the scene in which one of his closest friends stood up while the company was advancing up a hill and was hit by a burst of machine gun fire.

The friend fell back onto Mr. Murphy, gave him a strange little smile and said, "I goofed, Murphy." Then he died in Mr. Murphy's arms.

"When we shot the scene," Mr. Murphy recounted, "we changed the part where Brandon died in my arms. That was the way it had really happened, but it looked too corny, they said. I guess it did."

MOVIE WAS A SUCCESS

The movie was a success, however, and it is still being shown to late-night television audiences. Ironically, it was on the television here early yesterday morning while a search was being conducted for the wreckage of Mr. Murphy's plane. The movie review in the New York Times on Sept. 23, 1955, said:

"Gallantry has been glorified more dramatically on film previously but Mr. Murphy, who still seems to be the shy, serious, tenderfoot rather than a Titan among G.I. heroes, lends stature, credibility and dignity to an autobiography that would be routine and hackneyed without him."

Mr. Murphy's film career, which began in 1948 with "Beyond Glory" and continued into the late 1960's, included about 40 movies. Many of these were Westerns or war stories, in which he played young, eager American boys, very much like himself.

He often joked about his lack of acting ability. For instance, in "Beyond Glory," a story about West Point, he had a bit part.

"I had eight words to say," he recalled. "Seven more than I could handle."

ADMITTED TO HANDICAP

Another time, when a director yelled at him for his wooden acting, Mr. Murphy interrupted and said, "You forget that I've got a hell of a handicap."

"So?" the director sputtered. "So what is this handicap?"

"No talent," Mr. Murphy reportedly said.

Mr. Murphy's movies also included "The Kid from Texas" (1950); "The Red Badge of Courage" (1951); "Destry" (1955); "Night Passage" (1957); "No Name on the Bullet" (1958); "The Quiet American" (1958); "The Unforgiven" (1959). He also played in a television series, "Whispering Smith."

He was born on June 20, 1924, on a cotton farm near Kingston in the Texas blacklands. His father was a sharecropper and the family lived in what Mr. Murphy later described as "an honest-to-God shack." There were 11 children.

One day his father walked out of the house and never came back. A few years later, when Audie was 17, his mother died of a lung disease.

Young Audie tried desperately to keep the family together. He hunted with a borrowed .22-caliber rifle and learned never to miss, because he never had more than a dime's worth of shells. When he couldn't get hold of a rifle, he used a slingshot to kill rabbits.

In June, 1942, he lied about his weight and his age—he was skinny and not quite 18—and joined the Army.

A PAGE OUT OF HISTORY

His tour of duty resembles a page out of a World War II history book. He was in Casablanca in 1943. He took part in the landing of Sicily in July of that year, then landed on the beach at Anzio.

His company marched up through Italy and into Southern France. Out of 235 men, Mr. Murphy and one supply sergeant were the only ones left at the end of the bloody journey.

When he returned home his picture on the cover of Life magazine attracted the attention of James Cagney, the actor, and his brother Bill, the producer. The Cagneys persuaded Mr. Murphy to become an actor, and his movie career began.

It was a long time before the effects of the war wore off. For years, he had nightmares. He couldn't go to sleep without a loaded German Walther automatic pistol under his pillow.

Some one once asked Mr. Murphy how people managed to survive a war.

"I don't think they ever do," he said.

EQUAL TREATMENT FOR PUERTO RICO—II

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks I have been discussing with a number of our colleagues and others the plight of Puerto Ricans—both those on the mainland as well as those on the island—and the many and varied problems facing the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

I have commented on numerous occasions that American citizens in Puerto Rico are not receiving their full and fair share of Federal assistance and that this situation is especially critical in light of the economic difficulties currently being experienced on the island.

In my May 4 speech I noted that the current recession in the United States is felt as a depression in Puerto Rico. The island's two primary industries—tourism and textiles—have been the hardest hit. Four of the large luxury hotels have been closed and three others are very seriously endangered. A number of textile plants have been forced to close or to drastically reduce the number of employees. Unemployment is at a record level of 33 percent of the potential island labor force.

The effects of this depression are particularly calamitous when you take into account the already prevalent economic conditions: the average pay for industrial workers on the island is approximately \$1.60 per hour, less than one-half the U.S. average; the average annual per capita personal income is almost less than one-half that of Mississippi, the poorest of the 50 States; one out of every nine Puerto Ricans receives welfare payments; the cost of living in Puerto Rico is at least 10 percent higher than in the United States and some sources indicate that this may be even higher. These are just a few of the many examples which could be presented.

As an integral part of the United States, the problems of poverty and economic development in Puerto Rico have a very definite bearing on those same areas here on the mainland. Inequitable treatment of Puerto Rico in the past has contributed to an economic crisis on the island. Unless prompt and meaningful action is taken, the search for economic opportunity will spur a new wave of Puerto Rican migrants to the mainland and further aggravate the urban crisis here. The fact is that Puerto Ricans are migrating to the United States not because they necessarily want to but because they are compelled to do so in the search for employment and economic security. The labor market on the island is simply unable to effectively cope with the burgeoning, and largely unskilled, labor force. What is particularly tragic is that there is no solution—not even momentary relief—in sight. The inadequate and discriminatory treatment of Puerto Rico is bound to aggravate what is already a serious condition and the time for reform is long past due.

In order to dramatize this present crisis, I have compiled a number of statistics. I believe these figures will present an accurate picture of the consequences of the inequitable treatment of the island in comparison with the State; the disastrous problems being experienced by the Puerto Rican economy; and, the tragic status of the average Puerto Rican worker. These figures have been drawn from a wide variety of sources, ranging from Federal and Commonwealth Government statistics to data prepared by various island industrial groups.

Mr. Speaker, I present these statistics herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, so that our colleagues may be better aware of the current dilemma facing Puerto Rico and to give further impetus to interest in implementing my four-point program to cope with this tragic situation:

COMPARISON OF FAMILY INCOME

Annual income	Number of families (Puerto Rico)	Number of families (United States)	Puerto Rico percent ¹	United States percent ²
Less than \$1,000.....	64,409	804,000	10.5	1.6
\$1 to \$2,000.....	99,989	1,600,000	16.3	3.1
\$2 to \$3,000.....	92,014	2,371,000	15.0	4.6
\$3 to \$4,000.....	76,819	2,705,000	12.5	5.3
\$4 to \$5,000.....	70,543	2,752,000	11.5	5.4
\$5 to \$7,500.....	104,282	3,314,000	17.0	12.3
\$7,500 to \$10,000.....	49,075	11,115,000	8.0	21.7
Over \$10,000.....	56,435	23,576,000	9.2	45.9
Total.....	613,566	51,237,000	100.0	100.0

¹ Fiscal year 1969.

² Calendar year 1969.

³ \$5,000 to \$7,000 and \$7,000 to \$10,000.

Sources: Selected statistical data circulated to Subcommittee on Labor, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, San Juan, P.R. May 7, 1971, as appendix to statement by Manuel A. Casiano, Administrator, Economic Development Administration, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. "Consumer Income, Current Population Reports" U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, No. 70, July 16, 1970.

PER CAPITA PERSONAL INCOME IN SELECTED AREAS, 1969 AND 1970

Area	1969	1970
Puerto Rico.....	\$1,234	\$1,472
District of Columbia.....	1,439	5,519
California.....	4,232	4,469
Mississippi.....	2,358	2,561
New York State.....	4,495	4,797
New York City.....	65,55	(³)

¹ District of Columbia metropolitan area.

² Not available.

GENERAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The Puerto Rico Department of Social Services reports that in 1970, 80 regional centers were operated to distribute food donated by the Federal Government to 91,469 families, numbering 524,369 persons or approximately 19.5% of the total Puerto Rican population.

DHEW reports that, as of 12.30/70, 324,310 persons in Puerto Rico were receiving welfare payments, an increase of 88,000 over the previous year or approximately a 37% increase.

1 out of every nine Puerto Ricans receives welfare payments.

The average estimated income per capita by municipalities was \$1,240 in 1969. However, 37 of the 77 municipalities had incomes below \$550 per capita and only 12 had a per capita income of \$1,000 or more. 56 municipalities had an unemployment rate above 15%.

In 1969 Fomento, the economic development agency, promoted 2,700 jobs—a 4.2% rise from jobs created up to 1968. In 1970, however, there was a net loss of 1,800 jobs—a decline of 2.7%—due to layoffs and plant closings.

EXTERNAL TRADE

U.S.: Merchandise external trade—7.8% of GNP [1969].
P.R.: Merchandise external trade—92.5% of GNP [1969].

PROFITS, 1960-70

U.S.: +43%.
P.R.: -20%.

PER CAPITA RETAIL SALES, 1970

U.S.: \$1,576.
P.R.: \$656

NEW PLANT PROMOTIONS IN P.R.

1968/69: 523; 1969/70: 40; -23%.

PLANT CLOSINGS IN P.R.

1968/69: 61; 1969/70: 86, +25%.

COST OF LIVING

Jan. 1971: 141.8; Feb. 1971: 141.9, +4% over Feb. 1970.

WELFARE PAYMENTS

Family of six with incapacitated husband: \$67.60 per mo.+\$1.25 for each school age child+food supplements.

Family of four without husband: \$46.20 per mo.+\$1.25 for each school age child+food supplements.

Summary of estimated average expenditure for a family of 5 members; Puerto Rico, 1970

[Average annual expenditure]

Food	\$1,954.68
Clothing and personal care	1,179.76
Housing, light, equipment, furniture, water, and gas	1,556.13
Transportation	447.00
Recreation, reading, and instruction	213.00
Other expenses in consumption	114.00
Personal insurances	139.00
Donations and presents	99.00
Total	5,702.57

Source: Puerto Rico Department of Health, 1970.

FAMILY INCOME PER TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT; TYPICAL BUDGET AND DEFICIT OR SUPERAVIT; PUERTO RICO 1970

Type of employment	Average family income	Typical budget per family (1970)	Deficit (-) Superavit (+)	Number of families (thousands)	Type of employment	Average family income	Typical budget per family (1970)	Deficit (-) Superavit (+)	Number of families (thousands)
Professionals and technicians	\$8,448	\$5,702	\$2,746	41.0	Service workers	\$4,132	\$5,702	-\$1,570	34.7
Agriculturalists	3,328	5,702	-2,374	25.0	Agricultural workers	1,621	5,702	-4,081	34.1
Managers	9,142	5,702	3,440	50.5	Workers	3,050	5,702	-2,652	30.8
Officer workers and salesmen	4,979	5,702	-723	59.4	Others	3,149	5,702	-2,553	155.6
Supervisors	4,732	5,702	-970	82.0	Average	4,557	5,702	-1,145	
Operatives and kindred workers	4,445	5,702	-1,257	59.7	Total number of families				576.7
Domestic servants	1,153	5,702	-4,549	3.9					

Source: Economic Development Administration, 1971.

LABOR AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Total labor force: 850,000 (1970):

Agriculture (162,000 in 1963)	60,000
Nonagriculture	679,000
Service industry	241,000
Commerce	145,000
Manufacturing	137,000
Apparel/garments	38,000
Total	850,000

Per capita income:

1940	\$266
1969	1,234
1970	1,427

GNP per employee (1970):

United States	\$12,437
Puerto Rico	6,142

Average hourly wage (1970):

United States	\$3.46
Puerto Rico	1.79

Percent of population employed (1970):

United States	Percent 38.5
Puerto Rico	27.7

Unemployment:

June 1969, 75,000 (9 percent); June 1970, 92,000 (11 percent), 22.7 percent increase.
September 1969, 85,000 (10.4 percent); September 1970, 101,000 (11.9 percent), 18.8 percent increase.
December 1969, 87,000 (10.6 percent); December 1970, 99,200 (11.7 percent), 13.8 percent increase.

January 1970, 100,000 (11.9 percent); January 1971, 112,000 (13.2 percent), 12.8 percent increase.

Labor force:

Each Puerto Rico worker supports 2.7 dependents—27.2 percent of labor force employed.

Each U.S. worker supports 1.6 dependents—38.5 percent of labor force employed. Unemployment rate (1970—early):

United States	Percent 6.2
Puerto Rico	11.7
Puerto Rico:	
January 1, 1970	11.9
January 1, 1971	13.2

CALCULATED EMPLOYMENT DEFICIENCY IN PUERTO RICO, FEBRUARY 1971

[In thousands]

Age and sex	Civilian noninstitutional population ¹	Percent in U.S. labor force ²	Calculated potential labor force ³	Reported employment ¹	Calculated employment deficiency		Age and sex	Civilian noninstitutional population ¹	Percent in U.S. labor force ²	Calculated potential labor force ³	Reported employment ¹	Calculated employment deficiency	
					Number	Percent						Number	Percent
Both sexes:													
14 to 19	362		148	44	104	70	45 to 54	109	94.2	103	86	17	16
20 to 24	263		186	123	63	34	55 to 64	85	83.0	71	56	15	21
25 to 34	378		270	215	55	20	65 and over	85	26.8	23	22	1	4
35 to 44	271		195	154	41	21	Total	895		682	523	159	23
45 to 54	229		168	116	52	31	Females:						
55 to 64	168		107	67	40	37	14 to 19	178	34.9	62	10	52	84
65 and over	174		32	25	7	22	20 to 24	130	57.7	75	44	31	41
Total	1,845		1,106	744	362	33	25 to 34	202	50.1	101	71	30	30
Males:													
14 to 19	184	47.0	86	34	52	60	35 to 44	148	51.1	76	52	24	32
20 to 24	133	83.3	111	79	32	29	45 to 54	120	54.4	65	30	35	54
25 to 34	176	95.8	169	144	25	15	55 to 64	83	43.0	36	11	25	69
35 to 44	123	96.9	119	102	17	14	65 and over	89	9.7	9	3	6	67
Total							Total	950		424	221	203	48

¹ Employment and unemployment in Puerto Rico, February 1971, Commonwealth Department of Labor.

² 1970 average civilian labor force participation rates in the United States.
³ U.S. participation rates applied to corresponding age-sex groups in the Puerto Rican population

OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE LABOR FORCE

[In percent]

	Employed		Unemployed	
	United States ¹	Puerto Rico ²	United States ¹	Puerto Rico ²
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White collar ³	48.3	38.2	27.2	3.4
Blue collar ⁴	35.3	40.5	45.2	17.9
Service ⁵	12.4	12.6	13.2	2.5
Farm ⁶	4.0	8.7	2.0	3.0
No work experience			12.4	73.2

¹ 1970 monthly average.

² Data for February 1971.

³ Professional and semiprofessional; managers, officials, and proprietors, except farms; clerical, sales, and kindred workers.

⁴ Craftsmen, and foremen; operatives and kindred workers; nonfarm laborers.

⁵ Private household workers; protective services; and other services; personal, commercial, maintenance, etc.

⁶ Farmers and farm managers; farm laborers and foremen.

Note: Unemployed in Puerto Rico include 97,000 reporting previous occupation, 7,000 reporting no previous work experience plus 258,000 "potential" workers assumed to have had no previous work experience.

MANUFACTURING

(Clothing, shoes, rubber footwear, lingerie, hosiery, etc.)

HOSIERY

During last 20 years price of hosiery products decreased 20% while labor costs rose 313%.

Price of panty hose reduced from 14% to 30% since December 1970.

Hosiery manufacturers reduced labor force by 1,246 workers—25.7%—from late 1968 to March 1971.

KNITWEAR

A. Total value of knitwear shipments to the United States:

[In thousands]

1966	32,896
1967	33,285
1968	33,496
1969	28,780
1970	22,137

B. Shipments of womens full fashioned sweaters to the United States:

[In millions of dollars]

1965 (431,000 dozen)	28.9
1967 (496,000 dozen)	30.1
1968 (494,000 dozen)	29.6

C. Employment decline:

August 1968	3,074
August 1969	2,656
August 1970	2,344
February 1971	1,918

MEN'S AND BOY'S CLOTHING

A. Employment decline:

1968	7,326
1969	7,388
1970	6,469

B. From August 1968 to May 1970, some eight firms began operations with 520 employees but there were seven firm closings with 1,300 employees.

Since May 1970 nine establishments with over 700 employees in November closed their operations.

RUBBER FOOTWEAR

A. Employment decline:

[In percent]

Overall	10
Converse	5
B. F. Goodrich	50
Uniroyal	10

EMPLOYMENT DROP FROM PEAK—AUTUMN 1968 TO PRESENT

Company	Em- ploy- ment (peak level)	Pre- sent level	Job loss
Boqueron Mfg. Corp.: Cabo Rojo	533	365	168
Finetex Hosiery Co., Inc.: Arecibo	324	142	182
Ginny Lynn Mills, Inc.: Quebradillas	261	181	80
Giosamar Mills, Inc.: Quebradillas	8	6	2
Hatillo Hosiery Mills, Inc.: Hatillo	255	233	22
Hosetex Corp.: Arecibo	330	185	145
H. H. S. Inc.: Hato Rey	50	0	50
Kayser-Roth Hosiery Corp.: Arecibo	39	36	3
Manhattan Hosiery Corp.:			
Aguadilla branch	913	793	120
Aguada branch	173	160	13
Maunabo Hosiery Mills, Inc.:			
Maunabo	102	91	11
Patillas Hosiery Mills, Inc.:			
Patillas	338	270	88
Sabana Grande Manufacturing Corp.:			
Sabana Grande	411	267	144
United Hosiery Mills, Ltd.:			
Canoyanas Branch	170	114	56
Guanica Branch	260	232	28
Ricon Branch	345	286	59
Rosan, Inc.: Cidra	50	0	50
Eleven Eleven Corp.: Bayamon	66	62	4
Orocovis Hosiery Mills, Inc.:			
Orocovis	199	178	21
Total	4,847	3,601	1,246

Source: U.S. Department of Labor—Wage and hour survey economic report January 1971 (supplement) table 1.

AGRICULTURE

DECREASE IN AGRICULTURAL OUTPUT

[In millions of dollars]

1964	19
1965	6
1966	3
1967-69	7

TOBACCO

1952: 10,000 workers processing 28-30 million lbs. of tobacco.

1970: 5,500 workers.

From 1950 to 1969 the agricultural product increased only 17.5% whereas the island gross product increased 442%. The index of physical value of production [1950-51=100] increased to 128 in 1962-63, declining to 105 in 1968-69. Last year the farm price index was 108.

SUGAR PRODUCTION

	Tons
1968	637,000
1969 (-35%)	477,000
1970	455,000

DATA INDICATIVE OF TECHNICAL TRENDS IN THE SUGAR INDUSTRIES OF PUERTO RICO AND OTHER U.S. AREAS

	Sugar produced in tons per acre, highest 4 years of 5		Percent changes, 1939-43 to 1965-69
	1939-43	1965-69	
Puerto Rico	3.91	3.01	-23
Average 4 areas	3.53	4.81	+36
Louisiana	1.62	2.28	+41
Florida	3.19	3.64	+14
Hawaii	7.45	10.95	+47
Beet States	1.85	2.38	+29
Puerto Rico as percentage of 4	111	63	-43

Sources: Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, "Manual of Sugar Statistics," and U.S. Dept. of Agriculture sugar reports No. 222, September 1970.

PUERTO RICAN TOURISM

1. DECLINE IN PASSENGER MOVEMENT TO PUERTO RICO

Fiscal year	Number of arrivals	Difference	Percent
1964-65	1,254,338		
1965-66	1,445,139	190,801	16.0
1966-67	1,594,735	149,596	10.3
1967-68	1,839,470	244,735	15.3
1968-69	2,112,264	272,794	14.8
1969-70	1,992,819	-119,445	-5.7

2. DECLINE IN HOTEL/GUEST HOUSE REGISTRANT EXPENDITURES

Fiscal year	Amount	Difference	Percent
1964-65	\$70,195,000		
1965-66	82,751,000	\$12,556,000	18.0
1966-67	99,866,000	17,115,000	20.6
1967-68	128,276,000	29,410,000	29.4
1968-69	143,653,000	15,377,000	12.0
1969-70	133,900,000	-9,753,000	-6.8

3. HOTEL CRISIS

Hotel	Rooms	Direct employees
A. Closings:		
El Miramar	217	134
Petit Miramar	217	111
Condado Beach	340	452
Dorado Hilton	310	321
Total equals 11.9 percent of industry employed in February 1970		
11,018		
B. Endangered:		
San Jeronimo	350	618
El Convento	92	156
Racquet Club	220	173
Total, 1965 equals 23 percent of industry employed in February 1970		
947		

4. COMPETITION

A. COST OF AVERAGE HOTEL VISITOR STAY (INCLUDING TRAVEL)

Puerto Rico	\$412
Europe/Mediterranean	890

B. TOTAL U.S. TRAVELERS

	Europe/ Mediterranean		Puerto Rico	
	To over- seas and Puerto Rico	Number Percent	Number Percent	
1963	2,486,000	1,102,000 44.3	496,000 20.0	
1969	5,700,000	2,363,000 41.5	1,077,000 18.9	

C. INCREASE IN U.S. TRAVELERS (1963-69)

	Percent
Puerto Rico	117
Foreign overseas	132
West Indies/Central America	169
Europe/Mediterranean	114

D. HOUSE PROFIT

[Percent of total food and beverage sales (1967)]

Puerto Rico	15.3
Overall United States	21.2
Hawaii	25.8
Southeast United States	20.9

FEDERAL AID TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, BY STATE

[In millions of dollars]

State	Fiscal years					1969 total less highway aid
	1949	1959	1965	1968	1969	
Puerto Rico.....	8.1	59.2	148.7	222.6	309.5	303.3
Mississippi.....	29.7	108.6	167.6	284.2	321.2	277.3
New York.....	116.2	451.2	786.3	1,828.1	2,047.6	1,811.3

FEDERAL AID TO INDIVIDUALS AND INSTITUTIONS, BY STATE

[In millions of dollars]

State	Fiscal years				
	1949	1959	1965	1967	1968
Puerto Rico.....	64.1	48.1	32.9	30.0	27.7
Mississippi.....	78.2	64.5	40.9	156.6	165.7
New York.....	301.1	220.5	241.2	328.5	334.8

COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVELS OF WELFARE BENEFITS

1. Average payment basis—AFDC: Puerto Rico equals \$9.25 per person per month, December 1970; Mississippi equals \$12.10 per person per month, December 1970.

2. TOTAL WELFARE PAYMENTS—AFDC, FISCAL YEAR 1970

[Dollar amounts in millions]

State	Federal share (percent)	Federal payment	State payment
Puerto Rico.....	47.3	\$11,945	\$13,316
Mississippi.....	83.1	13,451	2,728
New York.....	49.0	420,020	1,219,471

1 Plus an additional \$216,970,000 local payment.

3. Puerto Rican family averages: Average overall family, 4.3 persons; average AFDC family, 5.05 persons.

ANNUAL BUDGET FOR MINIMUM LIVING REQUIREMENTS FOR A WORKER'S FAMILY OF 6 IN PUERTO RICO, FEBRUARY 1969

Item	Budget	1971 budget (based on 4 percent per annum rise)
Food.....	\$1,973	\$2,131
Clothing.....	150	162
Housing.....	365	394
Light and fuel.....	69	75
House furnishings.....	63	68
Household operations.....	52	56
Medical care.....	37	40
Personal care.....	108	117
Transportation.....	44	48
Amusements.....	77	83
Education.....	33	36
Other.....	106	115
Total.....	3,077	3,325

HOURLY WAGE NEEDED TO EARN BUDGETARY REQUIREMENTS

Nature of annual employment	Hourly wage	Hourly wage (1971)
52 weeks at 40 hours.....	\$1.48	\$1.60
45 weeks at 40 hours.....	1.71	1.85
40 weeks at 40 hours.....	1.92	2.08
30 weeks at 40 hours.....	2.56	2.77

Note: This budget was originally compiled by the Division of Public Welfare of the Puerto Rico Department of Health in 1942. It was designed according to the department to serve as a basis "upon which to build the standards of assistance of the Division of Public Welfare." Changes in the consumer price index compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Puerto Rico Department of Labor were used by the ILGWU research department to bring the pricing of this budget up to date. Because the standards of minimum adequacy are much higher today than 20 years ago even the updated budget falls short of what could properly be considered a minimum standard of adequacy or minimum essentials for health and decency.

SELECTED STATISTICAL COMPARISONS

	1960	1966	1970
1. Gross national product (billions):			
United States.....	\$503.7	\$749.9	\$976.5
Puerto Rico.....	1.681	3.039	4.606
2. Disposable personal income:			
United States.....	350.0	511.9	684.8
Puerto Rico.....	1.352	2.482	3.637
3. Gross fixed domestic investment:			
United States.....	71.3	106.6	132.3
Puerto Rico.....	.354	.747	1.403
4. Labor force (thousands):			
United States.....	72,142	78,893	85,903
Puerto Rico.....	625	770	827
5. Labor force participation (percent):			
United States.....	60.2	60.1	61.3
Puerto Rico.....	45.2	47.0	46.0
6. Per capita consumption expenditures:			
United States.....	\$601		\$1,352
Puerto Rico.....	1,813		2,965

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET VAIL WOOLLEY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, the city of Torrance dedicated a new \$10-million Torrance Memorial Hospital. Among those who brought the dream to reality is the past president of the board of directors of the Jared Torrance Memorial Hospital, Mrs. Margaret Vail Woolley.

While this seven story, 250-bed structure is certainly a milestone in the history of Torrance, it is also a tribute to the vision and inspiration of Mrs. Woolley, who, after 16 years on the board of directors, is now stepping down.

In order to establish the new facility, Mrs. Woolley saw the need to consolidate the Torrance Memorial Hospital with the Riveria Community Hospital. As president of the boards of directors of both of these units, she provided the leadership and guidance to bring about the

consolidation. In the process, Mrs. Woolley helped to secure Government grants of over \$3 million for hospital construction.

Her efforts to obtain quality medical care facilities for the South Bay area are not limited to the consolidation and the construction of the Torrance Memorial Hospital. Mrs. Woolley helped to organize and incorporate Torrance Volunteers for Children which serves child patients at nearby Harbor General Hospital. In addition, she is the director of Affiliates for Mental Health which supplies volunteer workers for Harbor General Hospital and for other mental health facilities in Torrance and the surrounding area.

Her service to the community also extends to legal endeavors. As a partner with her husband, Boris, in the Torrance law firm of Woolley & Woolley, she helped found the Legal Aid Society in Torrance to provide free legal advice for the needy.

Margaret Woolley, a third-generation Californian, has kept abreast of her children's activities and has been a Camp Fire leader in Torrance and the Harbor Area for the past 4 years. In addition, she joins with her two boys and two girls in swimming, tennis, and horseback riding. In the summer, they occasionally assist the cowboys in the rounding up of cattle on the Vail Ranch.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Woolley's service to the community, especially through her work in bringing about the new Torrance Memorial Hospital, has been outstanding. So, at this time when she is leaving the board of directors, I would like to say thank you, Maggie, for a job well done.

LIBERTY LOBBY

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the Liberty Lobby to insert the following reprint from the New York Times of May 18, 1971, as written by Warren Richardson, general counsel of Liberty Lobby.

Whether or not I agree entirely with Mr. Richardson's statement of opinion for Liberty Lobby in this matter, regarding U.S. international involvement, is not the issue or my intent in asking this reprint be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

I feel that Liberty Lobby deserves the opportunity for publicly noted correction of what it feels was a misquoted statement by certain press organizations.

I further feel that all sides to the question of the Indochina war and other involvements internationally in which the United States takes part, deserves the attention of the Congress and the general public.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point the reprint for the benefit of all to read.

THE LIBERTY LOBBY

(By Warren S. Richardson)

WASHINGTON.—Certain liberal newspapers reported recently that Liberty Lobby told the House Armed Services Committee, "We are opposed to Moscow Communism but not Vietnamese Communism," and that we called America's part in the Vietnam war "aggression."

The first statement is a misquote. In replying to a question from the committee, I said, "We don't hold on all fours with his [Representative Paul N. McCloskey Jr., a Republican of California] position . . . but in sending our youth and manpower and matériel and raising our debt limit, we are in effect draining away the lifeblood of the country, and we will one day open ourselves to, as McCloskey says, the Moscow-type domination of Communism."

The second statement is correctly quoted. Obviously, wars may be either aggressive or defensive. Defensive wars protecting one's homeland are justified. Aggressive wars are not.

Some observers have seized this opportunity to profess surprise at these statements and wonder whether the policy of Liberty Lobby, long a bulwark of anti-Communism, has changed. Certainly not! The truth is that from the very start Liberty Lobby has opposed the war in Vietnam, pointing out that this nation has no business being there and that only disaster could follow our military intervention on the mainland of Asia.

What is Liberty Lobby? It is a nonpartisan political institution—the original "people's lobby"—which has been operating in Washington and growing steadily since 1960. It is now one of the largest political organizations in the U.S., with 25,000 members of its board of policy and more than 200,000 subscribers. The policy of Liberty Lobby is distinctly pro-American and anti-Communist. All applicants must sign a loyalty oath to the U.S. before they can become members.

How do we reconcile the Lobby's hard anti-Communist stance with its position on Vietnam? While it may come as a shock to the no-win planners, we believe that the Communists' objective is to win! From Marx to Lenin to Stalin and the current Kremlin rulers, the Bolshevik world has been dedicated to overpowering the U.S., the citadel of individual freedom.

Direct assault does not appear feasible or safe to the Kremlin; therefore, it seeks a steady attrition of our matériel, manpower, money, and our will to fight, trying to prepare the way for our possible defeat. Such a strategy is readily accomplished by having the U.S. fight wars on foreign soil for some politically illusive and often selfish economic goal. In short, fighting the Vietnamese Communists plays into Moscow's hands beautifully.

I emphasize, however, that Liberty Lobby does not advocate precipitate, unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam. (A liberal-minded person against the war in Vietnam poses as peace-loving, while a constitutionalist who also opposes it is called an isolationist.) Regardless of rhetoric, withdrawal means defeat—with severe consequences.

What is our solution to this unending series of painful problems? Since 1966, we have been advocating an all-Asian Anti-Communist Foreign Legion.) Such a force, composed of volunteer ethnic units from Japan, the Philippines, Formosa, Indonesia, Indochina and Indian would entirely remove the race issue from the Vietnam conflict preventing Red China from using this issue as a device to mobilize her people for aggressive action. It would also dramatically demonstrate that the war is to liberate Asian nations from the threat of domination by Communist-financed China, and not to aggrandize the international banking cartel now dominating our money policy in the U.S. and abroad.

Our no-win, sure-lose sacrifice in Vietnam is a monumental horror to most Americans! Never again must we become the tool of world Socialism and be thus involved. Yet, unbelievably, powerful forces are now working day and night to involve us in an additional war theater—the Mideast—whose potential for disaster dwarfs Vietnam. Even as we suffer from the consequences of a carefully misguided foreign policy, we can behold the preview of a far greater catastrophe.

While the Establishment with its Council on Foreign Relations and huge tax-free foundations seeks to sneak us into a war which 85 per cent or more of Americans oppose, apparently most political, civic, religious and other influential organizations—except Liberty Lobby—either condone or endorse this action, or are too afraid to speak out against it, because of possible reprisals! What shame!

Liberty Lobby denies that America's best interests require our supporting or joining either side in the Mideast mess. Quite the reverse!

Liberty Lobby will not tag along with the cowards who would rather countenance another national disaster than brave the screams of the pro-Zionist "free press" in America. Naturally, we do not expect to receive hearty applause for taking such an American stand from the top leaders of the Council on Foreign Relations and their sly cronies that ladle out vast amounts of tax-free dollars from the Carnegie Corporation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation and others! These foundations have long planned to socialize this world very quickly, by means of wars, and by financing revolutionary projects—in this country and abroad—to distort and downgrade our American way of life.

We are the people's lobby!

THE FLOWER MOUND NEW TOWN

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, in the Friday, June 4, 1971, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, a special feature article was presented in the real estate section on an exciting new development proposal for the Dallas-Fort Worth area. The Flower Mound New Town is being planned and developed by a group principally headed by two Dallas men of broad vision, Edward S. Marcus and Raymond D. Nasher.

I would like to present excerpts from the article for the RECORD.

NEW CITY TO DRAW 100,000

(By Aline Willbur)

DALLAS.—The new Flower Mound city to be built between Dallas and Fort Worth will trigger more than a \$1 billion worth of construction activities when building begins in mid-1971.

If the name sounds romantic, it should be. This city of the future is going to combine governmental aid with local businessmen's vision and knowhow, and together create a community which will be "a step in the fulfillment of the American dream."

The innovative, new city, which eventually will provide living services for 100,000 people, will be built on a 6,155-acre site, four miles north of the Dallas-Fort Worth regional airport.

George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, announced in Washington last December that the project qualifies

as a Title IV new community development. This means a federal guarantee of \$18 million worth of debenture notes to help finance the project.

Principals in the development known as Flower Mound New Town, Inc., are Edward S. Marcus, chairman of the board of Neiman-Marcus Company, and Raymond D. Nasher, a Dallas developer.

They are planning a town in which solutions to environmental and social problems will be found before the building actually starts.

20-YEAR DEVELOPMENT

According to Mr. Nasher, Flower Mound is not going to be "just a bedroom community" but a genuine town where people will work and live and where economic levels as well as age groups will be mixed for a truly integrated society.

The town will contain homes for presidents of corporations as well as their foremen and workers. One out of five homes will sell for \$25,000 or less, or rent for less than \$100 a month.

The new town, located on the banks of Lake Grapevine, will be developed over a 20-year period. It will consist of 14 neighborhoods grouped into four "villages" clustered around a town center.

Each neighborhood will have its own elementary school, shops, park, and playground, and approximately 1,400 housing units providing living space for an average population of 5,000. Each neighborhood will include low-income as well as middle-income and upper-income housing.

In each neighborhood the architectural design of homes and shops will have an individual character and in each ample space will be devoted to small parks and greenery.

The only things that the 14 neighborhoods will use in common are a marina, two golf courses, and two major parks established along a creek.

Members of the development team have been studying new concepts in urban living in foreign countries, particularly the garden city of Tapiola, near Helsinki, Finland, and are working closely with several research companies in the United States, to find means of bringing to Flower Mound an ideal way of life.

LITTLE WHITE CHURCH

At this early stage the developers are a little reluctant to give details on what exactly those means will be, other than to say that they are working on an industrial section that will insure clean air and water; a school system with closed-circuit TV that will allow an incapacitated or difficult child to be taught at home; and a rapid-transit system which will link Flower Mound with Dallas and Fort Worth, each about 20 miles away.

This is the Flower Mound of the future. Occupancy of the first neighborhood is planned for the fall of 1972.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT,
APRIL 1971

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the April 1971 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, APRIL 1971

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in the month of April was 2,883,535 as compared with 2,872,978 in

the preceding month of March. This was a net increase of 10,557.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in the month of April totaled 2,844,761. This was a net increase of 9,862 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of March. Employment by months in fiscal 1971, which began July 1, 1970, follows:

Month	Executive branch	Increase	Decrease
July 1970	2,942,517		-1,595
August	2,901,856		-40,661
September	2,851,875		-49,981
October	2,838,664		-13,211
November	2,843,411	+4,747	
December	2,838,320		-5,091
January 1971	2,829,637		-8,683
February	2,834,209	+4,572	
March	2,834,899	+690	
April	2,844,761	+9,862	

Total employment in civilian agencies of the Executive Branch for the month of April was 1,699,303, an increase of 10,997 as compared with the March total of 1,688,306. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in April was 1,145,458, a decrease of 1,135 as compared with 1,146,593 in March.

The civilian agencies of the Executive Branch reporting the largest increases during April were Department of Agriculture with 4,772, Treasury Department with 2,582 and Department of Interior with 1,423. These increases were largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense the largest decrease in civilian employment was reported by the Navy with 1,880. The largest increase was in Air Force with 745.

Total Executive Branch employment inside the United States in April was 2,643,896, an increase of 12,279 as compared with March. Total employment outside the United States in April was 200,865, a decrease of 2,417 as compared with March.

The total of 2,844,761 civilian employees of the Executive Branch reported for the month of April 1971 includes 2,521,942 full time employees in permanent positions. This represents a decrease of 442 in such employment from the preceding month of March. (See Table 2 of the accompanying report.)

The Executive Branch employment total of

2,844,761 includes some foreign nationals employed abroad, but in addition there were 97,628 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during April who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in March was 99,499.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

Employment in the Legislative Branch in the month of April totaled 31,148, an increase of 611 as compared with the preceding month of March. Employment in the Judicial Branch in the month of April totaled 7,626, an increase of 84 as compared with March.

DISADVANTAGED PERSONS

The total of 2,883,535 reported by the committee for April includes 20,832 disadvantaged persons employed under federal opportunity programs, an increase of 201 over the preceding month of March. (See Table 4 of accompanying report.)

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a tabulation, excerpted from the joint committee report, on personnel employed full time in permanent positions by executive branch agencies during April 1971, showing comparisons with June 1969, June 1970, and the budget estimates for June 1971:

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

Major agencies	June 1969	June 1970	April 1971	Estimated June 30, 1971 ¹	Major agencies	June 1969	June 1970	April 1971	Estimated June 30, 1971 ¹
Agriculture	83,425	82,912	82,876	85,600	General Services Administration	36,176	36,400	37,740	39,900
Commerce	25,364	25,427	27,856	28,400	National Aeronautics and Space Administration	31,733	31,223	29,611	29,900
Defense:					Office of Economic Opportunity	2,856	2,387	2,446	2,500
Civilian functions	31,214	30,297	29,976	30,900	Panama Canal	14,731	14,635	14,180	14,800
Military functions	1,225,877	1,129,642	1,076,605	1,079,500	Selective Service System	6,584	6,665	6,524	6,500
Health, Education, and Welfare	102,941	102,297	103,992	105,300	Small Business Administration	4,099	4,015	3,970	4,100
Housing and Urban Development	14,307	14,661	15,466	16,000	Tennessee Valley Authority	11,987	12,657	13,447	13,300
Interior	58,156	59,349	56,939	58,000	U.S. Information Agency	10,500	9,989	9,800	9,900
Justice	35,106	38,013	40,827	43,600	Veterans' Administration	147,606	148,497	150,169	154,400
Labor	9,723	10,217	10,888	11,600	All other agencies	26,200	27,420	28,029	29,700
Post Office	562,381	565,618	567,839	585,200	Contingencies				5,000
State	24,658	23,618	23,196	23,600	Subtotal	2,633,762	2,552,571	2,520,652	2,574,000
Agency for International Development	15,753	14,486	13,771	14,000	Public Service careers			1,290	4,900
Transportation	60,386	63,879	67,288	69,600	Total	2,633,762	2,552,571	2,521,942	2,578,900
Treasury	79,982	86,020	89,822	93,500					
Atomic Energy Commission	7,047	7,033	6,933	7,000					
Civil Service Commission	4,970	5,214	5,335	5,500					
Environmental Protection Agency ²			5,127	6,700					

¹ Source: As projected in 1972 budget document; figures rounded to nearest hundred.

² Established as of Dec. 2, 1970, by transfer of functions and personnel from Interior, HEW, Agriculture, Federal Radiation Council and Atomic Energy Commission.

³ Source: Civil Service Commission estimate of persons in entry component for whom ceiling relief has been granted.

U.S. TROOP COMMITMENT IN EUROPE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in 1941, the United States entered World War II. Since that time, this country has actively participated in protecting and preserving the economic and military status of Western European nations. Although the war was over 26 years ago, we continue to maintain our troops and their dependents, scattered throughout Europe, at a tremendous expense to our Nation.

In 1950, when the buildup of American troops began, our troop strength numbered approximately 145,000 men maintained at an estimated cost of \$627 million. At the present time, there are 333,000 men in Western Europe with their dependents. The total American presence

therefore comes to about 525,000 people. To maintain these men and their dependents in Western Europe costs the United States \$14 billion each year.

In 1947, 2 years after the war ended, the United States announced its intention to extend financial aid to European countries "willing to assist in the task of recovery." In the next 3 years, Congress authorized \$3.5 billion to fulfill the promise which had been made. The Marshall plan, in conjunction with the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance, clearly can be credited with restoring economic health to Western Europe and halting the march of communism in this region. Through the assistance offered under the Marshall plan since 1947, Europe has been able to rebuild itself.

Germany, in particular, has made such progress that its economy is the best in the world. The German Government has had to revalue the mark upward in relation to other currencies twice in the last 2 years. In 1969, one American dollar was worth 4 German marks. Today, \$1 is only worth 3.66 marks. What

is more, Germany has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the world. It is under 1 percent, a figure far lower than that here in our country.

Germany is unmistakably one of the world's most successful societies. Its extraordinary postwar recovery is now history. The economy is still booming.

Within the past year, Willy Brandt has negotiated a bilateral renunciation-of-force treaty with the Soviet Union. Under the provisions of this treaty, signed August 12, 1970, West Germany and the Soviet Union have agreed "to refrain from the threat or use of force" and to promote "the development of peaceful relations among European states." I submit that this treaty between Russia and Germany indicates that our troops are no longer needed. It is grounds for at least a gradual removal of the forces we have maintained in Western Europe for 26 years at an exorbitant expense. Perhaps Germany would welcome such a retrenchment on the part of the United States. It became obvious that we had overstayed our wel-

come in France, when that Government insisted that our troops be removed.

The maintenance of American troops alone for 26 years has cost the United States more than \$57 billion. This is one of the reasons why the citizens of the United States are weighted down so heavily by taxes.

We find that our European friends urge us not to change our commitments or remove our military forces, while at the same time they argue that we should reduce our payments deficits, which are due in large part to the activities which they say cannot be altered.

Over each of the next 5 years, the European countries together plan to spend an additional \$200 million for their own defense, an amount roughly equal to one-ninth of the annual U.S. balance-of-payments deficit incurred as a result of American military expenditures in Europe.

It is my feeling that Germany is now capable of taking care of itself and that a reduction in our troop strength in Western Europe should begin. This may, of necessity, be gradual. But it is beyond the capability of the United States to pay for troops in Europe any longer, and it is far too great a burden on the American taxpayer. Even if Germany and the other Western European countries agreed to accept a greater share of the burden of paying for their presence, I do not believe it would be acceptable. There is a reluctance on the part of the American people to serve as the sole protectors of the status quo in Western Europe.

THE RESOLUTION GAP

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert the following editorial written by a constituent of mine, Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones:

[From the Tulsa Tribune, May 8, 1971]

THE RESOLUTION GAP

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

It was a familiar script. The "anti-war" Vietnam veterans, some looking like Castro and others like Che Guevara, lined up on the steps of the U.S. Supreme Court doing a chorus kick.

Senator George McGovern had met with them and praised them. Senator Fulbright had beamed upon them. Ramsey Clark had undertaken to serve as their legal adviser. And now all was ready for the confrontation, when cossacks, i.e. the Washington police, would move in on the chorus line.

You get the picture, of course. Patriotic GIs, appalled by America's monstrous participation in this most unjust of all wars, being hounded away from their peaceful efforts at petition by the minions of an oppressive and guilty state. Or, if you don't get the picture, you'll get it on the six o'clock tv news.

Even as this highly-select group of veterans was gathering, that unspeakable warmonger from the Pentagon, Melvin Laird, was trying to warn that the Russians would soon have a clear lead in the missile race. Laird

was lucky to get on page 1 of most newspapers.

Then, a few days before, Sen. Henry Jackson, D-Wash., had made a speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in which he said:

"The capacity of our strategic force to survive a first strike is now coming into question. The relentless Soviet strategic and naval buildup poses a serious threat not to just one, but to all three of the elements of our strategic deterrent—ICBMs, bombers and Polaris/Poseidon."

Jackson pointed to the peculiar inconsistency of the Soviet position in the SALT disarmament talks—a willingness to consider dismantling defensive missiles, but absolute refusal to discuss offensive missiles. This makes sense if you expect someday to have overwhelming first-strike capability and are not really worried about the enemy making a first strike.

Senator Jackson got a little publicity for his speech, but he didn't do anywhere near as well as Jane Fonda, who landed on the front cover of Life's April 23rd issue. The Life article showed Jane holding forth to pop-eyed college students as she described her new film which maintains that stealing is not theft, but property is.

Life didn't get around to mentioning that this martyr of the young remains unpunished for kicking a U.S. customs officer in the stomach when he irritated her by finding a purse full of pills. It didn't quote her classic statement, "Don't knock communism until you've tried it." One of the people who hasn't tried it is Jane.

Jane has been bringing anti-war dramas to towns in which military camps are located, and she has been trying to get into the camps, themselves, to pass out anti-military literature. Many homesick GIs, it is said, got real turned on.

Then there is the interesting situation of racial warfare in the armed forces. In Vietnam the hurling of fragmentation grenades into the tents of unpopular white officers by militant black soldiers has become sufficiently common so that "fragging" has joined the military vocabulary.

Gen. Hamilton Howze, writing in the magazine "Army", says that U.S. military discipline is generally so bad that he doubts if he could successfully command an Army company today in battle situations "against a powerful and determined enemy."

So we come to the resolution gap. History is full of cases where powerful nations, short on resolution, have succumbed to less powerful nations. Napoleon, with his disciplined legions, licked the flabby armies of many wealthier kings and emperors.

The Chinese army would not put up with "fragging". There are no Jane Fondaviches running around Russian military camps. No Jane Fondangos are kicking Cuban officials in the stomach and then dashing off to lecture at Castro's universities on the evils of communism. No disillusioned North Vietnamese are camping defiantly on any public grounds in Hanoi. No tv programs behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains are monopolized by angry proponents of the Americans.

What will be interesting to see is whether this great nation, the U.S.A., can be rendered defenseless through internal confusion and disbelief even as its wealth and liberties remain the envy of most of the world, and while it retains in its hands the thunderbolts of Zeus.

Fifty-nine year old Americans like me have lived for 59 years under a high degree of personal freedom.

Perhaps it might be in order if a 19-year-old, sitting at the feet of Jane Fonda, began to wonder how many years of freedom he'll have.

THE ENVIRONMENT—PAST, PRESENT, AND PLUPERFECT

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Abel Wolman of the Johns Hopkins University has been of great help to the House Science and Astronautics Committee over the years. His reasoned views on environmental problems stem from a long productive career in public health. He recently has commented on the negativism and gloom of current attitudes toward applied science. Dr. Wolman observes:

Can we make environmental progress without eroding the institutions which protect against the arbitrary, the foolish and the destructive under the guise of protecting us against the evils of environmental degradation? Here I rely upon the intuitive wisdom of the future, so frequently manifest in the common man. The pendulum will swing back to the recognition that universal prohibition of ecologic sin does not provide for the millennium. Man, as an endangered species, will forever depend upon the fruits of science and technology, tempered by statesmen's capacities for selection and priority.

I commend his thoughts to my colleagues and insert the text of Dr. Wolman's paper at this point in the RECORD:

THE ENVIRONMENT—PAST, PRESENT, AND PLUPERFECT

(By Abel Wolman)

Some forty years ago, Morris R. Cohen, a thoughtful observer of the social scene, made the pertinent observation that: "In law as in other social fields the very vitality of our interests makes us passionately espouse half-truths and zealously exclude the vision of those who see the opposing and supplementary half-truth." (Morris R. Cohen, Law and the Social Order. Harcourt Brace and Company, New York, 1933.)

Even at the risk of endangering my professional reputation, the comment above describes, perhaps with reasonable accuracy, the environment discussions in the climate of today. The Diogenes, in search of a balanced view and a statesman willing to espouse it, must have diligence, eternal hope and the patience of Job.

This paper undertakes to review the past and present environment, with a look at the desired Utopia of the future—the "pluperfect"—not in the grammarian's sense, but in its generic meaning of the "more than perfect"!

Before sailing into these treacherous seas, let me say that I am *for* protecting and enhancing the quality of life and that I am *against* the degradation of the environment. The "quality of life" and "degradation", banded about with flourishing pennants, mean different things, to different people, at different times. The concepts are not absolutes (though some use them so), but relative terms, each frequently in complete competition with the views of others. As a further setting for this journey, we need to be constantly reminded that wherever man is, whatever he does, when he eats, works, plays, sleeps or lectures he changes the ecology of his environment. Man thus is the creator of environmental determinants of both good and evil. The challenge in our society is to maintain a balance between them with maximum logic, wisdom and humanity. We do not meet the issues by un-

bridled chaos or by a swift retreat to the "good old past."

THE REMOTE PAST

The Director of the U.S. Geological Survey reminded us recently that, over the millennia of the past, rivers were dirty long before man arrived on the scene. Inexorably the rains that fell and still fall upon the U.S. bring with them, annually, more than 4 million tons of table salt, 2½ million tons of sodium sulphate and 36 million tons of calcium compounds. It was not his view that these characteristics of nature's behavior provided any warrant for man adding to his loads, infinitesimal as they are in relation to nature's contributions, without assessing the benefits and hazards of his actions. The geologic and geographic realities, however, must be borne in mind when we rush toward "instant" solutions to environmental disabilities. The "instant enzyme" of television promise is not yet at hand.

Your own State Geologist, John C. Frye, has recently commented in a similar vein: (John C. Frye, A Geologist Views the Environment. Environmental Geology Notes, Illinois State Geological Survey, February 1971, No. 42.) "The Earth is known to be several billion years old, and the geologic record of physical events and life-forms on the earth is reasonably good for more than the most recent 500 million years. Throughout this span of known times the environment has been constantly changing—sometimes very slowly, but at other times, quite rapidly. . . . Less than 20,000 years ago the area occupied by such cities as Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, and Toronto were deeply buried under the glacial ice."

Twelve thousand years ago, this great area, in which I speak, drained to the Gulf of Mexico rather than to the Atlantic Ocean. Some in the audience might still have preferred this contingency, but Frye simply listed these facts to emphasize that the environment is a dynamic system that "must be accommodated by man's activities, rather than a static, unchanging system that can be 'preserved'."

The persistent and strident belief of many that negativism toward any proposal leads to an ecological heaven, will have rude awakening when the consequences, tangible and intangible, of retreat to a non-existent past come due.

THE LESS REMOTE PAST

Those who would retreat, with the nostalgia for imaginary Thoreau-like environments, either have short memories or do not read while they run. The reports by Chadwick in England, Stephen Smith in New York City and Lemuel Shattuck in Massachusetts should be required reading by the militant advocates of a return to some early Utopia. Turning off the electricity, reducing water use to that of less favored countries, reverting to so-called nature's foods, using your sewage on your own household lot, are the serious proposals of the day at State and Federal legislative hearings.

What was it like for the people a century or more ago? Sir Edwin Chadwick gives a reasonably accurate picture of the environment in the mid-nineteenth century in London. It had its counterparts in New York, Boston, Chicago, Washington and other American cities. As was and still is the British custom to recognize its problems, the Government announced a Royal Commission in 1832 to study the problems of the poor. Fortunately, Chadwick was one of the assistant commissioners. For the next 25 years, he was the great social reformer, continuously and persistently obnoxious in disclosing the sanitary mess in which, not only the poor, but the rich wallowed.

It is not surprising that his reports, each a masterpiece of exposition, were focused primarily upon "the great preventatives (of squalor and disease) of drainage, street and

house cleaning by means of supplies of water and improved sewerage, and especially the introduction of chapter and more efficient modes of removing noxious refuse from the towns, are operations for which aid must be sought from the science of the civil engineer, and from the physician . . ."

Periodically, cholera raged through the cities. Death rates were considered normal at 23 per 1000. Present rates are less than 10. In the generation of white males born in the 1840's less than 60 percent survived to age 20. Of those born in the 1960's, by contrast, over 96 percent will live to that age. Likewise, the expectation of life at birth was then between 30 and 40 years. Today, it is at the level of 70 years!

Further elaborate comparisons of the past with the "evil" present would do no more than suggest that the past was far from the Elysium envisioned by the prophets of doom and the haters of cities. Realistic reminders of the dismal environmental past are still close at hand in the bustees of Calcutta, the favelas of Brazil and the villas misereres of the Argentine.

THE PRESENT

In the United States, a new empire of some 50,000,000 people has been created since the 1940's, reaching a total figure in 1970 of 205,000,000. With the most modest of estimates, another empire of 50,000,000 will be with us by the year 2000. No matter how successful the "zero growth" zealots may be, engineers, doctors, economists, sociologists, political scientists, statesmen et al will have to provide the whole spectrum of environmental services to an additional 100,000,000 men, women and children. For them to survive, energy will be required, industrial products must be manufactured, food will have to be grown, houses, water and wastes will have to be serviced. No amount of idealistic incantation or King Chanut behavior will stem the tides of industrialization, urbanization and consumerism. Decrying the past, mass self-flagellation, recrimination and prohibitory decrees will not meet these demands now at our respective doorsteps.

Before moving on to the design of the future, and its implications, it is well to dispose of a few dramatic myths still actively peddled by the prophets of global doom. During July 1970, about 100 scientists and professionals met for a month on the campus of Williams College in Massachusetts. They conducted a study of critical environmental problems, concerned mainly with the consequences of pollution in climate, ocean ecology and large, terrestrial, eco-systems. Their findings, in brief, are essential prerequisites to any planning conception for the world of the future. They are:

(a) The likelihood or direct climate change in this century resulting from CO₂ is small, but its long term potential consequences are so large that much more must be learned. . . .

(b) Although by the year 2000 we expect global thermal power output to be six times the present level, we do not expect it to affect global climate.

(c) Atmospheric oxygen is practically constant. It varies neither over time (since 1910) nor regionally. It is always very close to 20.946 percent. Calculations show that depletion of oxygen by burning all the recoverable fossil fuels in the world would reduce it only to 20.800 percent.

To these items, I add a few other findings which have been successfully documented here and abroad, as follows:

(a) The quality of rivers in the U.S. and in England has not been completely degraded over the last 50 years. The Thames is better today than it has been in over 100 years. The majority of the streams in England show similar improvement in the last two decades. Some major rivers in the U.S. have not been degraded since the 1930's and some are of better quality.

(b) Lake Erie is not "dead".

(c) The atmosphere over London, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Baltimore and others is greatly improved over 25 years ago.

One must concede that these myths offer much grist for political speeches, particularly in election years. They serve no useful purpose, however, in providing lessons for maximum ecological balance in the years to come. Only science and technology can possibly provide the safeguards society must have if it is to capture that cherished quality of life each man seeks in his own definition. The future will have its environmental problems. Many of us not only confront them, but have the confidence they may be resolved—given the will and the money.

THE PLUPERFECT

What is this world we seek? History has many lessons in our search for the perfect society—most of it strewn with failures. Perhaps, our "unperfect" world can only be re-designed toward improvement rather than perfection. Of the great idealists of history, perhaps no one left for posterity so high a vision of Utopia as Sir Thomas More. Since the early sixteenth century his conception has guided the old and inspired the young with the hope that somewhere on this earth life would be sweet, free from battle, and peopled by the generous and helpful. Yet, the vision has always remained unfulfilled. Kenneth Clark put his finger, perhaps, on the missing ingredient, in his recent comment on Sir Thomas More: "himself was a noble idealist, too good for the world of action where he sometimes lost his way."¹

How can we prevent ourselves from losing our way in our trek toward a better environment? Let us review some of the pitfalls which confront us.

(a) *Science and Technology*: Some believe that the major threat to our existence lies in the very attributes of our past—namely in the sins engendered by the great advances in science and technology. This self-flagellation has become the hallmark of even some scientists and technologists in their public testimony, lurid with hyperbole.

E. J. Mishan, a London economist, recently viewed the future in this gloomy perspective: "Try as I might, then, it appears that I am destined to end on a pessimistic note after all. To the effect, in sum, that in their despair, or greed, or both, men have come to place their faith in research, what they reverently call 'scientific research'. For deliverance they turn from Mammon to Science. And when the time comes, Science, in its turn, will consign them to oblivion."²

How true is all this attack? Are we basking in the delusion that science and technology are in reality the instrumentalities of civilization? Let us look at the record once again.

I have already pointed out that a hundred and fifty years ago, life was brief; for most, life expectancy was 38 years. Life was hard. The work week was 72 hours. The average pay was \$300 per year. A dishwasher, a vacuum cleaner, a macerator—the housewife's relief and the doomsday prophet's anathema—were never heard of. The food was monotonous and scarce. The winters were harsh and the summers difficult. Epidemics were frequent and severe. In this region, malaria was prevalent and typhoid fever killed annually at the rate of 50 to 75 per 100,000 people. This rehearsal can be expanded ten-fold. Its import is only that those dreadful days were eliminated for most people, but not yet for all, by science and technology.

It is true that these same forces brought in their wake less salutary effects, some disregard of the amenities and of esthetics, some destruction of the environment and of our natural resources. On balance, however, the lot of man was significantly improved. Our responsibility today is clear. It is not to bemoan the past, to derogate the present

Footnotes at end of article.

and to fear the future. It is rather to assess the prospect and its challenges and to meet them with a real understanding that they must be encountered with a faithful acceptance of ecologic equilibrium. Despair has never been man's best guide. The better mood is to view the future with hope, blinded neither by simplistic doom or by effortless wishful thinking.

We shall increasingly learn how to meet the hazards and insults of the old and new technologies, esthetically and with minimum damage to social, behavioral and natural values. There is reasonable basis for assuming that we can be successful, as shown by the progress in the past, and the structures, facilities and services which cover the country. That some of these do not fulfill all the highest desires of man is a demonstration only of our frailty, not of our devastation.

(b) *Politics*: Alexis de Toqueville, in 1852 spoke before the French Academy of Moral and Political Sciences. The speech has only recently been published in English. In his characteristic fashion he analyzed the problems of politics as they still confront us in this or any other country. We shall forever concern ourselves with whether there is a science of politics and, if so, how best man may be subjected to painless, useful and permanent discipline, in place of painful, destructive and evanescent chaos.

Those of us who view the political scene vis a vis environmental debates may easily despair at the vagaries of political leaders, swaying wildly with the winds of doctrine. The central theme of all revolves around the beauties of enhancing the quality of life—a policy now virtually approaching a religion. Where politics enters the scene is in translating the religious tenets into daily application, by fiat, by preaching, by bribery via grants, by penalty, and by reprisal. Although it is still too early to determine the validities of these approaches, one has the uncomfortable feeling that the hopes are not being rapidly fulfilled.

De Toqueville's warnings in these efforts are worth recording here. He points out that the practical and militant aspect of politics is in providing for passing needs, where it is aided by the ephemeral passions of its contemporaries. It is in such an era that we live today, where environmental passions run high. In every revolution, including our present one, their "leaders do not need our blessings or our curses, but only our pity, for they almost always did otherwise than they intended, and in the end arrived at a result they detested."²

If one reads the militant briefs of today, with their recriminations of society in general, and, in particular, of government, industry, law and the courts, one cannot escape their tacit conclusion that the world would be saved if all these artifacts of civilization were swept away. De Toqueville properly reminds us that "revolution and liberty are two words which in history must be kept carefully apart. The First Consul, who personified the French Revolution and continued it after his own fashion, was nonetheless one of the greatest enemies of liberty the world has ever known."³

Can we make environmental progress without eroding the institutions which protect people against the arbitrary, the foolish and the destructive under the guise of protecting us against the evils of environmental degradation? Here I rely upon the intuitive wisdom of the future, so frequently manifest in the common man. The pendulum will swing back to the recognition that universal prohibition of ecologic sin does not provide for the millennium. Man, as an endangered species, will forever depend upon the fruits of science and technology, tempered by statesmen's capacities for selection and priority.

(c) *The Law*: The abiding faith in the law has ancient and warranted roots. Today's picture of meeting our environmental ills by legislative fiat is, however, an extension of faith almost to the point of hysteria. Here I should like to distinguish between a passionate concern for conservation and a hysterical attack upon any who suggest that a happy mean is necessary between preservation and growth and development.

We witness today the proliferation of laws, unlikely to be enforced, which seek to meet all debatable issues by suits, penalties, espionage and even blackmail via communications media. Some of these views are exemplified by one of the strong advocates of "environmental law," Professor Joseph L. Sax, at the University of Michigan. In opposition stands, among others, Professor Louis L. Jaffe of the Harvard Law School.

Professor Sax has considerable impatience with present procedures, both in administration and in courts, in defending the environment. He would like to universalize citizen action and to enforce greater concern with environmental impact in all decision making. Professor Jaffe believes that environmental considerations can and should be given a very high priority, within the legal framework now in existence. He goes further in emphasizing that "courts should conclude that a serious environmental impact must be justified by relevant and weighty considerations. . . . Merely verbal, trivial or marginal factors should be disregarded as frivolous. Needs must be verified; alternatives must be explored; and costs of alternatives must be quantified."⁴

One might well test many of the proclamations, regulations and laws against these specifications. In not too many of these, which flow weekly from Washington, are these sound criteria obeyed. Professor Jaffe goes on to say "the now fashionable theory is that administration cannot be trusted to take important initiatives altering the status quo where as courts are for more dependably 'with it.'"⁴ In order to meet these attacks, administrative agencies rush to prove that they can be as arbitrary as any devout environmental impact novitiate.

I share the thoughtful view that agencies are capable of effective action, deeply considered and well supported, provided they can free themselves reasonably effectively from vociferous intimidation and high decibel recrimination, often by minority groups with the best of intentions. "Unless this comes about . . . the possibilities of effective and broadscale environmental protection action are not very good, since the courts without powerful and continuous administrative initiatives cannot . . . accomplish a great deal."⁵

In all of these discussions, one finds a deep-seated faith in the efficacy of law in resolving major issues of human behavior. Few studies of such efficacy are really at hand. One might well question whether the faith is fully warranted. Many years ago a law was passed for one of the Maryland counties which prohibited the discharge of sewage, treated or untreated, into any receiving body of water. It is perhaps still on the books. Aside from the deep satisfaction at its passage enjoyed by its sponsors, the results were nil.

One of the few serious inquiries in this field was made by a National Water Resources Committee at the request of the Congress in 1939. The Report found, as one might expect, that strong legislative sanctions for enforcement of stream pollution abatement in the States were in no way related to favorable results. Strong administrators, with weak laws, showed greater accomplishments than weak administrators with strong prohibitory statutes.

It is probably still true today as stated in 1939: "Experience in the United States and abroad shows that enforcement powers, no

matter how strong are of little avail unless supplemented by knowledge of practicable treatment methods and by means of financing the needed works. If suitable methods and adequate funds are available, in combination with enlightened public opinion, enforcement rarely is necessary."⁶

Of more importance, however, than these considerations in enforcement are the increasing evidences of hasty, ill considered and intimidating requirements in areas of complex scientific nature. Some of these, of long term implications, are in the decisions regarding DDT, lead in gasoline, and so-called thermal pollution. It is doubtful whether these and other materials were subjected to the deep and thoughtful consideration which their overall significance to society warranted.

The prohibition of lead in gasoline has little public health significance and probably less smog advantage than its new and old substitutes. Although it had minimal health significance, it has maximum television and newspaper appeal. Four hundred thousand cases in the U.S. of lead poisoning in children, largely in ghetto areas, deserved, however, only four lines, once, in the daily newspapers.

Hearings on the abolition of DDT deteriorated in many instances to mob intimidation of those courageous souls who dared to suggest that the use of this insecticide had saved the lives of millions of people. Where its use had been discontinued, as in Ceylon in the 1960's, over 600,000 cases of malaria were reported in 1968 and the first quarter of 1969. Unfortunately, no substitute has been found for DDT and its high efficiency in the prevention of malaria, yellow fever and typhus. Some 1300 compounds have so far been tested for replacement by the World Health Organization, in cooperation with several national agencies. Not one has measured up to DDT. It is true of insecticides, as of beneficial drugs, that they may be harmful if misused. A total ban would be even more harmful. Yet the rush for zero constituents of everything—with an assumed zero risk world—is the slogan of the day, even in the law.

In the case of the discharge of thermal units, chaos still prevails, while officials vie with each other in announcing requirements bearing little or no relationship to demonstrated ecologic hazard or advantage. In many instances, the effort is directed more toward winning popularity contests than to assessing scientific validity.

(d) *Economics*: It is rare to find directives publicly supported by any statement of economic impact. The clamor for parallel statements of environmental impact, to the exclusion of all other considerations is understandable. For so long these important ecologic aspects were never spelled out, so that demands for their elaboration are persuasive. Perhaps, it is not too much to prophesy that, before long, pressures will mount to add to these displays, corresponding pictures of the effects of each decision on the economy of the region, county or globe. Broad assessments of the present era of negativism remain to be made, while debates in Congress are already under way to provide the official forum for the assessment of the technologic proposals for the future.

I expressed a mounting concern regarding the absence of such assessment of current decisions in 1968, in the following terms: "In this effort to improve the quality of the air, a number of stumbling blocks arise. They include the difficulty of identifying relative causes and origins of pollution, of measuring the effects on man, plant, animal life, and property, of evaluating and setting reasonable limits on discharged constituents, of assessing technological means of correction, of determining costs and benefits and of understanding economic impacts."⁷

In April 1971, Dr. Houthakker, a member

Footnotes at end of article.

of the National Council of Economic Advisers, joined the mounting chorus of people who feel that the time is ripe for a detailed examination of our desires for a fresh quality of life, by listing at what tangible and intangible price. He charges that the advocates of the dominance of human ecology make up for the absence of empirical evidence "by a liberal supply of horror stories that make the description of economics as the dismal science obsolete. . . . The fact that in the field of human ecology it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between science and science fiction should not lead us to the conclusion that environmental problems are not serious. . . . Pollyanish though it may seem, the economist may reasonably start out from the assumption that mankind will be with us for some time to come. Like most economic problems, the problem of the environment is primarily one of choice. . . . The question then arises how clean is clear."¹

He goes on to point out how widely the estimates of pollution control costs can vary. In the case of copper smelters, for example, the estimates, for controlling emissions into the air, range from one cent per pound of copper to 5 or 6 cents, depending on whether one believes the official or the industry. As to the everpresent conflict between the needs of the economy and the needs of the environment, he feels "the search for perfection is not likely to serve us well; instead the rule of reason should prevail."

The list of basic conflicts noted above continues to grow as people grow in numbers and desires. The hope that these two phenomena will disappear is wishful thinking. It becomes compulsory, therefore, for society to recognize that the easy road to Utopia by saying "no" to all programs and projects is doomed to fail. Wise adjudication, obviously, must prevail for new energy requirements, for new water impoundments, for incinerators or substitutes therefor, for Alaska oil development, for Rotterdam expansion by filling wetlands, and myriads of other necessities for man's continued existence. It takes no great stroke of genius to stop everything.

The wholesome concern about the environment will be served best by intelligent ordering of our values and priorities. The underpinning for such ordering lies not in collapse of activity, but in the best assessments we are capable of on each conflicting issue that confronts us. Those who charge full steam ahead and "damn the torpedoes" are not the best leaders for winning the war to protect the quality of life.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

One of the curiosities of the present climate is that environmental health considerations are distinguished primarily by their complete absence in most governmental decisions. The words appear generally in preambles to legislative acts. The reality, however, is that budget allowances are infinitesimal and at the bottom of the heap. Yet, officials are under the uncomfortable duress of justifying many of their dicta and standards on the basis of protecting the health of the public—whether it is so or not. This stance must stem from the feeling that the public is still impressed with this argument, whereas it might not be too persuaded by the emphasis on the alligator, the seal or the bald eagle.

The low status of health evidence input is unfortunate, since both positive and negative epidemiologic data are increasingly available on the impact of pollution on man. National and international research on the health implications is extensive and long term. Their financial support is amazingly meager, although their long term value in assessing policy and practice and in the illumination of choices for action is immeasurable.

Without belaboring this significant deficiency in the U.S. and probably elsewhere, it is well to record here the observations on

air quality standards by the most recent World Health Organization Expert Committee. Their findings are equally applicable to other environmental determinants. They stated in 1969: "Such standards should be based on sound scientific evidence as supplied by air quality guides; however, other considerations—including economic factors and technological feasibility—must be taken into account in establishing them. . . . the establishment of standards is a social and political decision that attempts to balance the costs of pollution abatement against its benefits. . . . Such factors have been evaluated only sporadically and inconsistently, and the improvement of such estimates would be of significant help in the establishment of standards."²

We might well ask whether we actually follow these specifications in our official practices. The evidence is slim!

MONEY AND MANAGEMENT

The environment will not be made over, even slowly, without money and management—with lots of each! Both of these deficiencies are passed over lightly in public discussion. Massive grants-in-aid evaporate with budget deficits and inflation. The "carrot" crop suffers from long term drought, even though the Alice-in-Wonderland belief still persists with much of the public that somehow this money does not come out of our own pockets. Santa Claus is wonderful with his largesse, when he comes.

An equally serious problem of moving forward lies in the absence of appropriate managerial institutions to provide necessary correctives. A tremendous gap exists between the proposals for political re-structuring of local governments, in myriads of inquiries and reports, and the creation of regional governmental units. It is not obvious that local governments can be rapidly enticed into releasing some of their prerogatives to overlying agencies to ensure broader efficiency and economy. Until now, reluctance is great and successes few.

Both fiscal and organizational resources required are great, but not too great for the U.S., if they are intelligently husbanded and perpetually reimbursed. It is inescapable, of course, that, when confronted with the price of environmental enhancement, the public will have to evaluate priorities, choices and alternatives. One might even predict that when all these are made visible, the electorate may decide to use the elusive public dollar, for schools, houses, medical care, wilderness areas, bowling alleys, or beauty shops.

IN SUMMARY

Man has always used and misused his environment. He has rarely consciously done his bookkeeping regularly enough to take stock of his assets and debits. With the tremendous growth in population, in urbanization and in industrialization, the truth is thrust upon him that beneficent and deleterious results flow from his behavior. How this realization came about dramatically in the 1960's I leave to the historian.

The ecologist, reincarnated from Haeckel's definition of 100 years ago, has become the present-day Messiah to lead us into a saner world. He has done his job well in reminding all that every action carries its own reaction—sometimes good and sometimes evil. As has always been the case with Messiahs, their followers demand salvation quickly and distrust non-believers—perhaps would even destroy them, legally, of course. Prophecies of eternal doom have marched consistently through history and the portents have been postponed from time to time as wiser oracles became less quantitative.

What is true is that we have a list of innumerable environmental problems. Generally, we are too slow in correcting them, although the record will show that we have not done too badly. Instant enzymes are not

characteristic of human behavior—they may not even be so good in soaps!

Industry which, in truth, provided a standard of living previously unheard of in history, at the same time invariably lagged behind in its own housekeeping. Its revival of social responsibility is visible. It is hoped that this will continue to grow, without the necessity of countervailing government fiat, blackmail or penalty. Destruction of the goose that lays golden eggs did not work even in the fairy tale.

Retreat to the past is impossible, even for those few who enshrine it. The past was imperfect, sad for many, and dangerous to all.

The decision is a clear one. The future can be better, however measured. The tools for a sane world are either here or around the corner. As always, they are only used when we have the mind or the will to pick them up and put them to work.

Let no one assume that the task will be simple. The environment is complex, although not nearly so fragile, in general, as some suggest. It has good millennia of change and will continue on its way. Our responsibility is to adjust to change, somewhat gingerly, with the maximum of wisdom and logic that we can summon up. Fear, delusion, and even hysteria make poor guides on this journey. Even in mythology, the courageous navigator was increasingly able to steer safely between the hazardous waters of Scylla and Charybdis.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Kenneth Clark. *Civilization*. Harper and Row, New York, 1969.

² E. J. Mishan. *Futurism—And the Worse That Is Yet to Come*. Encounter, March 1971, p. 9.

³ Alexis de Toqueville. *The Art and Science of Politics*. Encounter, January 1971, pp. 27-35.

⁴ Louis L. Jaffe. *The Administrative Role in Environmental Protection*. ALI-ABA Course of Study on Environmental Law. Washington, D.C. January 28-30, 1971.

⁵ *Water Pollution in the United States*. Third Report of Special Advisory Committee on Water Pollution, National Resource Committee, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1939.

⁶ Abel Wolman. *Air Pollution: Time for Appraisal*. Science, Vol. 159, 29 March 1968, pp. 1437-1440.

⁷ Hendrik S. Houthakker. *The Economy and the Environment*. Before the Cleveland Business Economists Club, April 19, 1971.

⁸ *Urban Air Pollution, with Particular Reference to Motor Vehicles*. Report of WHO Expert Committee. Tech. Rep. Series No. 410, 1969.

JOE FELKNOR

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform my colleagues about the death of Mr. Joe Felknor, a prominent attorney in Dandridge, Tenn. Mr. Felknor is the brother of my good friend, Leon Felknor, of Houston.

Although he never held public office, Joe was actively interested in the affairs of his State and Nation, and he worked hard for good government. I wish that every American shared his interest and concern about the wellbeing of our country.

I join his family and many friends in mourning his death.

GOLDEN JUBILEE OF LINCOLN
PARK, MICH.

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the city of Lincoln Park, in my congressional district, is celebrating its golden jubilee this year—the 50th anniversary of its founding as a village in 1921.

To mark this historic event, Lincoln Park City officials have designated June 28 as the highlight of the celebration, and have made plans for an eventful program to mark the occasion. A coordinating committee of seven persons have been named—Lawrence Bailey, William S. Mellus, Alexander Petri, Davig Nagy, George Chelenyak, Joseph Renier, and Vernon Stough.

Civic organizations, businessmen, and residents are being asked to join in the golden jubilee observance.

Lincoln Park, a community of nearly 6 square miles, was carved from Ecorse Township, one of the original Wayne County townships created by the Michigan Territorial Legislature in 1827. From this township have been created nearly a dozen cities comprising what is today known as the Downriver Area—being “down” the river from Detroit.

The intersection of Fort Street and Southfield Road—then called the St. Cosme Line and later State Street—has traditionally been the “center” of the city. Once known as Quandt's Corners, the intersection was the site of a grocery store and saloon in the late 1800's.

Henry Ford's famous “Five-Dollar-Day” at the nearby Ford Rouge plant in 1918 provided the spark which launched Lincoln Park on its way to citydom. Thousands of new Ford employees flocked to the area seeking homes, and the years following World War I saw a gigantic real estate boom. Subdivisions were laid out, and new business enterprises were begun.

Incorporation as a village in 1921 was followed by reincorporation 4 years later as a city. Expansion slowed down during the depression years of the 1930's, but the Second World War brought another period of growth. The Federal census of 1930 listed Lincoln Park as the 34th city in Michigan, with a population of 12,336. By 1940, Lincoln Park ranked 26th with 15,236, and in 1950 reached the top 20, with 29,265 inhabitants.

By 1960, Lincoln Park's 56,933 population made it Michigan's 12th largest city. The 1970 census listed 52,984 residents, indicating that Lincoln Park's growth had leveled off.

Intelligent city planning has made Lincoln Park a modern, attractive community. The city was among the first in Michigan to conduct urban renewal programs during the late 1950's and early 1960's. Enlightened and farsighted city officials have drafted and enforced tight planning and zoning laws to protect the high-class residential character of the community, while providing convenient commercial areas.

For a comparatively young city, Lincoln Park has developed a strong civic spirit, manifested in active civic organizations, many churches, and a highly visible municipal pride.

The current “family” of city officials includes Robert DeMars, mayor; Max F. Schiebold, council president; George A. Barber, Russell V. White—both former mayors—Arnold C. Gregory, Frank LaFata and Victor Bonora, councilmen; Clarence A. Hicks, treasurer; Frances Marcelonis, acting city clerk; William T. Chapman, municipal judge; John A. Aloisi, associate judge; Kenneth Mixer, city attorney; Robert Duncan, police chief; Clarence Bay, fire chief; Dr. Paul P. Walter, health officer; Lester Porath, assessor; Edward Figure, controller; Emmanuel Gorland, director of community improvement; Michael T. Knowles, superintendent of public services, and John Powell, purchasing agent.

Members of the board of education include Joseph W. Unger, president; Charles L. Higgins, vice president; Christopher E. Smith, secretary; Richard P. Richardson, treasurer; and Mrs. Cleola Haas, Mrs. Carmen Queen, and Richard Petoskey, trustees.

To this outstanding group of officials, and to all the citizens of Lincoln Park, I offer my congratulations on the occasion of the golden jubilee. I am proud indeed to represent the city of Lincoln Park in the U.S. Congress, and I call upon my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in wishing Lincoln Park many more half centuries of progress.

YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER CLEANUP

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, each year the Corps of Engineers sponsors a cleanup of the Youghiogheny River in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and West Virginia. I attended the kickoff of this year's campaign last Sunday and was very impressed with the dedication of all concerned in this effort. Mr. Marlin Lawson of Friendsville, Md., the Friendsville Rod, Boat, & Gun Club, and Mr. Burl B. McVicker, Reservoir Manager, Monongahela Area, U.S. Corps of Engineers were my hosts.

In 1967, the first year of the organized cleanup campaign, the citizen participating collected over 4,000 oil drums from the Youghiogheny. This is hard work, but the people involved know how heartening the results are. I was greatly impressed by the civic pride and community spirit of the participants.

I would like to commend all the participants who have made past campaigns and are making this one a success. The Corps of Engineers and the citizens of the Youghiogheny River Valley have set an example for other areas of the country to follow. I know the campaign, which ends July 4, will be a success.

CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING—THE
SITUATION IN CONNECTICUT

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, childhood lead poisoning is a disease which takes its toll nationwide. That is why preliminary requests for funding have been submitted to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from cities across the country—Cincinnati, Denver, Kansas City, New Orleans, Omaha, Mobile, Nashville, Saginaw, Rochester, San Francisco, San Antonio, and many others.

In Connecticut, the Connecticut Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics last year launched a campaign to eliminate lead poisoning in New Haven and other Connecticut cities. Initiation of this program was spurred by a survey conducted by the University of Rochester in March of 1968, which revealed that New Haven reported more lead poisoning cases per 100,000 people than any other city in the United States—22 for each 100,000 people.

The April 1, 1970, issue of the American Academy of Pediatrics Newsletter detailed these activities in an article entitled “Connecticut Chapter Launches Multifaceted State Program To Combat Lead Poisoning”:

CONNECTICUT CHAPTER LAUNCHES MULTIFACETED STATE PROGRAM TO COMBAT LEAD POISONING

The Connecticut Chapter recently launched an innovative legislative and educational program to eliminate lead poisoning in New Haven and in other cities throughout Connecticut.

MULTIFACETED PROGRAM

The program includes liaison with key state and city legislators; delivery of testimony by chapter representatives before House Committees conducting hearings on lead poisoning; mailing of letters supporting such legislation; review of new legislative proposals concerning the problem, and public education programs.

The Chapter efforts have paid off in such tangible results as passage of Connecticut Public Health Bill 533—a bill requiring labeling of paint containing poisonous substances.

SPURRED BY SURVEY

Initiation of this multifaceted program was spurred by a survey conducted by the University of Rochester, New York, in March of 1968, which revealed that New Haven reported more lead poisoning cases per 100,000 people than any other city in the United States. New Haven had 22 cases of lead poisoning reported for each 100,000 people as compared, for example, to New York City which reported 7.5 for every 100,000.

FIRST STEP

As a first step toward alleviating the causes which contributed to the high rate of lead poisoning in New Haven, Carlos B. Zilveti, M.D., F.A.A.P., representing the Connecticut Chapter, enlisted the assistance of key legislators to promote new bills to combat lead poisoning.

Dr. Zilveti, director of Maternal and Child Health, New Haven Department of Health, and Dr. Daniel Rowe, associate professor of Clinical Pediatrics, Yale University School of Medicine, testified before House Committees

conducting hearings on proposed legislation to control lead poisoning.

Dr. Zilveti's and Dr. Rowe's testimony before the Connecticut Public Health and Safety Committee helped to secure passage of Connecticut Public Health Bill 533—Labeling of Paint Containing Poisonous Substances. This law requires that paint cans containing lead be so labeled.

SUPPORTING LETTER

The Connecticut Chapter supported Dr. Zilveti's and Dr. Rowe's testimony in an official letter to the Connecticut Public Health and Safety Committee.

Dr. Zilveti, in an interview, emphasized that the Connecticut Chapter will not be content simply with the passage of this legislation. "One of our goals," he said, "is to see that legislation enacted in Connecticut on lead poisoning, as well as other poisonous materials, conforms as closely as possible to the standards established by the American National Standards Institute, Inc. relating to specifications to minimize hazards to children from residual surface coating materials."

As another phase of its program, the Connecticut Chapter is working closely with the Governor's Task Force on Lead Poisoning to review new legislative proposals concerning lead and other surface coating materials to insure that these bills, if possible, meet the Institute's specifications.

LOCAL EFFORTS

To educate the public about the lead poisoning problem in New Haven, the Connecticut Chapter is working through the Hill Health Center in the city. Alvin Novack, M.D., F.A.A.P., director, Hill Health Center, noticing the high percentage of lead poisoning in children when they were given pediatric screening in the Center, initiated an in-service training program for his staff to point up the causes and effects of lead poisoning. The staff, along with Fellows of the Connecticut Chapter, and other physicians from Yale—New Haven Hospital then began teaching the people in the community about the hazards of lead poisoning.

CITIZENS FORM GROUP

As a result of this program, citizens in New Haven formed a group which they call Citizens Against Lead (CAL). This organization sponsors regular educational sessions on lead poisoning; holds block meetings to educate the public about lead poisoning; develops publicity programs; has conferences with city officials, and informs fellow citizens regarding sources of legal redress they may take concerning lead poisoning incidents.

All these efforts, the Connecticut Chapter hopes, will drastically reduce the incidence of lead poisoning in New Haven and throughout the state, and will create a more thorough public awareness concerning the hazardous ramifications of the problem.

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commentary on the cost of higher education:

THE COST OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Few families can now afford to send their sons and daughters to college without financial aid in some measure. The average annual cost of higher education for a student

varies from about \$1,360 at a state university to \$3,000 at a private institution. And, as if that was not enough, the costs show no signs of leveling off.

The high costs of higher education have put two-thirds of the Nation's colleges—enrolling three-fourths of our students—either in financial difficulty or soon to be there.

Most of the prestigious private institutions are now out of the reach of students from middle-income families. State universities are experiencing enormous increases of students and a fiscal squeeze which threatens their ability to provide a quality education.

The well-being of higher education is vital to this nation. It plays a crucial role in providing the basic knowledge and the skills needed in our complex society and in enhancing the quality of life of the people. A substantial investment by all levels of government and private individuals and organizations is essential if the quality and growth of higher education is not to be curbed at the very time the national need for ideas and skills is so crucial.

The Federal government's response to the rising costs of higher education has triggered one of the major debates in this session of the Congress. The legislation covering student aid is due to expire at the end of June. It is estimated that the House Education Committee will not finish its deliberation on student aid and higher education assistance for another four to six weeks.

As Congress seeks the best way to keep college education within reach of all qualified students, regardless of family income, the debate has focused on two questions:

1. Whether the Federal student-aid program should be reoriented to concentrate only on students from poor families, and
2. Whether the financial plight of colleges and universities should be relieved through direct institutional aid.

The President has recommended the abolishment of the present student-aid programs of opportunity grants, insured loans and work-study programs, and the concentration of assistance on low-income students. He has proposed a \$1,400 "floor" of grants and low-interest loans to students from the poorest families, with Federal assistance being cut back sharply as family income grows. For those whose families do not qualify, the President has proposed Federally-guaranteed loans at higher interest rates. The burden of student loan financing would be shifted, under the President's recommendations, to private funds.

He opposes direct aid to any institution, and has recommended stopping grants and low-interest loans to colleges to finance construction projects, calling instead for private loans which would be underwritten by the Federal government.

Others contend that the present student-aid programs should be extended and funded at higher levels. They propose that a program of institutional aid be established—one which provides direct grants of essentially unrestricted funds which colleges and universities could use to help pay operating costs, and hopefully, keep tuition costs more in line.

The President's recommendations, they say, ignore growing financial pressures on middle-income families with children in college, and concentrate what amounts to reduced Federal assistance on students from lower income families.

I do not support the proposed restructuring of student-aid programs. I believe the costs of higher education today require a broad range of improved student assistance programs for those from low and middle-income families, including grants, direct loans, insured loans, and work-study payments. I believe, too, that our institutions of higher education need direct, institutional aid.

PROJECT CANNIKIN—A NUCLEAR TEST BLAST IN ALASKA THIS YEAR

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, last week, in Anchorage, Alaska, the Atomic Energy Commission held hearings to gain further information regarding the nuclear test to be held later this year on Amchitka Island in Alaska. These hearings were held at the request of Alaska Gov. William A. Egan, and brought forward a great deal of concerned testimony on this proposed 5-megaton test.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4, 1971 on page 18084, Alaska Senator MIKE GRAVEL has inserted his own testimony at these hearings, as well as the testimony of many others who came from all over the country at their own expense to testify. I commend this testimony to all interested, and remind you that the proposed Alaska nuclear test will have a yield substantially larger than any previous underground test in this country.

My own testimony, which is included here, shared an element of serious concern with the testimony of nearly every person who appeared.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. NICK BEGICH

(Hearings on the Atomic Energy Commission on Project Cannikin, Anchorage, Alaska, May 28, 1971)

Thank you for the opportunity to appear here today. I believe these hearings are indispensable to a full evaluation of the Project Cannikin nuclear test, and I am certain that the witnesses appearing here will offer a great deal of relevant and important testimony. Considering the unprecedented magnitude of this nuclear test, it is my desire and my understanding that the decision to attempt the test or to do so on the present schedule is still open pending the results of these hearings. In the realization that this will be the last test in Alaska and at the same time, the largest underground test ever in the United States, I believe that the information from these hearings can be vital in making the final decision.

For my part, I have examined with great interest the various documents prepared by the Atomic Energy Commission which relate to the proposed Cannikin test and to the results of the Milrow test which occurred on October 2, 1969. Like any lay person considering a project of this type, I am staggered by the complexity of the technical considerations, and somewhat the captive of the information put forward by the A.E.C., which is advocating the test.

As I understand it, the A.E.C. proposes, in the Autumn of 1971, to explode a nuclear device having a force of nearly five megatons, and to do so in a chamber 6,000 feet underground on the island of Amchitka, Alaska. For perspective, it might be pointed out that the largest prior underground detonation in the United States was just over one megaton, and that the bomb which destroyed Hiroshima had a yield of only about 20 kilotons. After one prior test in the Amchitka area, the MILROW test of one megaton in October, 1969, the A.E.C. has stated that the Cannikin test, at this place, at this time, and at the five megaton yield level is:

1. Necessary, and;

2. Likely to have only minimal environmental effects.

My response to this proposal and to these judgments on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission cannot be that of an advocate in opposition, yet I have serious questions remaining in my own mind regarding both the necessity and the effects of the test. These are the questions which I bring to you today in the hope that more satisfactory information and thinking may result. I do not expect answers to these questions at this time. In fact, I believe some of them can be answered only with the passage of additional time and with the information which may be produced at these hearings. Nevertheless, I believe the people of Alaska deserve the answers in definite form before the test is performed.

My first questions relate to the environmental impact statement on Project Cannikin. Over a period of time, I have expressed disappointment with the manner in which Federal agencies have chosen to comply with Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and this 102 impact statement does little to ease that disappointment. Section 102 does not seek advocacy of any proposed project, but rather full information on its possible environmental effects. The results of an inadequately prepared 102 statement have been made very clear to Alaskans who witnessed the granting of a Federal injunction delaying the pipeline because the 102 Statement of the Interior Department was insufficient. I believe some of the following questions must be answered before the Cannikin statement is considered adequate.

1. The statement indicates the yield of the test as "less than five megatons."

a) Is the reason for the omission of the exact yield that it cannot be reliably predicted?

b) Have past nuclear detonations by the A.E.C. demonstrated that the yield can substantially surpass expectations?

c) If the yield is 4.9 to 5 megatons, is this not five times larger than any previous underground nuclear test in the United States?

d) If the yield is five times greater than the Milrow test of one megaton, can the predictable results be derived by assuming that they also will be five times greater, or will they be more than five times greater, or possibly less?

2. The statement makes a number of wide-ranging predictions concerning Cannikin based on the experience of the Milrow test. Considering the risks involved, does the A.E.C. believe that the results of a single pre-test provide sufficient data for an underground nuclear detonation five times greater than any previously attempted?

3. Regarding the seismic force of the Cannikin test, the A.E.C. predicts that it will be "a few tenths of a point higher than the 6.5 value assigned for Milrow."

a) While this sounds like very little, isn't it true that this reading is on a logarithmic scale which means that a few tenths of a point may mean that the force could be as much as five or six times greater?

b) It is my understanding that the 6.5 reading for Milrow was in excess of pre-shot expectations. Is this under-estimate also a possibility for Cannikin?

c) Although I realize that the question of this blast acting as a "trigger" for a larger earthquake is one subject to differences, is it not the case that this test will provide a triggering force substantially larger than any previous test?

4. Regarding the possible venting of this explosion, and the escape of radioactive material into either the atmosphere or the ocean:

a) "Adequate distance from faults," is listed by the A.E.C. as a requirement for the

containment of radioactivity, but the Cannikin site is within 3,300 feet of one fault and within 2,800 feet of another suspected fault. Since the zone of "cracking" around the blast will extend according to the A.E.C., for a radius of 2,500 feet, might it be advisable to take further time for study of these nearby faults, or others presently unknown?

b) I understand that the Banebury test in Nevada in December, 1970 vented without a fault, by simply splitting the earth with its own pressure. If Banebury can do this at a yield of 20 kilotons, is it not a realistic fear with Cannikin having a yield of five megatons with identified faults nearby?

5. One of my greatest concerns regarding the chance of venting is the possible escape of radioactive material into the nearby ocean, which supports a commercial fishery of tremendous value. Although Amchitka is an isolated area, it is one which is familiar to Alaskan fishermen. No risk to these fisheries resources can be allowed.

a) The A.E.C. has stated that the migration of water having harmful radioactivity is so slow as to be of little concern. Is the period of less than two years since the Milrow test sufficient to judge this process in the water migration medium which is present on Amchitka, or is additional time desirable?

b) All descriptions of "safe" contamination levels are given by the A.E.C. in terms of freshwater, yet greater concern for Cannikin would apply to seawater. Are "safe" contamination levels also agreed upon and available for seawater?

c) The A.E.C. impact statement minimizes the danger of water contamination from the bomb by citing a dilution factor of one in 100,000 parts. Does our Nation's experience with D.D.T. or mercury pollution apply to cast doubts on the safety of dilution in the case of Cannikin's radioactive pollution?

6. In the case of every possible effect of an extremely serious nature (earthquake, tidal wave, immediate venting into the air or water, or the rapid migration of contaminated water), the impact statement assessed the chances of such incidents as "remote" or "extremely unlikely." Following such judgments, no statement indicates what the environmental impact of such extreme effects would be. In the feeling that even the worst possible effects should be publically known. I would ask if such information is available or if it can be made available?

7. No mention is made in the impact statement or elsewhere by the A.E.C. concerning the recently disclosed fact that a substantial quantity of World War II mustard gas in large canisters was dumped in the sea in this area in 1946. Has this factor been considered by the A.E.C.? How current and reliable is the information and testing regarding this potentially important new factor?

8. By a wide margin, the most deficient aspect of the A.E.C. impact statement is the evaluation of possible alternatives to the Cannikin test. Such alternatives as testing a smaller device, or delaying the test for further study are dismissed with a single sentence. In fact, all possible alternatives are dismissed in just over one-half of a page. My question relates to the A.E.C. statement which immediately precedes this painfully short evaluation, and states that all alternatives to the proposed action were "examined carefully." Are the full details of that careful examination of alternatives existent and available, and will they be made public so that the A.E.C. analysis of the alternatives can be more fully appreciated?

These various questions represent areas in which I believe further environmental information can be usefully developed. They are the questions of a layman applying conventional knowledge to an area of technical complexity. I believe they should be answered before proceeding.

Moving from the impact statement itself,

I believe there are additional questions which are relevant at this time, and important in any assessment of the Cannikin project.

First, I would ask that the A.E.C. explain the curious shortage of information in its pre-test statements relating to the human inhabitants of the test area, particularly the Alaska Natives who have for decades made the Aleutian Islands their home. In stating that the effects of the test on man will be "nil", the A.E.C. makes a very important statement to the Aleuts, who have looked to this area for years to supply the means of their subsistence. The same area is now subject to the Alaska Native land claims.

Although it is rarely the case that technological advance is stayed for conflicting human needs, I ask if it may not be advisable to delay this test pending the approaching resolution of the land claims question, and a further consultation with those who live in the area. It is my understanding that testimony is to be given in these hearings by representatives of the Alaska Natives and Aleuts, and I would defer to their statements gladly after urging that their testimony be carefully considered in reconsidering this test.

Further, I sincerely hope that our interchange here includes the desire to cast this nuclear test in its proper political and environmental perspective. Surely no-one would differ from the proposed test if the question were between potential harm to several sea otters and nesting sites and the security of our Nation, yet this is not the fact of the matter regarding either our nation's security or the potential effects of the test.

I believe it is possible, at some length, to debate the merits of the Spartan missile for whose warhead this test is certainly intended, just as it is possible to debate the environmental effects of this test. The question is simple:—At a time when these important debates are in progress and unsolved, and at a time when only a few days ago the President assured the Nation that significant arms and testing limitation agreements with the Soviet Union were more possible than in several years, is it the best part of wisdom to terminate the debates and the hopes by undertaking the largest underground nuclear test ever in the United States? I think not.

Finally, I believe something must be said just on behalf of Alaskans. It is the home of a number of Alaska Natives which provides the area of this test. It is the fishing grounds of generations of Alaskan fisherman which are threatened by any mistake in the expected results of the test. It is the citizens of Alaska who must fear earthquakes or tidal waves. Since it has already been announced that this is the last nuclear test in Alaska, it is known that Alaskan laborers can expect to benefit from no further employment on the A.E.C. test sites.

Most of these considerations mean only one thing—that the real impact of this test falls most heavily on Alaskans, and I believe I speak for many of them when I request that the A.E.C. supply the answers to the questions I have raised. I remember very clearly this same situation just prior to the MILROW test in 1969, when legislators and other public officials were being asked their opinion. Expressions of shock and disapproval ranged from the general to the specific and detailed. By far the best was the response of one veteran legislator who, when asked his feelings on the upcoming nuclear blast, replied with candor, "Put me down as nervous."

You can put me down as nervous, also, along with a great many Alaskans. And behind that nervousness, I have a very real concern which can be greatly alleviated by the answers to the questions I submit here.

Thank you.

FOOD STAMPS FOR THE
HARVESTER

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) has recently been appointed chairman of a newly created Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. The new Subcommittee on Agricultural Labor has jurisdiction over legislation dealing with farmworkers and their dependents.

It is inherent in the nature of my colleague that he has not rushed into the legislative arena precipitously. Even though JIM O'HARA has long been active in leading the fight for farm labor legislation, he has not rushed to the floor with some panacea in this area. It is his announced intention to move slowly and deliberately in the development of appropriate and effective legislative solutions to those problems of the farm worker which are particularly susceptible to legislative solutions.

But this deliberate approach has not silenced my friend and colleague. When the Department of Agriculture recently issued its new proposed food stamp regulations, JIM O'HARA, and the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), who chairs a corresponding subcommittee in the other body, sent a very perceptive joint letter to the Department, commenting on the regulations and pointing out the shortcomings of those proposed regulations with specific reference to migratory farmworkers. In their letter, the two chairmen commented on the irony of regulations which make it particularly difficult to secure food stamps for the very people who harvest the crops that these food stamps help others obtain.

The Michigan AFL-CIO News in its May 26 edition, featured a story about the efforts by Mr. O'HARA and Senator STEVENSON. I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper story, and a copy of the joint letter appear at this point in the RECORD.

FOOD STAMP RULES TO PENALIZE MIGRANTS

WASHINGTON.—If proposed new federal food stamp regulations are adopted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the men and women who pick the fruits and vegetables for America's tables may find it difficult to obtain food stamps.

This ironic twist was emphasized in a letter sent to the director of the U.S. food stamp division by the chairmen of the two congressional committees which deal with the problems of farm workers.

Representatives James G. O'Hara (D. Mich.) chairman of the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Labor, and Senator Adlai Stevenson III (D. Ill.) chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migrant Labor, urged the Agriculture Department to reconsider and revise its proposed regulations.

UNFAIR TO MIGRANTS

"Few affirmative steps," their joint letter said, "have been taken to assure in a positive way that migrant and seasonal farmworkers will receive full benefits of this program."

"Inadequate consideration appears to have been given to the unique elements of the migrant way of life—their existence in rural areas, their constant mobility, and their exclusion from existing social and worker benefit programs."

O'Hara and Stevenson particularly criticized the following issues:

Emphasis on households as eligible units, a term that is most difficult to define in view of the realities of the farmworker's life style.

Requirements for detailed documentation and verification of earnings, an inappropriate measure for migrant farmworkers with sporadic and unpredictable earnings engaged in seasonal work.

Continued emphasis on discriminatory residence requirements.

Administrative procedures for certification establishing and maintaining eligibility, and fair hearing and appeal procedures that lack time considerations applicable to a mobile population.

O'Hara and Stevenson urged establishment of a special task force on the extent to which the food stamp benefits are available to migrants. They also said steps should be taken immediately to set-up a national food stamp certification and distribution program for farmworkers.

MAY 17, 1971.

Mr. JAMES E. SPRINGFIELD,
Director, Food Stamp Division, Food and
Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of
Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPRINGFIELD: As Chairman respectively of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor and the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Labor, we are writing you to indicate our concern over the thrust of pending food stamp regulations now under consideration by the Department of Agriculture.

Neither of us has been Chairman of our respective Subcommittees for very long, but it does not take very long to discover that in almost all federal programs, the farmworker is the last to be adequately covered, or the first to find that his eligibility for program benefits is limited in degree or duration. It is particularly ironic to discover that in the distribution of food stamps the worker whose efforts are essential to the availability of fresh fruits and vegetables will be discriminated against by the proposed regulations.

We are aware that others have called your attention to the flaws in the proposed regulations, particularly as they affect farmworkers. Inadequate consideration appears to have been given to the unique elements of the migrant way of life—their existence in rural areas, their constant mobility, and their exclusion from existing social and worker benefit programs.

Issues which have especially been brought to our attention include the emphasis on households as eligible units—a term that is most difficult to define in view of the realities of the farmworker's life style; the requirements for detailed documentation and verification of earnings—an inappropriate measure for migrant farmworkers with sporadic and unpredictable earnings engaged in seasonal work; the continued emphasis on discriminatory residence requirements; and, administrative procedures for certification, establishing and maintaining eligibility, and fair hearing and appeal procedures that lack time considerations applicable to a mobile population.

These issues and others will undoubtedly make it difficult for those people who need food stamp programs the most to obtain benefits. In fact, it appears that few affirmative steps have been taken to assure in a positive way that migrant and seasonal farmworkers will receive full benefits of this program.

In view of the seriousness of the situation,

and the widespread hunger and malnutrition that characterizes this element of the nation's work force, we urge the following course of action:

1. A special task force with a significant representation of migrant and seasonal farm workers should be established to study the extent to which benefits of the food stamp program are made available to migrant and seasonal farmworkers. The task force should be directed to report back within 90 days with suggestions for improving the delivery of food stamp program benefits to farmworkers; and,

2. Steps should immediately be taken to establish a national food stamp certification and distribution program for farmworkers. Such a national focus is essential, for the migrant farmworker in particular is constantly on the move to obtain employment, living either temporarily or permanently in a hostile environment, and excluded from programs.

We urge that you make a careful study of our objections and proposals, as well as suggestions which you may have received from organizations who have a working familiarity and expertise with the needs of the migrant and seasonal farmworker. In view of the seriousness of this matter, and our respective Subcommittee's interest in continuing our investigation into the adequacy of our nation's food programs as they affect farmworkers, your immediate attention to these issues will be greatly appreciated.

BLESSING IN DISGUISE

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, with the great emphasis that is being placed on social consciousness, it is gratifying to note that American industry is demonstrating its capacity to assume a full measure of responsibility. This trend is evidenced in the annual reports of a substantial number of American corporations, where references are made to their equal job opportunity practices, voluntary programs launched in the inner city, and in their extensive measures to improve the human environment.

Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that these goals can only be attained through a strong business enterprise system, including business profits. This point was emphasized convincingly in a recent editorial in the Lakeland newspapers, a prominent newspaper chain circulating in Lake County in my 12th Congressional District.

I am pleased to submit this editorial to my colleagues:

BLESSING IN DISGUISE

The current slowdown in business may be a blessing in disguise. It might help teach respect for law—a first fundamental of self-government. It could also lead to a new realization that social goals are unattainable except through the strength of the business system.

The latest crop of college graduates, for example, are learning the hard way, in their search for employment, that profits, jobs, and prosperity sink or swim together. Perhaps this will lead to an awareness of other truths about the American business system. For example, in the first three quarters of

1970, 90.2 per cent of the earnings of the average American company—after paying for materials, supplies, taxes, rent, heat, etc.—went to employees. Of the remaining 9.8 per cent retained by the owners (stockholders) nearly half was needed to finance improvements for future growth.

From this, it should not be hard to see why it is idle to talk of social reform or progress of any kind unless it is accompanied by business growth and profits.

RED HEROIN

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the most recent edition of *Twin Circle* weekly news magazine. The author, Dr. Jerry Pournelle, points out one of the dangers inherent into moving toward closer contact with the Red Chinese is an increase in the flow of heroin into the United States.

The question which concerns us as Federal representatives is, what possible gain can result from recognition of Red China which would justify our exacerbation of a drug problem which we are unable to successfully control even now.

The article follows:

RED HEROIN

(By Jerry Pournelle, Ph. D.)

Narcotics and dangerous drugs are now the leading public health problem in the US and even with present day supplies will shortly become the number one cause of death, outranking cancer, heart disease, accidents, and suicide. The life expectancy of a heroin addict is about ten years, given the increasing number of young people using dangerous drugs it is probable that we will suffer more casualties to dope than in any of our wars.

In 1965 there were legal facilities for producing one hundred times as many medicinal opiates and morphiates as the legitimate world market could absorb; since that time both Red China and the Soviet Union have invested in new technology for morphine/heroin production. There is no legitimate market for heroin, which is banned from medical use by international treaty; yet the Red Chinese have constructed at least twelve large-scale factories for converting morphine base to heroin. Most Oriental addicts outside Hong Kong smoke opium and almost never use heroin.

The Soviets have gone further. The traditional method of harvesting opium poppies required skilled hand labor: the seed pod is carefully slit and the ripened sap scraped off the still growing plant at a later time. If this is done carelessly the product is spoiled. Now, however, there are at least two newly designed plants behind the Iron Curtain which can accept bales of cut poppies, stalks and all, and process them into a staggering proportion of morphiates. Each of these Soviet sponsored plants located in Hungary and Czechoslovakia can in a week produce the entire annual legitimate morphine supply.

By international law seven countries are authorized to grow poppies for medicinal opiates: Bulgaria, Greece, India, Iran, Turkey, USSR, and Yugoslavia. Greece and Iran have voluntarily stopped production. In addition to the five legal producers, Burma, Laos, and Red China are major growers of opium poppies, and the opium traffic through Laos is a major factor in the politics of the area,

far more important to tribal leaders than the Viet Nam War. Intelligence sources believe Soviet fields to be many times larger than needed for medicinal supply.

Drugs may be used by communists for many purposes. They have a value all out of proportion to production costs, and may be used as sources of illegal and untraceable funds for intelligence operations. They can also be used to recruit agents, although addicted agents are not reliable. Their blackmail potential and usefulness to weaken opponents' military forces may easily be seen.

Drugs can also be used in secret warfare directly against industrialized nations. By flooding a society with drugs and encouraging their use by youth many potentially valuable citizens may be as effectively killed as if they died in a major war, at far less cost to the aggressor. Not only is the youthful addict's education effectively terminated, but he becomes a problem to the police. Communist organizations in the U.S. are well aware of this fact.

One surprising development took place at a recent international conference on narcotics control, where a Soviet Civil Police captain from Tashkent told of vast quantities of Chinese heroin smuggled into Russian Turkestan. He estimated the number of addicts in his district as over ten thousand and growing rapidly, with drug addiction so severely affecting the area's economy that production goals could not be met. The Russian insisted that the Chinese were flooding his district with "cut-rate" heroin in order to soften it up for eventual Chinese occupation.

It is not known where Soviet heroin goes, although some intelligence agents believe a portion is sold to criminal groups operating in the U.S. Chinese heroin is easier to trace. Much of it is consumed in Hong Kong (which has over 100,000 addicts). A surprising amount is exported to Latin America where the market price of heroin has been rising steadily. The prime target may now be our own country since dollars are scarce in China, and with coming Sino-U.S. trade negotiations the Reds will need funds to purchase U.S. goods. Recognition of Red China and regularization of trade would also make it easier to export heroin to the United States, thus reducing economic costs and increasing profits above what can be made in Latin America and the Far East.

Heroin is unlike other economic goods: although the U.S. supply has gone steadily upwards, demand and price have also increased. The major factor limiting the number of U.S. addicts ("officially" estimated at 60,000, but known to be at least three times that number) is supply. With Red China and the Soviet Bloc increasing their trade and diplomatic contacts we can expect to see a lot more red heroin.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF U.S. COURTS OF APPEALS

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I announce that Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary will begin public hearings Wednesday, June 16, 1971, on H.R. 7378, a bill to establish a Commission on Revision of the Judicial Circuits of the United States.

The legislation has been recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States and calls for the establishment of a Commission whose membership would be appointed by the President of the United States, the Congress, and the Chief Justice of the United States. The

Commission would be charged with the responsibility to revise the existing jurisdictional lines of the U.S. Courts of Appeals. The last revision of circuit court boundaries occurred in 1929 when the Congress carved out the Tenth Circuit from the then Eighth Judicial Circuit.

In preparation for these hearings, I have written to the chief judge of each of the 11 U.S. circuit courts requesting his comments on the need for this legislation, particularly with regard to his individual circuit. Mr. Speaker, the hearings on revision of the boundaries of the courts of appeals is a phase of the committee's efforts in the present Congress to consider legislation and undertake studies directed toward reform of the Federal judiciary.

Parties interested in testifying or submitting statements for the hearing record should contact the committee offices in room 2137, Rayburn House Office Building.

A LETTER TO CONGRESS

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Ingham County News has gone right to the heart of the matter with respect to what is wrong with the present welfare system and the need for the 92d Congress to act to change it.

In an editorial June 2, 1971, entitled "A Letter to Congress," the *Mason, Mich.*, weekly newspaper, in noting the views of an Ohio citizen with a direct personal knowledge of the failures of the present system and its tendencies to perpetuate welfare as a permanent way of life, expresses the conviction, which I fully share, that a totally new approach is essential.

The House Ways and Means Committee, I am pleased to point out, has made this problem a matter of top priority and, by its action in reporting H.R. 1, has addressed itself directly to this situation. The hallmark of this new plan is the requirement, recommended by the Nixon administration, that all employable recipients must register for work or training as a condition of eligibility to obtain benefits. While the welfare problem is admittedly a complex and difficult one, I am satisfied that unless a work-oriented approach is adopted we cannot hope to make any real progress in controlling the staggering burden on our already hard-pressed taxpayers.

Although the editorial mentions that this information was printed previously in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* some 2 years ago, I believe that it fully bears repeating, particularly since the House will soon be considering welfare reform. I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

A LETTER TO CONGRESS

A couple of years ago the *Congressional Record* featured a letter from a Mrs. Willis of Ohio which had been written to her congressman. Obviously the conclusion must be drawn that Mrs. Willis' letter didn't get read by too many congressmen or Washington

bureaucrats for her sage advice didn't become policy.

So here is the wisdom of her letter again, 2 years later. Maybe if enough of us read it and are moved by it we can recommend that our congressman reads it and does something about today's welfare mess.

When a person speaks out against the tide of "gimmee" welfare programs which is inundating the nation the label attached to that spokesman is usually "bircher," reactionary," "racist" or some other such connotation.

Members of congress are getting lots of mail these days and are under lots of pressure from those who are making demands for a free ride from cradle to grave and from those who object to welfarism as a way of life.

Bear in mind that this letter was not from a bircher or a white racist. It was written by a 40-year-old Negro woman who knows what she is talking about.

"What is wrong with you men in Washington? You keep giving people more free handouts and more free checks, when what they need is a job so they can learn to work and help themselves. The welfare alone has been their ruination. If you give a check, make them do something to earn it. If you give commodities, make them earn it. If you give free education or job training, make them earn it. I am sick and tired of seeing the rest of us pay and pay for one-tenth of the people to learn that all they have to do is pretend helplessness and someone else will foot the bill. I would not blame the whites in this country if they started a revolt. There are many things to be done in this country that could be done by those who get free benefits....

"Do you people really not know that any human who gets something for nothing loses all pride and initiative?

"You are completing the total destruction of the manhood of the Negro male by all the so-called progressive programs. Giving a man an education is no reason to expect he will no longer be a problem. I have a mother-in-law, sister-in-law, and two brothers-in-law who are college graduates, but they sit... collecting checks and expect my husband to give them aid all the time. There are many others just like them. Find out which ones want to work first, then help them, but make them do something to earn that help.

"It would cost less money to create jobs for them than to support them as you are doing. I am not the only one who is sick of this—many people black and white are getting fed up with this free, free, free, free policy.

"Another thing—I do not like the excuse, we cannot find work. If I cannot get what I want I scrub floors, and have done so. My mother taught me nothing was beneath me if it was honest. I made my own living until I was 28. If a man cannot make it in this country, he would not make it if you gave him Wall Street."

No doubt, if they could be heard, millions of other blacks and whites would express sentiments similar to those expressed so eloquently by Mrs. Willis. The tragedy of the current social and racial crisis is that the voices of Mrs. Willis and the others who believe as she does cannot be heard above the shouts of the militants and demagogues. But the Mrs. Willis of this country deserve to be heard, too.

QUESTIONABLE BUSINESS TACTICS

HON. BOB BERGLAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to warn my colleagues of an invoice

being circulated to Members of Congress by a Mr. Bruno Woernle of Baltimore, Md.

Mr. Woernle claims to be a spokesman for "true Americans" and, I presume, "the free enterprise system." I will not judge his political philosophy, but I must call attention to his questionable business tactics. In small print at the bottom of his invoice, that only the sharpest eye could see, is stated:

If you do not wish to receive the Digest will you please return this invoice.

Tactics like this do as much to discredit the free enterprise system from within as any threat from without. I urge my colleagues, who did not specifically request Mr. Woernle's publication and who do not wish to receive it, to watch for any attempts to collect for unsolicited materials.

OPPOSITION OF THE DRAFT

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith for reproduction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three truly excellent articles on the draft by Thomas Boylston Adams. These articles appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe in May 1971 and are written by a distinguished constituent of mine who is the president of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

In all of the vast literature about compulsory military service in America it would be my judgment that these three articles constitute one of the most reasoned and eloquent statements in opposition to the continuation of the draft in American life:

A HISTORIAN LOOKS AT THE DRAFT—1: ABO-LITION TIDE THREATENS POLITICIANS

(By Thomas Boylston Adams)

The power to draft is the power to kill. Whether the expedient of a lottery is used to decide who shall be drafted or whether the choice is made according to some considered method of selection, the power to draft for military service is the ultimate power of the state. It is the power to kill at command without trial and without recourse.

In criminal process this ultimate power of the state to kill is hedged about with a multiplicity of safeguards. Revulsion against its use has so spread that in many civilized countries it is forbidden. Among the 50 states it has but limited and occasional acceptance. The national government is now considering its absolute prohibition.

But the honest citizen has not the protection of his life accorded the accused or even convicted criminal. If he is caught in the draft he must go where the state sends him and do what the state tells him to do. He must obey the command of the state, though his obedience may cost him his life and cause him to take the lives of others.

Were such a man chosen by lot from among his fellow citizens and chained to an oar and condemned for a certain period to pull it as a galley slave, all civilized nations would cry out in horror. Such barbarities should have ended at least two centuries ago. But in the name of conscription the practice of forced labor at unpleasant tasks is legitimized.

The code is accepted that if the survival of the homeland depends on it conscription

is legitimate. The principle has been affirmed by the courts. History proves the practicality of the affirmation. When enough people believe that survival is at stake the draft works. When feeling runs high enough, it is barely necessary. But as excitement dies down and enthusiasm fades the draft becomes necessary to prosecute wars or to maintain very large peacetime armies. And as a practical matter it continues to produce the results demanded as long as a substantial majority of the population believe that it is important for their safety.

It is at this point, the evidence seems to suggest, that our politicians have failed. They have not been sensitive to the changing sentiment within the population. It may be that a majority of the population still believe in the draft. But it is a declining proportion and its numbers diminish every day. With the advent of the vote for 18 year olds, the decline will be dramatic. If sentiment has not already swung against the draft, it is sure to before the next national election. This will put quite a few congressmen and some senators in jeopardy.

The opportunity, therefore, exists for the national assembly, moving in sympathy with the people, to achieve with credit what failure to achieve soon may cost a number of its members re-election. It is an opportunity that ought to appeal to legislators. A reputation for superior wisdom, and therefore a fair claim on the electorate, is gathered by barely anticipating a trend. It does not take much wisdom to recognize that the draft is unpopular with the most rapidly growing segment of the voting population.

Neither are the legislators blinded by the exercise of power, as is the executive department. The President, standing on the deck of a battleship, may be able to persuade himself that huge navies spread across oceans and vast armies occupying far lands are essential to the safety of the United States. These ideas are less appealing to the representatives of those people who must pay for the military establishment and supply the manpower to fill its ranks. Perhaps there are other ways of achieving peace.

Of course the representatives will follow the military line as long as they are persuaded that the course is popular or that they must. But it is hardly the pleasure for them that it is for the man standing in the open car in the middle of the parade. And so probably they are able to see more clearly than the President can see the failures of the policy of brute force. The objectives not achieved appear to the Commander-in-Chief and his generals to be the result of errors in strategy or failure of logistic support. The notion that the campaign should never have been launched is unlikely to enter their heads.

But such thoughts often do enter the heads of those who carry at the bottom the weight of the power structure. These are the thoughts which it is the duty and the interest of the Congress to understand and to interpret. Already failure to appreciate the reality of change has cost one Massachusetts congressman his seat. The life-time trained professional politician Philbin has been replaced by the newcomer Drinan. As a professional he should have known that though it is risky to be out in front of the crowd, it is fatal to be out of sight behind.

It is this new view of the world that is making quite a few congressmen and senators uncomfortable. No one, of course, is so optimistic as to believe that blather and obfuscation will go out of fashion, or that statesmanship will replace the political handshakes and favors at home. But pot bellied patriotism and middle-aged confidence in an army that builds men are out. Overkill does not add up to security. Destruction is not victory. A military establishment that has made such a thorough mess in Asia is not necessarily to be trusted in other matters.

So the draft is suspect. The draft lies at

the heart of the militarization of America. If the nation will put up with the draft, it will put up with anything. But perhaps those days are past. How far they are past can be understood and measured by a glance backward.

A HISTORIAN LOOKS AT THE DRAFT—2: HOW WE GOT TO WHERE WE ARE NOW
(By Thomas Boylston Adams)

The draft is the ultimate power of the state. It is the power to command any citizen of the state to kill others and to place himself in those positions of danger where there is the most probability of himself being killed. During the first three centuries of American history the draft was enforced for just two years. For although the principle of the draft was tried during the Civil War, substitutes hired with money were accepted. Not till 1917-1918 did America agree to conscription as practiced in Europe since the Napoleonic wars. And after the armistice, it was instantly cast aside.

The draft in America was always regarded as an importation of the caste system of the old world, where it worked only because an aristocracy controlled nations of peasants and serfs. In the greatest of democracies, when danger threatened, there was a call for volunteers. The response was sure to be enormous and the draft of 1917 was almost as much needed to control and select and efficiently use the manpower as to provide it.

The same can truly be said of the second world war. Especially after Pearl Harbor there was a rush to the colors. The colleges were left almost empty. Older men lied about their ages to get into the service.

How is it possible that the draft, despised and abhorred by 10 generations of Americans, should have become the central fact of life for the eleventh?

What has changed is the world in which we are living. The young people are not less worthy than their elders. They probably are more serious and they certainly are better educated. They object to the draft because they do not believe it is necessary for the safety of the homeland.

1948 was the fatal year. Everything had gone wrong for a well intentioned people who, from Harry Truman down, had "done their damndest" to restore peace to a world half destroyed by the ambitions of Germany and Japan. They had fought hard. Then they had demobilized the army, let the draft law lapse, turned the war-making machinery to the task of meeting the demand for consumer goods. To the religion of hope they turned adoringly, though their great men were dead or out of office, Roosevelt and Churchill, promising, and with material abundance, giving allegiance to the United Nations. And at Potsdam they pledged in good faith, granting many concessions, continued cooperation with their ally Russia.

Their reward was a quick series of kicks in the teeth. The Russian armies, still at full strength, took over Poland and stripped East Germany of everything movable, including its technicians. Berlin was soon divided and the iron curtain descended from the Baltic to the Adriatic. Pressure on Greece and Turkey forced the President to enunciate the dangerous Truman Doctrine that the interests of the free world required the United States materially to support friendly governments wherever they were threatened by communist subversion. Finally Foreign Minister Jan Masaryk was murdered in Czechoslovakia and his country taken over in a communist coup.

Small wonder that the country began to rearm. But the Republicans controlled Congress. For the first time in 16 years a Democratic President had to cope with a legislature of the opposite party. Naturally politics operated full force. The draft, which nobody liked but most felt to be necessary, was passed and the onus of putting it into effect

and the extent of its use was placed in the President's hands.

What was granted, in effect, was a standby authority to draft men as needed if sufficient volunteers did not come forward to fill up the ranks of the size army the military leaders believed necessary. Since these leaders were the men who had carried out the victories in Europe and Asia, there could be no doubt of their competence.

The Congress had long fallen into the habit of deferring to the President through dark years of depression and dangerous years of war. To grant to the President this renewed authority over the nation's manpower seemed a not unnatural act. It was the easier done because the act was unpopular, and though passed by a Republican Congress must be implemented by a Democratic President.

It did not occur to many that the exclusive power of the Congress to declare war was being impaired. The enormity of the possibility of undeclared war was not then imagined.

A HISTORIAN LOOKS AT THE DRAFT—3: THE PRESIDENTIAL ABUSE OF POWER
(By Thomas Boylston Adams)

When Congress passed the peacetime draft act of 1948, it placed on President Truman the onus of fixing dates of registration and carrying it out. It was a Republican controlled Congress and it rather expected that the draft would be the final nail driven into the coffin of the President's popularity.

Nobody liked the peacetime draft, but there was a real consensus that it was necessary. So the Congress, with deliberate intent, exercised its power to levy armies by turning over to the President for a period of two years the authority to do so. This authority has been continuously renewed since. It also turned over, as the event proved, its right, jealously reserved in the Constitution, to declare war, though this it did through mere carelessness and lack of thought, without deliberation.

A few people may have remembered Sen. Vandenberg's gloomy and prophetic speech of as long ago as 1940, that drew attention to "the fundamental theory that peacetime military conscription is repugnant to the spirit of democracy and the soul of republican institutions and that it leads in dark directions." But the temper of the time was probably more accurately expressed by the New York Times editorial, "The military establishment that we are planning is not in any sense an instrument of aggression. This force is the minimum that our military leaders believe is needed to make any planned attack on us so costly that it would not be made."

Subsequent events appeared to confirm these assumptions. The military leaders were men proved and worthy of trust. Gen. Marshall, as Secretary of State, proposed the plan that bears his name, the most farsighted and successful resolution of a devastating conflict history records. Gen. Eisenhower reorganized, as head of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the military forces of the free world. The combination worked and the power vacuum left by the too sudden demobilization in 1946 was filled within the decade by a new third force, a prosperous Europe united by the Common Market and beginning to grow independent under the leadership of De Gaulle.

Unfortunately the worst kind of politics was beginning to poison America. That vicious rascal Joseph McCarthy was terrorizing the Senate, tearing the country apart and destroying the careers of great numbers of decent people. The argument was raised and very widely believed that a communist conspiracy, within and without, was about to destroy the United States.

The invasion of South Korea by a well-trained army from North Korea and its subsequent support by Chinese troops was seen

as proof of the theory. The correct inference, of course, was the opposite. The really extraordinary aspect of the Korean invasion is that its planning and timing appears to have been unknown to the world's number one communist, Joseph Stalin and to his lieutenants in Moscow. There is no other reasonable way of explaining the absence of Russia from the Security Council at that time, which turned over to the United States the enormous advantage of repelling the attack under instrumentality of the United Nations. Since, the rift between Russia and China has become obvious.

But great numbers of Americans came to believe, and many still do, that the failure of Chiang Kai-shek to hold China was a failure of American reinforcement at the right time. The idea of containment of communism by force appeared to have worked in Europe. Why should not the same methods have worked in Asia? Surely it was not too late to try.

This fatal reasoning on the efficacy of brute force left out the fact that in Europe we were engaged in putting back on its feet a society which had long existed, the very society from which we ourselves are derived. In Asia we are still trying to bring into existence a society which never has existed, based on our theories of what a society should be.

This mirage has tempted a host of our public men to doom. It has destroyed the lives of more than 50,000 young Americans. It has earned us the hatred of more than half the world. But it had never been debated in Congress.

The draft, the ultimate power of the state, given totally into the hands of the President, has given the President the army he has needed to wage personal war in Asia. Every step of that war has been taken by executive decision. Yet Congress has not returned to itself its power to levy armies or to define the limits of their use. It has still left in the hands of the President the whole control of the vast and terrible machine.

A philosopher may reason that what America most needs is a really foolish President. Such a President might convince the people and through them the Congress of the folly of entrusting to one man the power to involve the nation one after another in those steps which lead to war. Or of the folly of trusting that such a man can extricate the nation from war.

The men who drafted the Constitution believed with extreme conviction that no one man should have the power to engage the nation in war or keep it at war. Congress does not have to draft men in peacetime or even in war if the war is a mistake.

The changing makeup of the voting population, with a great increase in the proportion of voters of draft age, may persuade congressmen and senators to a salutary review of their responsibility in the matter of delegation to the President without restriction of the ultimate power of the State, the power to conscript for military service.

INDIAN HISTORY

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, we are all cognizant of the hapless plight of the American Indian, how their lands have been wrongfully expropriated, and how their rights have been ignored. However, it is refreshing to know of a celebration which eulogizes the unique nature of Indian history and portrays what a significant role they have played in the history of Western America.

For 24 years the town of Apple Valley, Calif., has held a Pow Wow Days Celebration. The festivities are in honor of the American Indian, and recall all the great leaders of past Indian Nations.

This year's celebration will be held from July 30 to August 1, and includes a western square dance, a parade, Indian exhibits, and Indian entertainment. I wish to commend the people of the Apple Valley area for their contributions toward making this worthwhile event a huge success.

EMERGENCY LOAN GUARANTEE ACT

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as the debate over the Emergency Loan Guarantee Act draws near, I feel it necessary to share with my colleagues the following editorial from the June 1971 issue of Fortune magazine and a letter to Mr. Fred Borch, chairman and chief executive of General Electric from one of the Nation's leading test pilots. I am sure you will recognize the fact that the attack on Lockheed comes from a very biased source and therefore deserves the attention of this body.

The material follows:

GIVE LOCKHEED A SECOND CHANCE

The Administration's proposal to rescue Lockheed's 1011 TriStar airliner with a government-guaranteed bank loan confronts Congress with an unhappy choice between certainty and uncertainty. The certainty is that if the loan guarantee is voted down, Lockheed will go bankrupt. With the guarantee, Lockheed would have a fighting chance to survive, but might still fail. Under the circumstances, there is a lot to be said for choosing uncertainty.

The guarantee would cover a \$250-million loan to be put up by twenty-four banks, which have already loaned the company \$400 million. The government-backed portion of the total loan would be the first to be repaid, and if Lockheed should still go bankrupt, the government would have first claim on the company's total assets of \$1.3 billion.

The fact that the taxpayers' potential liability is limited does not in itself justify a government bailout for a private company. Nor is it enough to say that government-guaranteed loans have become a familiar aspect of our economic life, through the activities of agencies like the Export-Import Bank and the Federal Housing Administration. The case for the Lockheed guarantee rests on the fact that it is an exceptional measure to deal with an unusual emergency that befell a corporation especially vulnerable to circumstances beyond its control. There may be an element of bad management in Lockheed's predicament, but there is much more to the situation than can be explained away by accusations that the company was ineptly run.

The article on page 66 details the interlocking disasters that overtook Lockheed. Much that may have helped produce these disasters is not yet known. It is already amply clear, however, that the government itself bears some responsibility for the company's present plight. During the early 1960's, for high-minded reasons, the Pentagon adopted a new form of defense contracting that proved to be unworkable. It called for firm commitments years in advance to produce weaponry that had yet to be invented.

In trying to anticipate the unforeseeable, the Pentagon wrote contracts so intricate that they lent themselves to misunderstanding and legal disputes. Lockheed was unlucky—or perhaps unwise—enough to win several of those contracts, and is now paying for its success.

Lockheed itself may have been partly to blame for the battering it took in the C-5A contract; the evidence is highly ambiguous. But the misfortune that threatened the life of its prime commercial product, the TriStar, seems clearly to have been beyond the company's power to foresee or avert. After the collapse of Rolls-Royce, Lockheed's management performed a heroic job in bringing together banks, airlines—and the British Government—to save the plane. Only one link remains to be put in place—the loan guarantee. In the circumstances, we believe Congress should approve it.

THE COST OF FAILURE

The case is strengthened by a consideration of what it might cost if Lockheed were to give up the TriStar for want of financing. More than 30,000 jobs would be put in immediate jeopardy. In addition to the human anguish of the jobless, there would be real cost to the taxpayers—in terms of income taxes no longer collected, as well as in payments for unemployment compensation, retraining programs, and other government efforts to minimize the impact on individuals and the economy.

A Lockheed bankruptcy would exact its own high price. In a letter to Congressman William S. Moorhead of Pennsylvania, to which Lockheed is giving wide distribution, the Controller General of the U.S. has pointed out that the cost to the government of the C-5A program could "increase substantially" if Lockheed went bankrupt. This is so because subcontractors on the C-5A might be able to renegotiate prices they agreed to six years ago, before the onset of inflation. Lockheed's other uncompleted government contracts, which total about \$1.9 billion, might also have to be reopened. Essential projects doubtless would be continued, one way or another, but the disruption would be bound to be costly.

In the congressional debate, proposals will surely be made that the loan guarantee be tied to a requirement that Lockheed abandon Rolls-Royce and put U.S.-made engines in the TriStar. Fred Borch, chairman of General Electric, has already made this point, with the obvious aim of getting Lockheed to use the G.E. engine that is going into the McDonnell Douglas DC-10.

The airlines and Lockheed have twice studied the available engines, however, and twice they have chosen Rolls-Royce's RB211. Their decision may prove wrong or shortsighted, but it should be left to them, not Congress, to decide—especially since a change of engines would increase costs and delay deliveries to such an extent that it is probably no longer a practical alternative. It is also worth noting that use of the Rolls engine might enhance chances of selling the TriStar to foreign airlines, thereby benefiting the U.S. balance of payments.

A SORRY SEQUENCE

The Lockheed guarantee should not be regarded as a precedent for further government rescue missions, but it can serve as a useful warning. Unless the system of defense procurement undergoes fundamental change, other defense companies could well fall into difficulties like Lockheed's. In the future, military projects will become fewer but bigger and riskier. The idea that competitive bidding assures the best product at the lowest price is proving to be a delusion. What it actually has done is impel companies to make unrealistically low cost estimates in order to grab off contracts, setting off a sorry sequence of cost overruns, congressional inquiries, and financial trouble for the contractors themselves.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird's "fly before you buy" policy represents a big improvement in procurement procedures, but it is only a first step. Congress ought to convert its indignation over past deficiencies in the system into pressure for constructive reform that will assure the nation the best defense for the least money. But meanwhile, Congress should give Lockheed one more chance to survive.

JUNE 1, 1971.

Mr. FRED J. BORCH,
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, General Electric Co., New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. BORCH: I was considerably troubled by your letter to President Nixon and others and by the related press conference relative to the proposed legislation which would provide loan guarantees to a consortium of 24 banks in support of the Lockheed L-1011 TriStar program. It is not surprising that as a long-term Lockheed employee, I am troubled by your actions. I have always had confidence in big business and believed that it acted in good faith, but it is at best alarming that you put into circulation on a national scale information which was both false and misleading. Even casual inquiries would have proved them so. In the current atmosphere in which charges of mismanagement are rampant, it seems worthwhile to ask you as the head of the General Electric Company to look inward and determine how you as an individual and General Electric as a corporation could have been led into this needless trap.

My reaction is not prompted by my role as a 30-year Lockheed employee. It is prompted by my recognized role as one of the nation's leading test pilots who has spent hundreds of hours behind General Electric engines in the most hazardous flying circumstances as the first American test pilot assigned to this country's first operational jet aircraft. The airplane was the Lockheed F-80 and the engine was the General Electric I-40. In case your GE experience does not include this particular jet on March 20, 1945, I was almost killed in this airplane when the turbine disc disintegrated in flight shattering the rear fuselage with the loss of tail assembly and complete loss of aircraft control.

I spent many painful months in the hospital recuperating from a fractured lower spine and only by the providence of God was my life spared.

During this period, General Electric employees in whom I had great confidence acknowledged to me that G.E. had experienced this same type of failure with this engine at your jet engine facility at Lynn, Mass., but had not seen fit to advise Lockheed up until that time. Subsequently, two other great American aviators, Test Pilot Milo Burcham and War Ace Major Richard Bong, met untimely and apparently needless death behind the G.E. I-40 engine due to faulty overspeed governor operation.

But we live in a close community in aviation, a community which works together and, if necessary, suffers together. Thus, it was without hesitation that I straddled the G.E. J-79 engine in our Lockheed F-104 Starfighter series. Suffice it to say there was plenty of opportunity to remember my earlier experience with the G.E. I-40 engine. This engine kept the Starfighter program in jeopardy throughout its early life, but not only did we support G.E., not blabbing our problems with your product, we lent you both technical and moral support in correcting your problems.

This is the environment in which we at Lockheed continued to work with G.E. as a partner in those areas where our skills best complement one another . . . hopefully, without fear or favor. I am obviously not an expert on G.E.'s engine business, but I would hazard the guess that through the C-5 transport, the S-3A ASW aircraft and the AH-56, over and above the F-104 program itself, we

are the largest user of G.E. engines in the world.

When we chose the Rolls-Royce RB.211 engine for the Lockheed TriStar, we did not do it from weakness but rather from strength. No one is more familiar with G.E. engines than Lockheed, but the Rolls-Royce commercial experience so overshadows G.E. experience that there was no room for serious contest. As a pilot with long experience behind General Electric engines, I am confident you will ultimately produce a fine commercial engine. If that should happen in 1971 or 1972, it will be in contradiction of the experience cycle of all other complex technical equipment in the history of aviation . . . whatever your experience with the CF-6 engine . . . and I wish you nothing but the best.

But, as a man who stood behind General Electric products when there was little cause to do so, and as part of a company which did the same, I condemn you and the General Electric Company for the crass manner in which you have operated in the matter of the proposed Lockheed loan guarantee. Despite my natural tendency to support big business, your transparent lack of good faith is disheartening to me personally and a disservice to General Electric and its thousands of stockholders.

Yours truly,

A. W. (TONY) LEVIER.

SUPPORT OF DEEPENING OF TAMPA HARBOR

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution that has been adopted by the City Council of Tampa, Fla., in support of funds for the purpose of reconstruction planning, engineering, and environmental studies for the Tampa Harbor.

RESOLUTION NO. 3685, URGING THE FAVORABLE ACTION OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE DEEPENING OF THE TAMPA HARBOR

Whereas, the Port of Tampa is the transportation hub of the West Coast of Florida and handled more than 32 million tons of cargo during 1970, and

Whereas, the Port of Tampa generates upward of \$210 million in wage and salary payments in the eight-county area of Hillsborough, Pinellas, Citrus, Hernando, Pasco, Polk, Manatee and Sarasota, and

Whereas, one wage earner in five in the City of Tampa and Hillsborough County are employed in businesses either directly or indirectly related to the Port of Tampa, and

Whereas, more than 11 million tons of phosphate rock were shipped from the Port of Tampa in foreign commerce during 1970, and

Whereas, private industry has invested many millions of dollars in phosphate loading terminals in the Port of Tampa, and

Whereas, many ships now arriving in the Port of Tampa for phosphate rock must leave the Port of Tampa without a full load because of insufficient depth of water in the ship channels serving the Port of Tampa, and

Whereas, most foreign ports which receive Florida phosphate rock have depth channels deeper than the Port of Tampa, and

Whereas, the sale of Florida phosphate rock contributes heavily to the balance of payments of the United States of America and the maintaining and increasing of sales

abroad will make further contributions to the balance of payments, and

Whereas, there is a danger Florida phosphate producers will lose their foreign markets to foreign suppliers if harbor channels are not deepened, and

Whereas, more than eight (8) million tons of petroleum products enter the Port of Tampa annually, of which many hundreds of thousands of tons are for the generation of electricity, many more hundreds of thousands to fuel industry, and hundreds of thousands more for the fueling of airplanes and other modes of transportation in use for national defenses at bases in Tampa and Orlando, and

Whereas, petroleum tankers are growing larger each year and in the near future Tampa Harbor in its present state will be unable to accommodate such deep-draft tankers; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States of America in the Rivers and Harbors act of 1970 authorized for Tampa Harbor the deepening of the Tampa Harbor channels from the present controlling 34 feet to 44 feet and the deepening of branch channels to 42 feet and 40 feet, Now therefore.

Be it resolved by the City Council of the city of Tampa, Florida:

SECTION 1. That the members of the City Council of the City of Tampa, Florida, respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate \$600,000.00 for fiscal year 1972 for the purpose of reconstruction planning, engineering and environmental studies for the Tampa Harbor.

UNINSURED MOTORIST FUND

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, today I am cosponsoring a bill with Congressman GUDE to provide the public protection from the uninsured motorist. There were 268,156 motor vehicles registered in the District of Columbia during the registration year ending March 31, 1970. Approximately 30 percent—80,000—of these vehicles are not covered by public liability and property damage insurance. There is great potential for financial loss to residents who may become involved in accidents caused by the negligent operation of motor vehicles which are not covered by liability insurance, and the owners and operators of which are judgment proof.

The current Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia—enacted May 25, 1954—does not require the motorist to insure his own motor vehicle until after he has caused death, injury, or damage to some other person or property damage in excess of \$100 and has failed to respond in damages or otherwise pay compensation to the victim.

A special Department of Motor Vehicles' study made in 1966 indicated that 16,443 accidents were the fault of drivers of uninsured vehicles. Of these, 6,806 had their licenses suspended, because they could not produce adequate security to cover the injury or damage they had caused. Many of the victims of these accidents did not own automobiles; therefore, they were not eligible for automobile liability insurance with uninsured motorist coverage. Since most of the drivers could be considered judgment proof,

there was little expectation of any recovery from them.

The present District law can be properly called a "one bite" law, allowing the operator of an uninsured vehicle at least one opportunity to cause uncompensated injury or damage to another person who is not at fault. Thus, each person who drives one of the approximately 80,000 uninsured vehicles creates a potential danger of financial loss to District of Columbia residents and visitors in the event such a driver should be the cause of an accident.

This legislation combines a three-pronged approach to the financially irresponsible driver:

First, the bill would require that every liability policy covering a motor vehicle registered in the District of Columbia contain an uninsured motorist coverage endorsement to protect the insurance purchaser, his family, and guests riding in his automobile against financial loss resulting from injury or damage caused by an uninsured motorist. The cost of this coverage can be expected to remain at a figure below \$10. This does not relieve the uninsured motorist of liability for such loss; he may still be required to pay damages, and he still may expect to lose his license and registration if he fails to deposit adequate security after the accident or satisfy a judgment against him.

The required uninsured motorist coverage endorsement would protect the solvency of the unsatisfied judgment funds since only those persons who have no other source of recovery would be paid from the fund. Uninsured motorists would be disqualified from having access to the fund.

Second, the bill would require those who fail to secure liability insurance coverage on their vehicles to pay a \$40 fee into an unsatisfied judgment fund to be available to compensate the victims of such motorists. All expenses of administering the fund are to be paid from it. No taxpayer, insurance company, or insured motorist would be required to support the fund. The bill further provides that no appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury are to be used for maintenance of the unsatisfied judgment fund.

The required fee, although substantial, offers no protection to the uninsured motorist. It is expected to encourage drivers to purchase insurance.

Third, the bill provides for the establishment of a fund from which can be satisfied, up to specified limits, legally enforceable claims against negligent, financially irresponsible motor vehicle owners and operators. The primary purpose of the fund is to provide a source of recovery for those who have incurred certain losses arising out of motor vehicle accidents when the party who incurs the loss has not been able to collect damages from the party or parties who are legally liable, or from any insurance. The fund is also intended to provide an incentive to the victim to institute action against the negligent and financially irresponsible motorist who might otherwise go unreported.

Before any recovery from the fund, the victim must have proven that the uninsured motorist was negligent and the victim must also prove that he has fully pur-

sued and exhausted all remedies available to him for the recovery of the amounts due him.

It is important to bear in mind that this bill would impose the greatest burden on the uninsured motorist who, in turn, receives no benefit from the bill other than the bare privilege of operating an uninsured motor vehicle on the streets of the District. The bill is designed to provide for the indemnification of persons sustaining losses as a result of the operation of motor vehicles by negligent, financially irresponsible motorists.

THE VIETNAM WAR IS BEING WON

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, is Vietnamization really working? Army 1st Lt. Richmond T. P. Davis of Saratoga, Calif., has just returned from a 1-year tour of duty in Vietnam where he served as a village-level adviser to the South Vietnamese in the delta. His conclusions are spelled out in the following article. He is now stationed at Fort Meade, Md. The article follows:

THE VIETNAM WAR IS BEING WON

(By Richmond T. P. Davis)

Forget all the uproar you've heard over Vietnam and consider this proposition: The war is being won and the Vietnamese are doing it.

Public attention understandably focuses on the dramatic actions in the conflict, such as the Laotian incursion and the periodic reactive air strikes north of the DMZ. Yet, important though these events can be, the excitement and interest that they generate obscure the far duller—but for the future of Vietnam considerably more critical—activities that affect which side controls the people and to some extent has their support.

With an overwhelmingly rural population, South Vietnam's administrative structure is based on the village and its hamlets. A typical village is occupied by 5,000 to 10,000 people whose livelihood for the most part is dependent upon agriculture and livestock. The villager's life is hard and his wants are simple, revolving around his fields and his family.

Although one by-product of the war has been to increase his awareness of the outside world, he remains little concerned with what happens there. What, really, do such concepts as the Government of Vietnam (GVN) and the National Liberation Front mean to him? Yet his village and its government do have meaning; he must pay taxes, protect his crops, see to the health and education of his family and, perhaps, be called upon to die in a war.

It is on this local level, then, that the military-political war of Vietnam is viewed by most of the populace. From this vantage point, what's happening?

The military picture, without a doubt, continues to improve. In most areas, the VC remains as a definite threat to government control but with a difference: Time is now and has been for sometime on the side of the GVN. With growing confidence in their abilities and modern equipment, security forces have been pushing enemy havens farther away from the populated areas.

For the villager, these government advances have had some very definite results. Most populated areas that had been fertile ground for VC tax collecting and recruiting

activities since the early 1960's are no longer so. As village forces have spread their control over previous enemy source areas, the guerrillas have initially encountered military resistance to their forays and, with time, denial of any significant access at all. For the villagers living there, the power of the gun has switched hands; his security and his family's now rest with the forces of the GVN.

Viewed from the perspective of a year over there, the change in the relative control and power of the two contending forces has been significant. But when seen from five years' time, beginning with the days when so many areas of the countryside belonged to the enemy, the differences are dramatic. The tide is surely running in favor of the GVN.

Although power is becoming increasingly the property of the GVN, a foundation of might alone offers little stability against a cohesive opponent. Why? Because lacking the roots of support, raw power relationships are susceptible to rapid shifts. Thus, much is made in critical discussions of the Vietnamese war over the belief that the Vietnamese have no loyalty other than to their families. Consequently, the analysis continues, any improvement in the level of governmental control must be considered very fragile indeed.

Such a position assumes that the villager sees no difference between the competing claimants for power and does not care which side prevails. While the villager is still, I'm sure, concerned with little beyond his family, government activities during the past several years have clearly indicated that his best interests are being served by the GVN authorities. For instance, solely as a result of the government's expanding control, the peasant finds that land which could not be cultivated before due to the ebb and flow of battle, and the seemingly ever-present booby-traps now can be.

Whether it be increased ease in getting to the market for himself, better education for his children, or improved security for his family, the villager is directly benefitting from GVN control. He now has a stake in the war's outcome.

We are on the right path—Vietnamization is working.

NO EASY ANSWERS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial was reprinted in the Indianapolis News. It should be reprinted everywhere.

[The National Observer]

NO EASY ANSWERS

The problems of the nation are muddled in the middle and tangled at the ends, with many parts bent and barbed so that any movement of one problem invariably snags and shakes another one. Most contemporary problems are hugely difficult not only because each is complex, but because in an advanced society of tightly interlocking components it is practically impossible to consider or solve them singly.

The fact of intertwined problems demolishes loyalty to labels and easy answers. A decade ago a man might have gotten by with identifying himself as a "liberal" who believed the Federal government could cure certain social ills with a heavy hand and heavy spending. Or a "conservative" might have satisfied himself with proclamations about self-reliance and the majesty of a free market.

Today, the liberal has observed what a too-powerful president can do with billions

of dollars and thousands of lives in Indochina. The liberal has also seen that even the best efforts of the government have failed to reduce substantially the economic segregation of some minority groups.

The old conservative, for his part, is awakening to the helplessness of the most industrious individual when an economic turn-down throws him out in the street. Nor can free enterprise be permitted to function so freely that the environment becomes incompatible with human health.

All this means that when each of us ponders a public problem, he must not be concerned about the allies his decision may draw. The old dividing lines have been erased by complex facts, and if occasionally we find ourselves in agreement on one issue with otherwise idiotic politicians or writers, we should accept that company calmly.

A decent regard for our responsibilities as citizens requires that we approach national questions unencumbered by sentimental baggage. There is no law that requires a man to hang on to a label or a prejudice.

Let's get used to the idea that our adversaries may change with the issues, and that we are freer for it. And wiser, too.

SYSTEMS SAFETY—PLANET EARTH

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1971, our colleague from California, the Honorable JERRY L. PETTIS, a former distinguished member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, delivered the keynote address at the NASA System Safety Conference at the Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Md.

I know of no Member of Congress more capable of discussing this subject than Mr. PETTIS. He is not only a student of the space system, but his long experience in the aeronautical field gives him a background that few, if any, in Congress have.

I commend the reading of Congressman's PETTIS' speech to all of you:

"SYSTEM SAFETY—PLANET EARTH"

(Keynote address by the Honorable JERRY L. PETTIS, Member of Congress, for presentation to NASA System Safety Conference Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md., May 26, 1971)

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lederer, distinguished speakers, ladies and gentlemen.

It would be presumptuous of me to try to tell this audience anything about System Safety. You are the experts on that subject. I'm sure you'll be even more expert after you've been exposed to the excellent program that NASA has assembled here for you.

However, I am vitally interested in all aspects of System Safety. My years as a commercial pilot instilled in me a profound respect for any policy, procedure, or system that would contribute to the improved safety of my passengers, my airplane, or myself.

More recently, my years of service on the House Science and Astronautics Committee have enabled me to appreciate—at first hand—the unprecedented hazards, both on the ground and in space, that have been generated in the Space Age as we have responded to man's eternal challenge to explore his environment—and to satisfy his always urgent need to know. I have seen the magnificent response by creative and dedicated program managers and safety engineers—like many of you here—who have

worked together with your partners and associates in industry to make space travel the safest mode of transportation developed for Earth men—so far.

You know, I think it's safer to be on an Apollo flight crew than it is to be in Congress these days—what with bombing the Capitol building—the May Day demonstrations—and the recent threats to stop the normal functions of our national government. If we can't make our governmental systems safe, how can we ensure the safety of our citizens? How about some of you working on System Safety Capitol Hill? I don't believe it would be any tougher than making the Apollo Saturn safe.

At any rate, since I'm not a Safety Engineer, I thought I'd talk about the application of System Safety Principles toward the solution of planetary problems. American space travel via Mercury, Gemini and Apollo—has proven that we have learned to control the hazards we've encountered. Space travel via Planet Earth—throughout recorded history—has proved much more difficult. We might almost say that the hazards seem to have controlled us. Surely, we can learn to do something about that. If we could put six Americans on the moon, we can do anything—if we care enough to try.

The System Safety concept—the principles and the professional know-how—may be much more important than we've realized.

I am aware that the theme of my address may seem to be a little bit pretentious—"System Safety—Planet Earth." Are we ready for it? How much longer can we do without it?

What I'd like to do today is to expose—and try to clarify—a concept. The concept is relevant to this conference because the principles of safety—especially when applied with the expertise of systems management—are of universal value.

This gathering is symbolic of a much larger society. You represent many aspects of our national life. We have in America a complex system of government, purposely representative of all elements of our modern civilization. Among you here today are safety-oriented leaders from diverse industries, colleges and universities, and a wide spectrum of government agencies. Over seventy different types of groups can be identified. More specifically, you are professionally interested in all armed services, all modes of transportation and the national space program. The AEC, HEW, FAA, Interior, the Post Office Department, the TVA, the Library of Congress, the GSA, the National Bureau of Standards, the National Transportation Safety Board—as well as the District of Columbia and other Community and State governments—are all here.

It's safe to say that most of you are professional safety engineers, or managers with safety responsibilities. Your common interest provides a common bond. It has brought you together with NASA as the catalyst. Mutual interests and responsibilities motivated you to join us here today. Why?

Why are we so interested in safety? Because it's our job? Or do we believe in—are we dedicated to—the principles behind the safety concept—the preservation of human life, the conservation of materials, and the assurance of mission success?

Were you taught that Self Preservation was the first law of Human Nature? I was. The traditional right of self defense—for an individual or a nation—derives from that fundamental Law of Self Preservation. There is an even more basic law in Nature—related to the instinct to survive—to grow to maturity—and to reproduce in kind. Survival, defense and preservation of self—are directly related to the safety concept.

The concept of freedom seems to be a natural extension—or a more evolved development—of that Law which recognizes

that a man must live in freedom truly to preserve himself. We've tried to develop a way of Life in America that provides the best possible environment—and the safest—in which to live and grow. National Safety is also National Security.

We recognize "inalienable rights" that protect individual freedoms to live and grow—as long as those rights are not distorted into license—to deny another's freedom or his rights. This freedom or these rights are never relevant, unless we value the individual units of society as being human beings. Rights and freedoms become meaningful only if we value the human being and his native rights—to live, to grow, or to become responsible for his own choices.

Our founding fathers were concerned with safety. They believed in the value of a human life. They even believed that the principle of freedom was inherent in a Law of Nature conceived by Nature's Creator. Whether we share that belief, it is undoubtedly the reason that Americans, traditionally, have set high values upon human life, their own or someone else's.

For nearly 200 years we have believed in this principle so much that we have often risked—and even sacrificed—our own lives, that others, weaker or more threatened than we, could also share the "blessings of liberty".

What does this have to do with System Safety? Well, we sometimes refer to our "system of government", or even "the free-enterprise system". But more "right on", perhaps, the value of the life is essential to the safety concept. If life has no value, why protect it?

But we don't always obey law—even a Natural Law. We are just beginning to recognize, on a planetary scale—thanks to our Space Age perspective—some of the awe-some problems that we face when we disregard or disobey the laws of nature. "Self preservation" now pertains to all humanity. Planetary Security is directly related to the essential natural resources of our planet.

Self Preservation is inseparable from global ecology. The planetary system environment and our own viability as a part of that system are totally inter-related. They always have been. But we are now becoming very aware of this vital relationship. Conservation has now become an urgent mission, not just a part-time past-time.

Politically, the current problem seems to be how to work for conservation without appearing too conservative.

I understand that three years ago you held the first of these System Safety Conferences. It must have been extremely successful. Look to what has been accomplished in those few years.

We've landed three Apollos on the moon. Six men from Earth have leaped around in moon dust—and even "mulliganed"—and have returned to share unique experiences with Earth-bound men. Leaders like Jerry Lederer, Phil Bolger and their safety teammates must get due share of the credit—as should all of you who helped them. A very special mention should go to a canine astro-pup called Snoopy—perhaps the most successful safety engineer of all. Magnificent "mission success", shared with all humanity—in the face of unprecedented risk of life—with fantastic operational hazards to be overcome.

The tremendous learning experience of Apollo 13 may have been the most impressive of all—in retrospect. The whole world was able to appreciate what value we placed upon the lives of astronauts. Perhaps we came much closer to the realization of System Safety Planet Earth as a result.

Of course, human life, primary though it is, is not the only safety consideration. There is the economy of resources—of time, energy, money, and materials—of equipment and facilities—that is always at stake and riding with the mission—not to mention the maintenance of public support for our manned

space program itself. In this total light, the Safety of the System becomes paramount.

How can the uninitiated ever appreciate the value of the system safety concept? It really isn't easy. That may be why travel through space on Planet Earth has been so hazardous. It takes experience and intelligence. Wisdom is better—though much more rare. It takes discipline and training and knowledge combined with skill. But even more, it takes alertness—or "awareness"—and a very special kind of caring that produces individual responsibility. It all adds up to what can be called—"Human Reliability"—the most essential ingredient in any mission.

Instinct helps but we can't fly to the moon by the "seat of our pants." That seems to be the way we've been "piloting our planet."

But it wasn't instinct that permitted man to fly. Our physical bodies weren't optimized for flight. We had to learn to counteract the effects of the Law of Gravity—or, more accurately, we had to learn to cooperate with a Natural Law that we call "gravity" in a way to make manned flight feasible.

I recall many steps in the process. Ground school training—the flight simulator—flying, with an instructor—the dual controls—level flight—take-offs and, you hoped, safe landings, and finally—the solo. Then more difficult maneuvers—instrument flying, in worse than "field-grade" weather—and the responsibility for other lives in an aircraft under your control. And then, an entirely different set of standards for piloting commercial passengers—on scheduled flights.

The basic idea of System Safety was inherent in the training of a pilot from the very first day. You were taught to recognize different kinds of dangers—like the approach to a stall—or entering cloud or turbulent formations. You had to achieve the unnatural discipline of total reliance on instruments. You learned that most fatalities were caused when pilots ignored the "envelope of danger." That's just as true today. I still fly my own airplane and I still have to obey all the rules. You're particularly aware when you have your own family on board. Airline passengers take it for granted that the pilot is behaving like a System Safety Engineer—on duty—and totally aware.

Space Flight has forced us to advance and accelerate the state of the art of System Safety. The System Safety process involves an orderly understanding of the hazards to be encountered—and the development of reliable ways to control them. There is a lesson here for solving planetary problems.

Whether it's ground safety, industrial safety or flight safety—99% reliability isn't good enough—not any more—not with an astronaut on board—not with so much riding on the mission.

Space flight safety provided more complex problems to solve—but the principles were the same. And all through the process—the priceless ingredient was always—and will always be—what might be called, the Human Reliability Factor—in the careful identification and evaluation of hazards—to human life—to the economics of time, materials and money—and to ultimate mission success. The principles apply to humans and to hardware. People make the hardware. People use the hardware. People must control the environment or the environment will control the people.

All these factors directly affect the "viability" of the System—and the viability of any "human systems" whose lives are risked. The human systems, at least to us, are the most priceless of all subsystems.

We recognize now that system safety must be foremost in the minds of managers throughout all phases of research and development programs as well as during operation of the systems. We recall the historic battle—(or was it the kingdom?)—that was lost for lack of a horseshoe nail.

During your last Conference, three years ago, Dr. George Mueller described System Safety Engineering as being "organized common sense". I'll buy that—but common sense seems to be getting more uncommon every day.

There are some bright spots though and I'd like to reflect a little light from one of the brightest. I'm sure all of you have heard of "Spaceship Earth" by now. It's a useful, though rather challenging concept being effectively expressed by its inventor, Buckminster Fuller. (I'm sure the more "pragmatic" types would label it "simplistic".)

"Bucky" Fuller, now an energetic 75 or so, recently wrote a book called "Operating Manual for Spaceship Earth". Since then he has also invented and developed the "World Game". I'm sure Fuller has defined the patterns related to "System Safety Planet Earth" better than I could. He thought about the concept and understood our planet Earth as an integrated system—a long time before the Apollos made their impacts on our minds and hearts.

Fuller is optimistic about our chances for safely piloting the passengers and crew of Spaceship Earth into a more creative, harmonious and prosperous future—if we put our best minds and strongest wills to accomplish mission success.

Buckminster Fuller is not just a dreamer—although he's not afraid to dream—or to make full use of his fertile imagination. He has assembled impressive credentials. Fuller has developed more than 150 separate patents in 58 countries of the world. 10,000 of his geodesic domes—like the one assembled at Expo 67—are scattered over the globe. His name has 26 honorary degrees tagged on behind it. He's a multi-disciplinary systems-management task force, all in one—being simultaneously described as architect, cartographer, cosmogonist, designer, engineer, inventor, mathematician, philosopher—thinker and problem-solver—and even a poet. He's young and very idealistic, for his age. How can we train more "specialized generalists" like Bucky? When asked to describe himself, Fuller says, "I am a random element."

Are you wondering whether Bucky Fuller is relevant to a conference on System Safety? I think he is. Just as relevant as a conference on System Safety is to the mission success of Spaceship Earth.

We understand that System Safety Engineers must consider carefully all aspects of the environment in which the system is to operate. Recently, we have learned something about the hazards in space. We have also learned—through costly centuries of history—something about the hazards on board Spaceship Earth. On a planetary scale, we haven't learned enough yet about hazard analysis, risk avoidance or over-all systems management. We have a long way to go toward controlling our environment. We are just beginning to understand the Life Cycle of the System. Our essential feedback is all too often—distorted, garbled in transmission or completely blacked out.

In accordance with the System Safety approach, could we revise the mission to reduce exposure to hazard and minimize our risks? Revise the planetary mission? Perhaps—if we knew what our mission really was. That's been the age-old riddle for mankind to solve. Unless we know our purpose we never can define what's "relevant". If you don't know where you're going—or why—how do you know what to take along—how to train yourself—or what kind of guidance you will need?

Maybe when we see the world, as Bucky Fuller does, as a complex unity—of inter-related and dynamic systems—we might give better thought to the original System Designer—and try to discover and define His system concept. If He didn't have mission success in mind—then nothing has much

meaning. And if—He was capable of designing—even the simplest atom—and setting it in motion—then He could have had in mind a perfect System Safety plan for us to follow.

The traumatic and inspiring experience of Apollo 13 now can be given profound symbolic meaning. The life on board became vitally important to millions of fellow passengers on Spaceship Earth. For a few moments in history we glimpsed the highest priority. The support crew focused on solving the most urgent problem—and succeeded like seasoned professionals.

Can we ever keep our planetary passengers safe? Can System Safety Planet Earth ensure ultimate mission success? Or will the immaturity and irresponsibility of some of the crew members prove fatal to the mission? Will some of us—always be willing to escalate the risks and amplify the hazards—like playing "chicken" on a planetary scale—using risk as a weapon system with which to threaten, intimidate, and take over the controls of Spaceship Earth—in a ruthless attempt to hijack—willing even to abort the mission unless they can command the ship—absolutely—once, and for all?

To enjoy life on Earth as a "viable humanity"—"capable of sustaining life and growth"—we must also maintain a viable planetary system. To achieve mission success we must first identify our mission on this planet. When we begin to even understand that question and to formulate a "common sense" approach to find the answer—only then will we begin to be secure—for the first time in all of human history.

IRON CURTAIN LEAKS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, lately we have witnessed an excessive amount of wishful thinking about foreign policy developments involving Red China and ping-pong diplomacy. Unfortunately, this wishful thinking is again evident in analyses of the situation behind the Iron Curtain.

The situation in Eastern Europe, especially as it relates to the Iron Curtain efforts to lock out the influence of Western philosophy, is very properly discussed in a column by Dumitru Danielopol, the distinguished international correspondent of the Copley Press, in the May 21, Joliet, Ill., Herald-News:

IRON CURTAIN LEAKS

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA.—The Iron Curtain can no longer keep our Western ideas. Take the word of officials in Communist Yugoslavia who are becoming increasingly "bourgeois" in their outlook.

In fact, reform-minded Yugoslavia is beginning to carry these ideas into Romania—a straight-laced Red country that would prefer to ignore the Yugoslav higher standard of living.

An example is the joint Yugoslav-Romanian hydro-electric project at the "Iron Gates" on the Danube River. It's a 50-50 operation in which each country pays half the cost and does half the work.

But there's a hitch. Yugoslavs work with Caterpillar tractors, sophisticated tools and machines. The Romanians do their share with antiquated tools or by hand.

"No wonder they are disgruntled," says the Yugoslav, "they have to work three or four

times as hard to do the same job as our workers. They feel cheated."

The Romanians know that Yugoslavia is not as rich potentially as their own country, so they grumble against the system which keeps their standard of living so low.

The Greeks have had the same experiences from dealing with their communist neighbors. Ever since the military took over in April of 1967, they have tried to improve relations, especially with Romania, Albania and Bulgaria, countries involved in the Communist insurrection of the 1940s.

Don't the Greeks fear that too close a contact with the Communists would enhance chances for infiltration and subversion?

"The shoe is on the other foot at this stage of the game," was the answer. "It is our Communist neighbors who get infiltrated by Western, free enterprise, capitalist ideas."

Increasing prosperity and a high standard of living in Greece must make its Communist neighbors wonder. Even Yugoslavs who have practically abandoned their Marxist economy and have achieved considerable progress are amazed to see the spectacular success in free enterprise Greece. After all, they all know that Greece is poor in relation to most Balkan and East European nations and yet the differences are so great, that they can no longer be brushed aside by Communist propaganda.

"We don't have to tell them anything," says Nicolas Makarezos, the Minister of Coordination and one of the architects of the economic boom, "all they have to do is come and look. They go home very disgruntled with their own economy."

It may not be insignificant that George Georgalas the present under secretary for information in the Prime Minister's Office in Athens, is a former card-carrying Communist. After travelling for seven years in Communist countries he came back to Greece disenchanting and joined the Papadopoulos regime.

He is now considered one of the most lucid and most determined foes of Marxist ideology.

It is no mere coincidence also that Mikis Theodorakis, a Communist, and well known composer of "Zorba the Greek," who sought refuge abroad last year to fight against the military regime, has now reconsidered.

"The economic and social situation (in Greece)," Theodorakis said in a recent interview, "has improved. The gates are open and serious investments are coming in."

BLOCKAGE OF HAIPHONG PORT TO END THE WAR

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans who want the war in Vietnam ended once and for all continue to question the free flow of military equipment and supplies into the harbor at Haiphong. To some, it many times seems as if our leaders have agreed with the enemy not to molest the Haiphong port. Since Russia supplies 80 percent of the military supplies, the reason could be that our State Department does not wish to upset our mellowing relations with the Soviet regime.

Especially was this so when our men were sent into Laos and Cambodia under the pretext that they were protecting our fighting men in South Vietnam by

cutting off the flow of Communist military supplies and equipment. The easier and simpler solution to stopping the Red supplies would have been action before the Communists had dispersed them—better yet, to have prevented them from even reaching North Vietnam by blocking their entrance into the port of Haiphong.

Prevention of military supplies through the port of Haiphong is not new or without precedent. During World War II, a B-24 plane sunk a ship in the main channel of Haiphong, thereby preventing a Japanese convoy from landing supplies.

Also in World War II mines laid by submarines in the approach to Haiphong harbor sunk another ship causing the Japanese to abandon Haiphong as a port for anything larger than junks for the duration of the war.

If those in command want to end the war in Vietnam and are sincere in pronouncements that they want to protect our troops who are ever decreasing in number, the question remains as it has from the start: "Why not blockade, mine, or bomb the ship traffic at Haiphong?"

I insert excerpts from the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey, "The Offensive Mine Laying Campaign Against Japan," originally published by Naval Analysis Division on November 1, 1946, and reprinted by the Department of the Navy, Headquarters Naval Materiel Command in 1969, and a newsclipping at this point in the RECORD:

8. CHINA MINE LAYING—FOURTEENTH AAF

In October 1943 the Fourteenth U.S. AAF joined the list of commands engaged in mine laying. Its first two missions, consisting of one B-24 sortie each, were directed at Haiphong. A ship was sunk in the main channel almost immediately, and a 10-ship convoy which had been blocked out of the harbor milled around for some hours and then proceeded to Northern Hainan Island. There the Fourteenth Air Force caught up with it and sank 6 of the 10 ships. That experience plus another ship casualty in the mine field caused the Japanese to abandon Haiphong as a port for anything larger than junks for the duration of the war.

This early mine laying success convinced the Fourteenth AAF that mining was an effective means of obtaining maximum results with their limited supply of gasoline and explosives. They, thereupon, undertook a small but enthusiastic mine laying campaign which extended from the Tonkin Gulf in the south to the Yangtze River in the north. Hong Kong and Takao, soon became favorite targets for the mine laying planes. Both of these places, especially the latter, were used as staging points for convoys running between the Empire and the southern Japanese holdings; even minor delays there represented a loss of valuable ship time.

FIRST PHASE—SOUTHWEST PACIFIC

Mine laying by submarines in the Pacific commenced on 15 October 1942 when the U. S. S. THRESHOLD planted 32 Mark 12 ground mines in the approaches to Bangkok (12° 50' N., 100° 44' E.). Four days later, the U. S. S. GAR planted another field in the same general area but in a different location (12° 35' N., 100° 45' E.); this also consisted of 32 Mark 12 ground mines. On 29 October 1942, the U. S. S. GRENADEER performed a similar mission and placed 32 Mark 12 ground mines in the approach to Haiphong (20° 38' N., 107° 04' E.). This group of mine fields was completed on 2 November 1942 when the U. S. S. TAUTOG planted 32 Mark 12 ground mines off Cape Padaran (11° 10'

N., 108° 47' E.) and the U.S.S. TAMBOR placed a field of 32 Mark 12 ground mines in Hainan Strait (20° 04' N., 109° 18' E.).

These mine fields were in the normal route of ship traffic passing through Hainan Strait to Haiphong from the north, or making the circuit around the Indo-China peninsula to Bangkok. Almost immediately after they were planted, they began to claim significant casualties. Results now indicate that the following 12 ship casualties were obtained by these fields:

Field	Sunk	Damaged
Bangkok approaches.....	1	5,425
Cape Padaran.....	2	11,626
Hainan Strait.....	2	4,530
Haiphong.....	2	5,994
		12(1) 10,170
		(1)

1 Number in parentheses indicate ships for which no tonnages have been reported.

1968 BOMB-HALT ACCORD KEPT SECRET BY U.S. (By Lewis Gullick)

The Nixon administration has declined to take the secrecy wraps off the original diplomatic exchanges with North Vietnam which led to the 1968 bomb halt and the Paris peace talks.

As a result, just what the 1968 bomb halt "understanding" amounts to is unlikely to become known publicly as long as the war and the Paris talks go on.

An Associated Press request for the original record was made after the dispute late last year over an expansion of U.S. policy on air attacks on North Vietnam and statements by President Nixon and other high administration officials concerning the 1968 understanding.

The North Vietnamese consistently have denied agreeing to various conditions in return for the bomb halt. At the same time, both sides seem to want to continue the Paris parley despite a number of apparent violations of the 1968 arrangement.

The AP request for the U.S.—North Vietnamese exchanges which produced the 1968 deal was turned down by Herbert G. Klein, the Nixon administration's communications director.

He said the State Department opposes removing secrecy from this record "as long as the war is going on and the talks in Paris continue."

He quoted the State Department as saying that making the material public "conceivably might undermine our responsibility to maintain the confidentiality of diplomatic exchanges and undertakings in general."

Also "release of any part of the record at this time certainly will raise questions—the first of which would be 'why are you releasing this now?'"—and would be wide open to misinterpretation," Klein quoted the State Department as saying.

Beside-the-scenes talks with Hanoi envoys by W. Averell Harriman, then chief U.S. negotiator at Paris, and his deputy, Cyrus Vance preceded the Nov. 1, 1968, end to the sustained U.S. bombing of North Vietnam and the start of the U.S.—South Vietnam—North Vietnam-Viet Cong talks still under way in Paris.

A TRIBUTE TO THE NORFOLK FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, a dedicated organization serving a city I am proud to represent in Virginia's Second District will celebrate its 100th an-

niversary on December 17, 1971. The Norfolk Fire Department reaches its centennial mark as one of the best equipped and highly trained metropolitan fire departments in the Nation.

The Norfolk Fire Department has an unusual and interesting history. It originated as the Hope Fire Co. and the Union—later changed to United—Fire Co.

With the advent of the Civil War, fire organizations disintegrated. The United Fire Co. alternated as an artillery battery for Gen. Robert E. Lee. They made up the crew on the ironclad *Virginia*, later known as the *Merrimac*, and fought the famous battle of the *Monitor* and *Merrimac* in Hampton Roads.

After the war ended, the fire companies were beset with rival jealousy. This rivalry caused abuse and fights which culminated in a bloody riot in 1871. A few men died in the street and several were wounded.

In order to present another onslaught the city council decided to create professional fire companies. They terminated the volunteer organizations and on December 17, 1871, inaugurated the first Norfolk fire division.

Today, Norfolk's firemen still make history. They wear the metal fireman's badge fashioned after the Maltese Cross—possibly the first fireman's badge in the world. The badge symbolizes the honor and integrity of the fireman.

In addition to the other "firsts," the Norfolk department became in 1911 the first department in the State to use motorized fire engines.

The Norfolk fire department has an impressive history. But their present combat force transcends the bravery and courage of their predecessors. In fact the fire department operates more than \$2 million worth of equipment and has been so successful in its fire prevention and fire fighting operations that Norfolk enjoys one of the lowest fire insurance rates in the country.

Norfolk's firemen are a brave lot. The city of Norfolk cannot pay enough tribute to these outstanding men who have risked their lives preventing fire's destruction. I publicly thank the Norfolk fire department for their service and devotion to the community.

Each of us, whether or not we have had cause to use the fireman's services, should respect the fireman's motto: "Pride and Service." But above all, we should be thankful that we have an efficient and loyal force of men protecting our lives and our property.

ON THE EXCLUSION OF POLICE COMMISSIONER MURPHY FROM WHITE HOUSE MEETINGS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the White House held a meeting to discuss the rash of recent police slayings throughout the country. Incredibly and callously, New York City's Police Com-

missioner Patrick V. Murphy was excluded from this meeting.

No doubt the administration intended to show its supposed concern over the police killings by having this meeting. The omission of Commissioner Murphy, however, revealed the absence of genuine concern on the part of the administration; it revealed the meeting for what it was, a petty political ploy designed to curry favor with a part of the country, while avoiding the real issue.

If this administration is truly concerned about the police killings it should reverse its present position and support a strengthening of Federal gun control laws. This would be a positive preventive measure, for as was reported in today's New York Times 83 of the 86 police officers slain nationwide in 1969 were killed with firearms and 67 of them by handguns.

This administration did not pause to reverse its position on providing policemen's widows with Federal benefits as soon as it became politically expedient in their estimation to do so. One can only hope that the Nixon administration will prove itself responsive to something other than political expediency and reverse its position on gun control. Its decision to exclude Commissioner Murphy, head of a police force that constitutes 10 percent of all law enforcement officers in the country, a force that has already seen seven of its men killed in the line of duty this year, gives us, regrettably, little cause for optimism.

The New York City Police Department is truly the finest in the world and Commissioner Murphy has won the confidence of his force and of all New Yorkers in a short time. Yet New Yorkers, and their policemen in particular, are saddened and angry by the police killings in this city. The President's crude snub of Commissioner Murphy, no doubt motivated by Commissioner Murphy's strong support of gun control, disregarded and distained those feelings. This action does not reveal the type of leadership we look for in the Office of the President. It illustrates the hollowness of the President's law and order platitudes.

Yesterday we saw another example of how our national administration has chosen to listen to only those segments of the country with which it feels comfortable rather than to the country as a whole. This is truly an absence of leadership.

OIL INDUSTRY DEPRESSED

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, oil and gas are America's greatest source of energy. Yet, we are not encouraging the oil industry to provide for the future needs of America. Instead, an oppressive Government is stifling this essential mineral. The Federal Government cut the encouraging depletion allowance from 27½ percent to 22 percent. The Federal Government makes it difficult to

get fair prices for gas. The Federal Government provides little in the way of research and development.

The oil and gas industry has been built by dynamic aggressive men. Coming to mind are such great oil independents as Edwin L. Cox, Cary Maguire, Jack Crichton, Al Hill, Roland Bond, Bun Bright, Jake Hanon, Hub Hill, Wilson Germany, Gene Constantin, Jack Vaughn, Bruce Calder, Ray Hunt, Harry and Dick Bass, Herb Schiff. I could name hundreds—names of great men like Jack Pew of Sun Oil, Dick Galland of Fina, Bill Clements of SEDCO, Preach Meaders of Halliburton. The oil industry provides outstanding service, fine quality product with economical prices.

I was visiting with Abbott Sparks who publishes the Petroleum Engineer. Abbott is in close touch with the oil and gas industry and he pointed out some facts that will be of interest to you here in the House. One hour's average pay today buys five times more gasoline than it did in 1925. This means the dollar in a workers pocket is getting five times as much value in paying for gasoline as it did in 1925. What is more, the gasoline is of much higher quality and is cheaper than distilled water.

The dynamic oil industry has accomplished this in spite of the fact that it costs three to five times as much to build facilities and operate them as it did only 25 years ago. Abbott Sparks summed it up when he said the answer is the great leadership we have among oil men. It is the drive and brains the oil industry has put into engineering and technology. It is oil leadership's track record in converting technology into hardware, software, and action. These oil companies engineering innovations have given consumers the true economic gain of energy products at basic, stable prices.

It has been said that adversity is the mother of invention. So, with all of their adversity the oil industry has met this with inspiration during the past 12 years. During the past 12 years domestic drilling rigs drop from 2,400 to less than 1,000, independent producers from 11,000 to less than 7,000, annual petroleum engineering degrees conferred from nearly 900 to less than 300, supply stores from 800 to 600.

The need for oil and gas far exceeds our current exploration developments. America must provide more adequate depletion and establish more realistic gas pricing.

In serving on the Oil and Gas Committee in the House, we will all work together in the 92d Congress to help America move forward by providing greater incentives for exploration of oil and gas minerals.

SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, at the funeral mass for U.S. Senator Thomas J. Dodd on May 26, 1971, Msgr. John S.

Kennedy delivered a homily that was beautiful and humane, comforting and compassionate. Because of the exceptional quality of Monsignor Kennedy's remarks, I insert them in the RECORD for others to read:

SENATOR DODD—MAY 26, 1971

This is the clement season of the Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ. He has been taken up into heaven, his mission on earth performed. We contemplate him in glory, all-serene.

What a contrast between his condition and ours! He is beyond the grime and the grief of this world, beyond its cruel rigors and ambiguities, beyond its perplexities and pain. And here we are, liable to uncertainty and temptation, the riddles and absurdities of life, the tedium and fatigue of existence, the weakness of the flesh and the wavering of the spirit, and totally vulnerable.

What link, then, between him, fixed in light, and us, floundering in the dark? It is in his humanity.

Ascended though he is, and long since, he has not shed the humanity common to us and to him. His wounds remain, eternally, as evidence, to quote St. Paul, that "he has been through every trial, fashioned as we are, only sinless . . . a high priest who can feel for us and be our faithful representative before God." And the Great Apostle goes on, "It is because he himself has been tried by suffering that he has power to help us in the trials we undergo."

Those trials include—indeed, culminate in—death.

This we must all endure—its indignity, its mystery, its utter loneliness, its cold finality. The thought of it periodically skims our minds even when we are well, and it shakes our hearts when we are ill. We walk in the sunlight, we exult in the loveliness of spring, but, unless we are giddy, there always lurks at the edge of our vision a hint of the death that is to be. And we wonder, "How will it be with me then?" No need to fear, if we are daily mindful of the Lord who went through death, and will see us through that same shadowed door.

Another trial is that of bereavement by the death of one we love. While he or she is still with us, we sometimes steal a glance and reflect, "What if I were to lose him?" or "If she dies, how can I bear it?" and we already feel the weight of sorrow, the sting of tears.

There comes a day when the unpredictable blow falls, the sorrow is crushing, the tears flow, and we are desolated. It is then we remember that because Christ our Lord has himself "been tried by suffering . . . he has power to help us in the trials we undergo." This is not illusion; it is truth solid as the rock of Gethsemani. And we are comforted, borne up in hope.

So is it now with Thomas Dodd, who, while the radiance of Ascension Day still brightened the air, was summoned by his time-scarred but triumphant Lord. So is it with the Senator's family, who, while rightly mourning him, are yet wonderfully consoled.

JOHN VOLPE

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, a recent Wall Street Journal article pointed out to all the readers of that paper what an excellent job Secretary of Transportation Volpe is doing.

In my years of congressional service, I

have been privileged to meet Americans serving their country in all roles, both public and private. And, I want to say that John Volpe has served his country in both capacities. He began working for his father at age 12 as a plasterers' apprentice. He worked his way through college and later went into the construction business. During World War II he had his first direct experience in public works—he served in the Seabees.

Upon returning to Massachusetts he was commissioner of public works and elected Governor three times for a total of 8 years. During 1956-57 he was our first Federal Highway Administrator. In those crucial years during the beginning of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways he set down guidelines that are still valid today.

I have long been impressed by the competence with which John Volpe can get a job done. His energy knows no bounds and he always performs "above and beyond the call of duty." If ever John Volpe enters into a controversy and he says that he will find a solution you can take him at his word. This is very impressive in the highly changeable atmosphere of politics. He is resourceful in finding solutions to problems and he will not ignore difficult problems.

Yet, in spite of his constant drive and the tremendous array of problems facing him, John Volpe is a very warm and likeable human being who has managed to retain his sense of humor. I have known him both in my official role and in private life. In the past, we have worked closely together on the Federal-aid highway program, problems relating to highway safety and beautification, and certain aspects of the mass transit program.

There have been times when John and I did not always see eye to eye on public works issues. But Secretary Volpe is one of those rare individuals who can disagree without being disagreeable.

And so Mr. Speaker in closing I call the following article printed in the May 25 Wall Street Journal to the attention of my colleagues, in the hope that they take notice of this article and share my feelings concerning Mr. Volpe:

MR. VOLPE'S SURPRISING ACHIEVEMENTS

(By Albert R. Karr)

WASHINGTON.—Not long ago John Volpe was handing out a medal to a rather remarkable man who used to test the effects of deceleration by catapulting down a track on a rocket-powered sled. The sled would roar to 632 miles an hour, then stop within two seconds.

Looking up from the middle of a formal citation, the Transportation Secretary couldn't suppress a comparison. "Sometimes," he said, "we in the administration have to decelerate faster than that."

It was a wry admission that Mr. Volpe, a hard-driving man who wants very much to leave his mark on the nation's transportation system, can't always sell his ideas to the President or the stolid aides who surround him. But that is a common problem for the Nixon Cabinet. The significant thing about Mr. Volpe is not in his setbacks—and there have been embarrassing ones—but in some major achievements that have surprised critics and supporters alike.

Mr. Volpe, a three-time Massachusetts governor who has also been Federal Highway Administrator and Massachusetts public

works commissioner, initially was regarded by critics as a narrow, roadbuilding fanatic who would try to pave over the country. Instead, he has irritated the highway lobby by killing disruptive projects and increasingly emphasizing mass transit. And in an administration more conservative and less programmatic than its predecessors, he has probably produced more new programs than any other Cabinet member, a number of them liberal measures. Among them: mass transit upgrading, a national railroad passenger system, or Amtrak, and the use of hitherto sacrosanct highway trust fund money for safety and other new programs.

This success is partly a fortuitous coincidence of Mr. Volpe's predilections and White House politics, because it is true that the Nixon administration is more open to programmatic experimentation in transportation than, say, civil rights or help for the cities. But it also reflects some personal attributes of Mr. Volpe: a deep social concern, a toughness combined with diplomacy and painstaking care in building up support. Moreover, in an administration that sometimes seems to value loyalty above all else, Mr. Volpe is the ultimate team player.

WILLING TO COMPROMISE

Intense, energetic Mr. Volpe, 62, fights hard for his programs, but the bouts are strictly intramural. Not for him are Walter Hickett's martyrdom or George Romney's public pronouncements that sometimes take him further than the administration wants to go. Mr. Volpe prefers to survive, to compromise, to chip away at opposition gradually if he has to. When the White House hits the brakes Mr. Volpe decelerates. And if it so orders, he'll champion positions he privately opposes.

That's what happened to the Secretary's plan for auto insurance reform. Central to his concept were federal standards, possibly backed up by pressure on the states to conform through a mandatory effective date or federal penalties. The White House opposed legislated standards, and Mr. Volpe abandoned the concept on the eve of testimony before a Senate committee. Instead, he suggested that Congress merely pass a resolution urging the states to act. (Responding to a Congressman's question in a House hearing later, however, Mr. Volpe said he wouldn't object to federal auto-insurance standards, as long as outright federal regulation were avoided.)

Another time, asked whether he concurred in a White House budget holddown he had strenuously resisted, Mr. Volpe replied: "Once the decision has been made, it's Transportation Department policy."

But the Secretary doesn't give up until policy is set, and his fight for Amtrak is a case in point. Key presidential aides opposed the plan, and at one point it took a heated outburst even to get Mr. Volpe past them and inside Mr. Nixon's office. Then, he says, "It took me about six minutes" to sell his argument. Later, Mr. Volpe threatened to resign if Mr. Nixon sided with the advisers who were urging him to veto the legislation.

Straightforward to the point of bluntness, Mr. Volpe meets most issues head-on. He has angered the potent highway lobby by stopping highway projects before they could rip through parks, historic areas and neighborhoods, and by warning that "excessive dependence on the auto" poses the "threat of urban suicide." He bruised egos by issuing a highway-safety "report card" that ranked states from "A" to "D." Alabama and Illinois each got three "D's" and the Secretary noted some "retrogression" nationwide. "Only a Republican ex-governor can get away with what he tells industry and governors to do," an associate declares.

A major caveat to the Volpe record, however, is that most of the programs he has

backed so far have simply involved spending more money to attack generally accepted needs, with the support of most interest groups involved. It was apparent even before Mr. Nixon took office that an expanded mass-transit program would be tremendously popular, for example. The administration has no fondness for the highway lobby, a fact that gives Mr. Volpe some latitude; and from the lobby's point of view, Mr. Volpe's positions thus far, while annoying, haven't substantially cut the amount of money available to highway building. "It's true that we've worked with the easy ones," one department official admits.

TOUGH BATTLES AHEAD

But the crunch is coming. Mr. Nixon's revenue sharing plan challenges the highways and airport lobbies in a fundamental way, since it would allow states to spend money in those two trust funds for any transportation purpose they desire. As a key salesman for this aspect of the plan, Mr. Volpe must confront the two lobbies and their substantial power on Capitol Hill.

In his first year in the job Mr. Volpe lost an intra-administration battle for mass transit, failing to win backing for a trust fund he proposed. But if revenue sharing fails, he'll revive another plan that would also boost mass transit: a "transportation trust fund" that would allow states to divert money in the highway and airport trust funds to other transportation purposes. This plan, like revenue sharing, would certainly arouse bitter opposition.

Originally a Rockefeller backer in 1968, Mr. Volpe was persuaded by advisers to climb aboard the Nixon bandwagon while he still had a chance. He did, and for a time was thought to be in the running for the Vice Presidency. After the election, he sought an administration job in an activist department, specifically Health, Education and Welfare or Housing and Urban Development. Ironically, the Secretaries of those two departments have found their activism repeatedly stifled by White House political considerations while Mr. Volpe, in a job he didn't particularly seek, has been relatively free to make his mark.

It's a task he gives almost undivided attention. Up most mornings by five, Mr. Volpe usually attends an early mass and heads for his office and a workout on the stationary bicycle. Then he plunges into work, rushing in and out of his office with brow furrowed. Mr. Volpe lacks a college degree, but aides say he's quick to see the significance of an issue and prefers quick, "Harry Truman" type decisions to agonizing and intellectualizing. He seldom gets away before 7, and even then usually packs along two bulging briefcases for work far into the night.

He has grown steadily into the job. More favorable to highways at first, he now says his Washington experience has made him "much more acutely aware" of the need for balanced transportation systems. In the process, he has converted skeptics. Declares a former transportation official in the Johnson administration: "If Nixon would listen to Volpe more often, he'd be ten times better off."

The Secretary seemingly views his job as the capstone to his political career and, accordingly, is particularly keen on programs that show visible accomplishment. He would like to get an air-cushion vehicle transit line going somewhere in the country, for example, but so far attempts in Los Angeles and Washington have fallen through. He would also like to leave office with a major reduction of highway deaths to his credit. So when he came across a newspaper clipping describing the inflatable air bag for automobiles two years ago, he quickly dashed off a memo directing his highway safety people to get cracking on an air bag program.

Devoutly religious, Mr. Volpe often interjects "the dear Lord" into press conferences and casual conversation. He eschews alcoholic beverages (his favorite drink is tea laced with honey), and will sometimes make a point by beginning: "If I were a gambling man—which I'm not—I'd bet that..." Nevertheless, aides say, he can be quite profane when angered, and his anger can flare quickly when an underling turns in a poor performance. Fortunately, they add, he doesn't hold grudges.

The son of Italian immigrants, Mr. Volpe worked as a hod carrier and plasterer's apprentice eventually, turning a \$500 stake into a thriving construction business. He's fond of relating how his father told him that, like other members of minority groups, he would have to climb the ladder one step at a time, and on his own. But in telling that story, Mr. Volpe usually admonishes those working for him to "remember to turn around once in a while to give a helping hand to those below you."

Translating this philosophy into action, Mr. Volpe has emphasized jobs for blacks, earning the administration some credit in a field where it generally draws criticism. There are now 20 blacks on the department's "supergrade" jobs; before Mr. Volpe there were none. And Aaron N. Henry, head of the NAACP's Mississippi unit, credits Mr. Volpe's "persuasion" for the fact that the Mississippi Highway Department, formerly all white, now is at least 30% black. Clarence Mitchell, the NAACP's Washington representative, says he's "ahead of most people in the administration."

Some of Mr. Volpe's initiatives, however, have bogged down in the conservative, slow-moving bureaucracy he inherited. Thus, Mr. Volpe has declared that no highway or other federal transportation projects will be authorized until suitable relocation housing is built or assured. But the Federal Highway Administration, traditionally an entity unto itself, has moved so slowly on this that one civil rights expert calls its performance "terrible."

Apparently recognizing this problem, Mr. Volpe last week announced new regulations designed to enforce his relocation-housing policy. They include a requirement that federal-aid projects causing displacement have a local relocation-assistance office to help displaced persons find new homes.

CONGRESSIONAL GOOD MARKS

The Secretary gets better marks on Capitol Hill, where he often goes to do some personal lobbying instead of leaving that task to subordinates. During the final stages of the administration's effort to push the SST—a project that the Secretary personally supported—he talked at length with lawmakers, focusing on freshmen Congressmen. He's quick to adapt his tactics. Trying to sell a new highway funding approach last year, he began by working through the Republican members of a Senate committee. But when a staff man for the Democrats telephoned to suggest that Mr. Volpe deal with them as well, he dispatched a bevy of experts to the Hill within the hour.

Mr. Volpe's intense, driving approach has brought him to the point of frequent, though not major, health problems, and one hard-pressed aide, a Washington veteran, says he has "never worked for anyone so aggressive and so decision-oriented." Nevertheless, Mr. Volpe laughs easily, frequently at himself, and loves to tell homey, self-deprecating stories.

One favorite concerns the time he was stuck in a long line of airliners waiting to take off, and impatiently asked the captain to inform the tower controllers that his boss, the Secretary of Transportation, was aboard. Back, Mr. Volpe says, came the controller's reply: "My regards to Mr. Volpe, but he's still 19th in line."

PILOT "AWED" BY THE OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE OF THE F-111

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, those of us in Congress have the responsibility for expressing the final judgment on modern weapons systems, such as the F-111. It is the pilot, however, who is capable of providing us with an intimate evaluation of an aircraft's aerial performance of the aircraft, as well as the pilot who gets to know the aircraft where it really counts—in the air.

The following article from the Air Force magazine of April 1971 provides us with a pilot's view of the F-111. Capt. John Francis, Jr., who has flown the F-111 for 2½ years, discusses the revolutionary features and outstanding performance of the aircraft, as well as the critical question of safety.

What better recommendation can an aircraft receive than words of a pilot who says:

There has not been a single moment during the history of F-111 accidents and groundings when I would not have gone to the flight line and taken off with confidence.

In hopes that my colleagues will appreciate the unique capabilities of this revolutionary weapons system, I am including in the RECORD the text of this interesting and enlightening article:

F-111 A PILOT'S VIEW

(By Capt. John Francis, Jr., USAF)

After several hundred hours in the cockpit of any airplane, you get to know the bird pretty well. If you're a professional military pilot and the aircraft will do its assigned job better than any other, you respect it. If it's also a safe bird, both in training and combat, you have confidence in it. If it's a pleasure to fly, you develop real affection for it.

For two and a half years, I flew the F-111A. My feeling about the aircraft is a mixture of respect, confidence, and affection, tinged—even now—with more than a little awe. It's that kind of machine.

There has been a lot of political and economic criticism of the F-111. I don't feel qualified to discuss those matters. It may be that for the same investment of time and money, we could have had an even better aircraft. I'm not qualified to judge that, either. The point is that we now have F-111As and Es in operational units. The even more advanced D model, with improved Mark II avionics, will be along next year, and later we'll get the F model, with a more powerful engine and modified Mark II avionics. The F-111s we have now, and those to come, should be judged on their merits—not on the selection and management decisions that are now water over the dam.

UNIQUE MEANS PRICELESS

There's only one word that describes the F-111 in a nutshell. The word is *unique*. As any military planner will tell you, when a weapon system has a unique capability, it becomes a priceless machine. Unique doesn't mean just higher, faster and further than some previous model. It means opening a combat arena where you have superiority because you are the only one operating there. There F-111A has such a unique capability. It opens to the Air Force nighttime, all-weather operations at low altitude. But the mis-

sion isn't the only unique thing about this airplane, from the point of view of the operational planner, and certainly not from where the aircraft commander sits.

As an aircraft commander, I can fly the F-111 at supersonic speeds within 200 feet of some awfully hard and unseen rocks. So I have a very special perspective. Keeping this perspective in mind as I discuss the F-111A will give you a much better appreciation of its special features. And almost everything in the F-111, from nose to tail, is special, unique, or revolutionary in some way. Let's start with the nose.

The nose section houses the electronic gear (avionics). You've probably read other articles that said avionics is one of the outstanding features of the F-111A, and so it is. You may have seen other articles calling those black boxes unnecessary electronic gadgetry that only runs up the cost of the aircraft. The truth is, without this equipment the aircraft would be incapable of its unique mission. A good aircraft, yes, but not unique. In other words, the electronic "gadgetry" is not only expensive—it is priceless.

The first item of avionics I want to talk about is the attack radar. So what's unusual about an attack radar? Lots of aircraft have them, but the F-111A system is greatly advanced in its ability to identify and delineate topographical features. That enhances the total radar-bombing capability. The ease of radar bombing and navigation will be obvious when I tell you the picture projected by the attack radar is like a map. Fantastic? Yes, but even more so when tied into the inertial-navigation system.

FABULOUS BLACK BOXES

The inertial platform and computers that make up the F-111A's navigational and bombing system are phenomenally accurate. It is this system that makes the F-111A capable of around-the-clock, all-weather weapon delivery within the lethal envelope of conventional weapons. Here, then, is the first of those missions that no other aircraft can accomplish. Interdicting the enemy's supply lines (bridges, passes, truck parks) and airfields at any time, in any weather, deprives him of an option he once had: digging in by day, repairing and moving by night.

You may have read that the F-111A's navigation equipment is accurate to a few thousand feet per hour (very good in itself). What you may not know is that, through the attack radar tie-in, the weapon system operator can maintain position accurately within hundreds of feet, at all times. Navigating at low level in bad weather increases your appreciation of such accuracy. Knowing your position and the terrain can be very reassuring when you depend on automatic systems to provide ground clearance.

The next avionic feature, the ballistics computer, is a pilot's dream. This computer was not originally a part of the F-111A. It's one of those modifications that contributed to the aircraft's escalating cost, of which you've heard so much. First, let me explain the increased flexibility it provides. Then you decide whether paying more money for it was justified or not.

The computer can determine continuously the impact point of any bomb, given the aerodynamic characteristics of the bomb and the altitude, airspeed, and vertical velocity of the aircraft. It then relates this information to the target's location and continuously updates a release time for the bomb. What does this mean to me, the aircraft commander? For the first time in radar-directed, level bombing, it is not necessary to fly straight and level on the bomb run. Altitude and airspeed can be changed without affecting bombing accuracy. Since these two items are essential information for the enemy's air defense system, it gives you a decided advantage over the defenses.

But the F-111's revolution in bombing

flexibility doesn't stop here. Since you can vary altitude and airspeed continuously, you can make a toss-bombing or dive-bombing attack with the same accuracy as in a level bomb run. You no longer have to overfly the target area. You can start a pullup miles short of the target, release in a climb, and break away, diving back to low-level concealment while the bombs continue to the target.

If you use the offset mode of the attack radar and bomb-nav-computer, you can further protect yourself from enemy defenses by choosing an axis of attack that positions a mountain range between the target and yourself. You can toss the bomb over the range. In this mode, without seeing the target, the weapon system operator aims on an offset point, which he knows is so many feet in such and such a direction from the target. Remember, if we cannot see the target area on our radar, then normal defense radars in the target area cannot see us. In other words, an enemy's first indication of attack would be weapons detonation. This is the tremendously flexible F-111A doing radar bombing.

DEFENSE SUPPRESSION

For still more flexibility, the ballistics computer can be tied into the LCOS (bombsight) for dive deliveries or visual-level deliveries. As I mentioned, the computer continuously computes an impact point. It can show the impact point on the bombsight at all times. Now you don't have to dive bomb in the traditional way—rolling in at a set altitude and airspeed, diving at a set angle, releasing at a predetermined altitude and airspeed, and making large errors in accuracy if any of these parameters were wrong. Now you can come from any direction, at any airspeed, altitude, and dive angle, drive the bombsight piper over the target and release. Flexible? Yes, and it greatly reduces delivery errors. But it means more. When you roll in on a target, you're not committed to the target by preset conditions of release. If the enemy's defenses open fire, you can switch your attack to them. It is no longer necessary for No. 4 in a flight to be a sitting duck because he's coming in at the same angle, airspeed, and altitude as the three previous aircraft.

Knowing my aircraft can do all these things, I wonder how anyone can say that the F-111 has no future as a ground-attack aircraft because it is too vulnerable and expensive to risk. The capability of striking targets and attacking the defenses at the same time doesn't leave you as vulnerable as all that. In fact, I think that defenses would be a little leery of giving away their position by opening fire, once they figure out the tremendous accuracy, firepower, and flexibility of the F-111.

The last of the avionic gear I am going to discuss is the terrain-following radar (TFR). This is it—the marvel of the aeronautical world. It is this equipment that allows the aircraft to fly thousands of miles over all types of terrain, never getting higher than 200 feet, and without the pilot ever touching the control stick.

The terrain-following radar is actually two completely independent sets, each capable of performing the entire terrain-following function and one serving as backup to the other. The TFR is not just unique. It's revolutionary. It is the TFR that opens up the arena of low-altitude, night, weather operation. The TFR can take you anywhere it can see. If it encounters weather that it can't see through, it takes you over or around it. The TFR not only lets you stay close to the ground; it lets you go through the low points in the hills. It lets you fly along a rocky mountainside where you'll be very hard to discern on enemy radar. But the TFR does more. It frees you from the stick and rudder work and lets you concentrate on other duties of the aircraft commander—decisions on what weapons to

use, enemy defenses, evasive action, and system malfunctions.

The terrain-following radar is safe in the hands of a pilot who knows it and its limitations, and it gives him the ability to fly where no other aircraft would dare. I would take my F-111A down into the Grand Canyon at night when the overcast was below the rim. In fact, one of our training routes does take us into the canyon. No other aircraft in the world could survive in that kind of environment.

So much for avionics. Now let's look at the crew module. Here is a system near and dear to every crew member's heart. It's the second revolutionary aspect of the F-111A. The crew module is the crew escape "capsule" that has had a phenomenal history of success. In an emergency, it allows the crew to abandon the aircraft as a crew. The module has been successful in every attempted ejection within the design envelope. It has been used at high altitude, high speed; at low altitude, high speed; at low altitude, low speed; in a spin; and while violently out of control. The ejections have resulted in no serious injuries to any crew member. While the success rate would seem enough in itself, it is even more significant because it gives crew members the confidence necessary to operate in the dangerous flight envelopes for which the F-111A was designed. Supersonic or low-altitude ejections, while still dangerous, are not the threats they once were. A little more about the crew module later.

A SWINGING WING

Now for the swingwing (switch blade, if you prefer). Revolutionary? You bet! Although there now are a few imitators in other parts of the world, the swinging F-111 flew in 1964. When talking about the variable-sweep wing, you get into some pretty impressive statistics on aircraft range and bomb load. Range and bomb load, of course, are trade-off items. But any way you slice it, you're talking about several times as much payload, carried much further than any other fighter-type aircraft in history. And you don't drag your feet getting there. The variable-sweep wing comes forward for takeoff and, with the highly efficient Fowler flaps and full span slats, allows the F-111A to get as many as twenty-four 750-pound bombs airborne. Then you sweep back the wings to reduce drag and push the speed right up to the delivery limit of the bombs. The same wing that allows you to come down the final landing approach at 130 knots sweeps back to reduce drag for supersonic flight on the deck.

General Dynamics could have made the movable wing a real nightmare. Instead, it is easy and natural to operate. In fact, there are some very favorable side effects of the engineering that went into the wing. As you might imagine, moving a wing changes the center of gravity and aerodynamic center of pressure. Problems of fuel balance, trim, and stability augmentation could be very annoying if the pilot had to compensate for them each time he moved the wing. Instead, the pitch-series trim of the aircraft compensates for trim changes. The fuel-distributing system is completely automatic, and the command-augmentation feature of the flight-control system gives a very nearly constant response to a given stick force, regardless of the wingsweep or aircraft speed. The aircraft always trims itself. Accelerating or decelerating, climbing or diving, you set the altitude with the stick and the aircraft trims off the forces. It is a dream during formation, flying a weather penetration, or on the air-to-ground range. The aircraft, through command augmentation, responds the same, with or without a bomb load.

Since the aft section of the wings sweep into the fuselage, conventional ailerons were impractical. The pilot gets pitch and roll by differential or symmetrical movements of the horizontal stabilizer. With the wings for-

ward, spoilers augment the roll response. As the wings sweep, the pylons rotate to keep the external stores aligned with the airflow. It is an outstanding engineering job.

BELOW AND BEHIND

Underneath the aircraft there is another completely new idea for fighters. Both wheels of the main landing gear are on a single trunnion. They both come down together: no chance of getting one without the other. The tires, designed to provide low-pressure footprints for landing on unpaved strips, are low wearing and may be used for up to 150 landings—ten times as many as some other fighter-type aircraft.

Within the wheels is a beautiful set of multiple-disc brakes. Combining the F-111's low approach speed with brakes that can be fully engaged at touchdown (thanks to the antiskid feature), the aircraft, weighing about twenty-five tons, can be stopped in a couple of thousand feet without a drag chute. Show me another fighter that can pull that one off! This short-field performance is vital to flexible, worldwide deployment. Not all places have 10,000-foot runways.

Finally, in the tail end we come to those unjustly maligned engines. Well, don't feel sorry for us F-111A crews. The P-1 engines (noted for compressor stalls) have gone the way of the test birds. The P-3 version of the TF-30 is another story. Another revolution in aerodynamics, the engine combines turbofan and afterburner for the first time in any aircraft. The result is a beautiful match of the outstanding features of each. The turbofans provide the very low fuel consumption that is needed for transoceanic deployments. The afterburners provide the thrust augmentation required to get a 70,000-pound vehicle up to two and one-half times the speed of sound. Boy, do they ever provide thrust augmentation—some eighty percent, compared to fifty percent in other engines! Further, the afterburner has five stages, each of which can be fully modulated.

Acceleration above Mach 1.0 is outstanding and very rapid to Mach 2 plus. I've never been Mach 2.5, but that's only because our supersonic flight area runs out as we're accelerating through Mach 2.1 at 40,000 feet and climbing rapidly. This aircraft can move! Not only that, but the engines have the power, and the aircraft is so clean at seventy-two degrees of wingsweep that it can sustain supersonic flight while holding Gs in a turn—a trait not too common in other aircraft. Sure, I'd like more power; what pilot wouldn't. And that's exactly what we're getting. The P-9 is already here in the D model, and the P-100 is on the way for the F.

WHAT ABOUT SAFETY?

Well, that's the F-111A, pitot boom to tail feathers. Now we come to a critical question. Is the F-111A a safe airplane? My answer is: Yes, it is safer than other fighters. There has not been a single moment during the history of F-111 accidents and groundings when I would not have gone to the flight line and taken off with confidence.

The Air Force says the F-111's safety record speaks for itself. You've probably seen the figures of so many accidents per so many flying hours, compared to other Century Series fighters (see chart p. 32). But the pilot doesn't get his feeling of safety from statistics. He gets it from knowing the aircraft and its systems, and from knowing how well they work for him and his fellow pilots.

The history of all aircraft accidents clearly identifies areas that are critical: engine and associated systems failures; fire; flight-control malfunctions; bad weather; and, finally, pilot factors. Here's my evaluation of these areas as they relate to the F-111A.

First, the engines. As a basic design feature for safety, the F-111A has two highly reliable engines. The engines have fire-detect-

tion and extinguishing equipment as well as an automatic airstart feature. The automatic airstart system works off a pressure-sensing circuit within the engine that senses the sudden pressure changes of a flameout and provides automatic ignition. Consequently, either because of engine reliability or automatic airstart reliability, I've never had a flamed-out engine. Even if I had to shut down an engine, it's no big thing. The F-111A performs very well on one engine, and neither electrical nor hydraulic systems are lost with one engine shut down.

The F-111A has dual electrical and hydraulic systems. Losing one side of these systems does not affect the aircraft except in loss of redundancy, for a single engine will provide all the electrical and hydraulic power required for normal flight. Either generator can carry the entire electrical load. If both generators should be out, an emergency generator provides essential electrical power.

There are two hydraulic pumps, one for each system (primary and utility), mounted on each engine. If you lose an engine, the other engine powers both the primary and the utility hydraulic systems. Then, if things should get worse and you lose one of these pumps, the other system can still power the flight controls and the wingsweep. This does not mean that other hydraulically operated systems are lost. You can operate all of these by electrical or pneumatic backup methods.

The hydraulic systems contain an additional safety feature. Isolation valves keep fluid from being lost in flight if a non-flight-essential subsystem is lost. For example, if the landing-gear hydraulic actuators should leak in flight, the only fluid lost would be that in the line to those actuators. In the event battle damage occurs to the primary hydraulic system, the utility system would automatically cut out flow to nonessential subsystems in order to furnish power for the wingsweep and flight controls.

The possibility of critical flight-control malfunctions still exists in the F-111A, as it has in all other aircraft. However, the additional sophistication of the F-111A has not brought with it increased danger. The flight controls are filled with electrical circuitry designed for redundancy and self-testing. These features warn the pilot of impending malfunctions so he can prevent unwanted signals from going to the control surfaces.

The F-111A mission makes it necessary to operate in and out of airfields with marginal weather. The aircraft's systems are ideally suited for this environment. The attack radar can be used for navigation around severe weather. It can be tied to the inertial-navigational computer for an instrument approach (including glide slope) to an airfield without any ground radio or navigational aids. The TFR is an invaluable aid for providing terrain clearance in a low-ceiling penetration. Added to all this is the auxiliary flight reference system, a completely independent, backup instrument system that is visible to both crew members.

THE PILOT FACTOR

So we come around to the pilot factor. This is a very personal thing, so nebulous that it's hard to convey to a reader how the factor of possible pilot error is reduced.

The cockpit is comfortable and well pressurized. There is no need for parachutes. Fatigue is reduced on long missions. Instruments are well placed and easy to read. Caution lights quickly catch the crew's attention.

The automatic systems allow the crew to divide their attention among all operations tasks. The aircraft is easy to fly, to take off, and to land.

The crew sits side by side, able to monitor each other's efficiency and to double-check the operation of the aircraft's complex systems.

However, should the crew have to eject despite all the F-111A's safety features, there is the escape module. In many aircraft acci-

dents, a fatality is the result of ejection-system failure or failure of the crew to use it in time. Again, the F-111A gives the crew an advantage over the crews of other fighters. The system works—it's been proved. The crew goes together and stays together. They don't face the hazards of ejection into the airstream. These advantages of the crew escape module should reduce the time it takes to decide to eject. And once on the ground, the escape module keeps right on working for the crew. They are together and equipped with more survival gear than can be carried in any other type of ejection system.

I don't want to leave you with the impression that I've covered all the safety features of the F-111A. I haven't even covered all of the major features. On almost every page of the flight manual, I can find some item that was designed to reduce a potential hazard in the air. I'll just say it again: The F-111A is a safe aircraft.

Within a pilot's frame of reference and the aircraft's operational environment, the F-111A does have shortcomings. All aircraft do. There never has been an aircraft that was all things to all pilots, performing all missions. There never will be. Just remember the things this aircraft, the F-111, can do better and more safely than any other. It can take the war to the enemy at any hour of any day of the year. He would have no time for rest, psychological relief, rebuilding and resupply, or training. Other fighters and bombers have left the enemy undisturbed as much as eighty-five percent of the time because of their inability to fly safely or effectively at night and in weather. The F-111A has taken this safe time from the enemy.

CRITICISMS—HOW RELEVANT

Now, what are some of the criticisms that have been leveled at the F-111's operational performance? Are they accurate? Are they relevant to its ability to perform its mission? Here are some of them.

"The aircraft won't fly at 65,000 feet." Maybe it will, and maybe it won't. I've never had occasion to find out. I fly my F-111A below 1,000 feet above the ground, which is the best place to be when you're penetrating enemy defenses.

"The visibility of the aircraft is too limited." You can see what you need to see. And at night, in bad weather, there's not much to look at anyway.

"The aircraft can't reach Mach 2.5 without compressor stalls." This is more high-altitude performance data that's irrelevant to the primary mission. I operate on the deck. The F-111A will fly supersonic on the deck, as advertised.

"The aircraft could never win in a dog-fight against the MIG-21." It probably can't, but I never expect to encounter one at my speed on the deck, at night, or in weather.

"The aircraft weighs too much." This is a relative statement. I still get off the ground and land with bigger payloads in less distance than other fighters. The aircraft maneuvers very well. The weight is a blessing in disguise. It is the weight that provides the fuel for long-range operation and the structure for carrying large weapon loads.

"The aircraft has no air-to-air role." That is simply not true. The F-111A could hardly be called a day fighter. But with air-to-air missiles aboard and the fuel to meet enemy bombers far out from our bombers, the F-111A could perform admirably in augmenting our air defense forces. The fuel, incidentally, gives us another unique feature—the ability to make multiple supersonic attacks on enemy supersonic bombers.

"The aircraft cannot deploy transoceanic without refueling." The F-111A certainly can, and on internal fuel, as it did to Paris in 1967. There is even more flexibility with external tanks. And ferry distance for other fighters is always in terms of external tanks.

In the context of the F-111's primary role, many criticisms fade into academic discus-

sion of specifications written more than eight years ago. During those years, the environment of tactical air warfare has changed considerably, and with it our understanding of how best to apply the unique features of the F-111.

I have tried to give you a view from the cockpit—the special view that F-111 crews have. For our particular mission, we do not need a different airplane. What we need are new techniques to fit a revolutionary aircraft to a new area of conflict.

The F-111 provides capabilities that are found in no other aircraft. It is unique, and, when the chips are down, unique means priceless.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, JIM

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James A. Farley, who needs no introduction at all, recently celebrated his 83d birthday and took that occasion to grant an interview to James Kilgallen. In the interview Jim Farley made a Jim Farley response when asked about retirement plans—"Why retire," he said. "I like to work. What would I do if I retired?" This is typical of the man that so many of us have known and loved over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Boston Sunday Advertiser,
May 30, 1971]

FARLEY SAYS ELECTION HINGES ON INFLATION,
EMPLOYMENT—"BREAD AND BUTTER" ISSUES
KEY FOR 1972 RACE

(By James Kilgallen)

NEW YORK.—James A. Farley, who will be 83-years-old today, said that "in my judgment the Vietnam war will not be an important issue in the 1972 presidential election. The bread and butter issues such as inflation and employment will decide the outcome."

Farley, now chairman of the board of Coca-Cola Export Corp., is regarded as one of the nation's keenest political observers. As Democratic national chairman in the 1930s, he twice masterminded Franklin D. Roosevelt into the Presidency.

In an hour-long pre-birthday chat with this reporter, Farley disclosed he has no intention of retiring. "Why retire?" he said. "I like to work. What would I do if I retired?"

"Genial Jim" has lost none of his interest in the political scene. As of today he thinks that the three outstanding possible Democratic candidates for the 1972 Presidential nomination are: Sen. Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota and Sen. Henry M. Jackson of Washington.

"And not necessarily in the order named," he added. "Any one of the three might make it."

None, however, has as yet announced his candidacy. Thus far only Sen. George S. McGovern of South Dakota has definitely entered the race.

I asked Farley about the chances of Sen. McGovern, Sen. Birch Bayh of Indiana, Sen. Harold E. Hughes of Iowa, and former Sen. Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota.

"I don't think any of those has any chance to win the Presidential nomination," said Farley. "But one of them might be selected as the Vice-Presidential nominee. Whoever is chosen as the Presidential nominee might pick one of them to be the second man on the ticket."

What about Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts?

"I think we must take Sen. Kennedy at his word that 'under no circumstances' would he be a candidate in 1972 for the Presidential nomination," Farley asserted.

"I believe that to be a good decision on his part and think he would be wise not to permit any of his followers to persuade him to change his mind."

Asked about reports that the liberal-independent Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York, nominally a Republican, may switch to the Democratic party and try for the Presidential nomination, Farley said:

"Mayor Lindsay hasn't been loyal to the Republican party which made it possible for the success he has had in public life. Based on that record you couldn't expect him to be loyal to the Democratic party and its principles."

Regarding President Nixon's chances for re-election, Farley said:

"If President Nixon is not able to solve his many problems, such as inflation and employment, he will be in a serious situation when the voters go to the polls on election day."

"I am of the opinion that with the influx of young voters the majority of them will support the Democratic Presidential nominee."

"That could be a decisive element in the final outcome of the election and could bring about a Democratic victory."

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL— PART I

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, soon the House will debate and vote on the defense authorization bill. At that time I intend to offer an amendment which will propose holding the fiscal year 1972 authorization to the level approved last year.

During the hearings on the bill, the Armed Services Committee heard testimony from nongovernment witnesses. The following testimony of Charles P. Shirkey supports the conclusion that the funds requested by the administration for defense in 1972 are more than we need. Mr. Shirkey concludes that:

As many as four Army divisions, seven Air Force tactical air wings and three Navy carrier task forces could be cut from the force levels proposed by the administration in 1972 without jeopardizing the administration's one and one-half war strategy for general purpose forces.

Such a reduction in forces should include proportionate reductions in procurement and R. & D. as well as the associated direct and indirect support.

Implementation of these force reductions could save \$7 to \$15 billion in 1972.

Mr. Shirkey is well qualified to comment on the 1972 defense budget and the adequacy of general purpose forces, having worked on the defense budget and national security issues in the Bureau of the Budget and Office of Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Shirkey's testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES P. SHIRKEY

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Armed Services Committee, my name is Charles Shirkey. For several years I have been concerned with defense policy—academically, in professional service and now in private research. At the Bureau of the Budget, I worked as an analyst on national security programs.

Subsequently, I served as a defense analyst in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Systems Analysis).

I wish to thank the Womens' International League for Peace and Freedom for granting me this time to appear before you. However, the testimony I present today represents my own views.

I shall limit my testimony to the general purpose forces, excluding the incremental costs and forces engaged in Indochina. In other words, I wish to concentrate on what we otherwise might call the "baseline" general purpose forces. As you know, these forces account for the largest portion of the defense budget.

It was observed last year that general purpose forces accounted for about 60% of the total FY 71 defense budget or 70% of the pre-Vietnam baseline budget, excluding the incremental cost of the Vietnam war. The FY 72 budget does not appear to represent a dramatic change in that allocation.

I would like to suggest today a way to conceptualize those general purpose forces and the associated budgetary resources. In particular, I wish to focus on force levels: why we maintain any given level, what are some of the rather consistent interrelationships peculiar to general purpose forces, what are some of the constants or "eternal verities," and what are some of the questions that one might raise in reviewing the 72 budget. For purposes of the record, my prepared text includes numerous tables which I will refer to during my testimony. Finally, I would like to suggest some broader questions that perhaps cannot be answered during this budget review but should be asked nonetheless.

The ultimate question confronting the Administration, you and your Senate colleagues is "how much is enough?" In a recent book by Alain Enthoven and Wayne Smith bearing that title, the authors begin with a quote from former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. I quote: "You cannot make decisions simply by asking yourself whether something might be nice to have. You have to make a judgment on how much is enough." This statement was made in 1963; it is equally true today. In the final analysis, the judgment that Secretary McNamara referred to is a judgment of how much confidence we feel is necessary to assure U.S. and allied security will not be placed in jeopardy.

That judgment process is exceedingly complex. The difficulty in making that judgment is perhaps equalled by the responsibility that you on this Committee share in reviewing the budget before you and ultimately shaping our general purpose force capacity. You are well aware that the recommendations and decisions that you will make will have an effect for many years to come.

We are speaking today of budgets, but of course, the final product are the very forces themselves. It is perhaps useful to put that relationship into perspective and look at the forces in being in 1969 and 1970. Those forces were largely the product of research and development of the fifties and early sixties, of procurement actions taken in the early and mid sixties, and of budgetary and management decisions on the operation and maintenance of forces in more recent years. Given this long chain of decisions, it is relevant to ask whether those forces were "enough" when they became operational. No one had a

crystal ball when those decisions and commitments were made. Yet the evidence suggests there was sufficient if not an abundance of confidence in 1969 and 70 in our ability to implement a flexible and graduated response vis-a-vis the Soviets, primarily in Europe, or the Chinese Peoples' Republic in East Asia. Furthermore, I submit that we could have so responded without drawing-down our forces committed in Southeast Asia and Korea; and in 1969 was the peak of our force commitment to that theater.

A publication on world military expenditures put out by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency observes that the entire world spent about \$200 billion on military expenditures in 1969. During that same period, the U.S. spent about \$80 billion or 40% of the world's total. Excluding the incremental cost of the Vietnam war, the U.S. still accounted for as much as 30%. The entire NATO Alliance spent about \$90 billion, excluding the incremental Vietnam war costs, compared to about \$65 billion spent by the entire Warsaw Pact, the bulk of which was spent by the Soviet Union. Of course, these figures include outlays for strategic nuclear forces by those countries so involved in addition to conventional or general purpose forces.

At first glance, the 72 budget suggests dramatic cuts in general purpose forces and equally dramatic changes in the underlying assumptions. However, I would suggest that these cuts and apparent changes are not as dramatic as they might first appear.

The key to general purpose force planning is land warfare and the number of division forces to be fielded. As shown in Table 1, in 1970 the U.S. had the capability to mobilize and deploy a total of 12 active Army divisions and two active Marine divisions, augmented by eight National Guard divisions and one reserve Marine division—a total of 23 division forces, excluding forces committed in Southeast Asia. As shown in Table 4, as many as 13½ active and reserve divisions were available to reinforce the 4½ divisions based in Europe, for a total of 18 division forces. Moreover, we had this capability simultaneous to the deployment of 6½ division forces to Southeast Asia, in addition to other contingencies as shown in Table 4. I do not wish to suggest that we had the proper degree of readiness; sufficient strategic lift capability; or the optimal mix of reconnaissance, mobility, and firepower. Yet the undeniable fact remains that we had an abundance of forces and were allocating sufficient sums of resources, over and above Vietnam, to buy and maintain a very impressive array of land force capability.

Taking into account the possibility of a minor contingency and a holding action in Asia, it appears that 11½ active divisions (excluding the possibility of one division in Vietnam) and a total of 20½ division forces should be enough in 1972 to assure a reasonable, if not high confidence capability for the U.S. to respond flexibly and with discretion to any NATO contingency—which after all is the most demanding case which we can conceive in the near-term. However, the 72 budget provides for 13½ active Army divisions or four more active divisions than what might be regarded as "enough". Thus an alternative which provides for 9½ active Army divisions (four less than the 72 budget) and 3 active Marine divisions or a total of 21½ active and reserve division forces compared to the 25½ proposed in the 72 budget does not appear unreasonable.

Given a particular number of active and reserve divisions, the number of tactical air wings is readily derived. Taking account of the size of the Marine air wing—about twice the size of Air Force and Navy tactical air wings—there has historically been about two wings per division. One of these has com-

monly been associated with the mission of close air support; the remainder are designed and assigned to such missions as deep interdiction air superiority and air defense. The 72 budget includes 21 active Air Force tactical air wings and 11 active Navy wings, in a total active and reserve force of 50½ Air Force (or Navy) tactical air wing equivalents. For an alternative force of 21½ division forces, it appears that 40½ active and reserve Air Force (or Navy) tactical air wing equivalents would be sufficient.

Another major determinant of general purpose force levels is the mix of land-based and sea-based tactical air given a particular number of tactical air wings. It can be assumed for the indefinite future that the number of Marine wings is given; this leaves only the number of Air Force and Navy air wings to be determined. Since Navy (or sea-based) tactical air wings are not designed for use in NATO's Center Region, where most if not all of U.S. land forces would be committed, it appears that a force mix of 14 active Air Force wings and 8 active Navy tactical air wings, augmented by the current 8½ Air Force and 2 Navy reserve wings, would be consistent with (a) the land force of 21½ divisions and (b) the concept of "realistic deterrence" (or flexible response), particularly as applied to the NATO theater.

A major factor in determining the size of naval forces is the number of carriers, including attack carriers (CVAs) and anti-submarine warfare or ASW carriers (CVSs); I will confine my discussion to CVAs only. Given 8 active Navy tactical air wings and maintaining the current 2 reserve wings, it further appears that 10 attack carriers would be reasonable. The 72 budget includes 12 CVAs and one CV, an experimental dual-capable attack and ASW carrier concept. As noted in Table 7, to maintain a 10 CVA/CV force in the out-years would require either (a) cancellation of the Eisenhower, CVAN-69, currently under construction, or (b) deactivation of one Forrestal-class CVA, the oldest of which will be 20 years old in 1975.

Just focusing on these major general purpose forces components, a case can be made that the 72 budget has more than enough for a flexible response for NATO. Given the Administration's "1½ war" strategy, the NATO contingency is simply the most demanding case; but this does not necessarily imply that we would use these forces in response to a NATO contingency only. It is still prudent, perhaps, to plan for the use of some U.S. forces in response to a major contingency in East Asia. However, assuming this is a valid basis for planning general purpose forces, the major alternative force levels proposed here would provide as much or more general purpose forces for deployment to East Asia than we committed in Korea or at the height of the buildup in Vietnam, as shown in Tables 4, 6 and 8.

If this alternative approach is valid, the excess would include the following:

- 4 active Army division forces;
- 7 active Air Force tactical air wings;
- 3 active Navy tactical air wings; and
- 3 attack carriers (CVAs).

Such a dramatic change in force levels would greatly impact on numerous systems in procurement and even in R. & D. Of course, savings would also include direct and indirect support associated with these forces. The total savings to the 72 budget would exceed \$7 billion. Cutting other general purposes forces to achieve a balance given these proposed reductions could perhaps double the savings in FY 72 for a total of about \$14-15 billion.

I do not wish to suggest that the capability for flexible response to a NATO contingency, particularly in Central Europe, is the only criterion for determining sufficiency in the

72 budget or is the only method for determining how much is enough. Nor do I wish to imply that I have addressed all the general purpose force level issues to be resolved in this 72 budget. It is merely my hope that this approach and the questions it raises may be of some assistance to the Committee and its members in reviewing the 72 budget and future Administration testimony.

In addition to the question "how much is enough?", I suggest that it is perhaps useful to this Committee to raise certain other questions with the Office of Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the individual military departments and services. Given the time constraint, I will simply enumerate what I consider to be major questions unanswered by the 72 budget:

(1) What is the appropriate ratio of manpower to the number of Army divisions? Examination will show that it is increasing in FY 72.

(2) Is it advisable to maintain 3 active amphibious divisions out of a total of 16½ active Army and Marine divisions (or even 4 out of a total of 25½ active and reserve divisions)? The Marine Corps continues to be organized into Marine Expeditionary Forces, primarily designed, equipped and trained for the amphibious assault mission.

(3) In implementing the Nixon Doctrine, what is the military significance, feasibility and advisability of Security Assistance for many recipient countries? In short, can we and should we try to accomplish through expanded Security Assistance to most recipients what we have been somewhat less than successful in doing with U.S. forces, particularly ground forces?

(4) Is the ratio of total active and reserve tactical air wings to divisions immutable? The ratio of about 2 to 1 appears to be an "eternal verity." Most interpretations of the Nixon Doctrine suggest that the cutback in U.S. ground forces for Asian contingencies, offset by greater self defense capability largely through increased Security Assistance, would result in an increased ratio of tactical air to division forces. As shown in Table 2, this is not the case in the 1972 budget.

(5) Does the 1972 budget adequately provide for the deployability and, in the final analysis the usability of the active and reserve forces based in the U.S.? Specifically, is there sufficient airlift, sealift and prepositioning; what is the appropriate mix of active and reserve forces; and what is the feasibility of attaining the necessary readiness levels, particularly given the ever-increasing complexity and sophistication of equipment?

(6) Are the dual-capable forces—namely, those designed to employ conventional as well as nuclear munitions—available for conventional employment at the outset of a contingency? It is relevant to recall the non-availability of such forces in and around Korea during the Pueblo crisis.

(7) Finally, given the level of modernization requested by all services in the 1972 budget, can equivalent units be maintained at equal or lower cost in future years? I would include such systems as the F-14, F-15, S-3, DD-963, MBT-70, SAM-D, A-X, Cheyenne, and miscellaneous electronic and communications hardware designed for reconnaissance and surveillance—commonly referred to as the "automated battlefield."

Beyond these specific questions, I submit that the Administration, this Committee and its counterpart in the Senate should give serious consideration to questions which go beyond the horizon of the 1972 budget and get to the very heart of the issue of national and global security in this and the remaining decades of this century.

First, in spite of the Administration's ap-

pellation of "realistic deterrence," it is relevant to question whether the concept of flexible response, particularly vis-a-vis the Soviets, continues to be relevant in the seventies. If so, should it be defined the same way it was in the 1960's? This particularly affects the NATO posture and the conventional arms race with the Soviets. If the concept should be changed, how should it be defined, what are the cost implications, and how do we get there from here?

Second, it is essential that we question whether militarily Asia is critical to U.S. security. It might be useful to note that in constant 1970 dollars, the U.S. spent about \$275 billion in pursuit of its foreign policy objectives in East Asia in the sixties. Of that total, roughly \$180 billion was for so-called "baseline" general purpose forces and military assistance designed to deter and, if need be, counter a conventional threat emanating from Communist China. About \$90 billion represents the incremental costs of the war in Indochina through 1970. The remaining \$5 billion is probably an overstatement of all unilateral and multilateral economic assistance and preferential trade to the area during the past 10 years. If our interests are derived from our principal interest in Japan, I submit they would be considerably limited. It would probably exclude Southeast Asia, perhaps Taiwan, and even a lower profile in Korea. One might even question one of the basic assumptions underlying the U.S. interest in Japan; namely, is the fear of a re-armed and independent Japan justified or not, Japan after all is exceedingly vulnerable were she to rearm conventionally or with nuclear arms.

Finally, I suggest there are some broader questions that force us even to redefine the meaning of national security and the means to ensure it. What are the *real* challenges to our national and global security in the 1970's and beyond? Admittedly, the problems of aggression and the tyranny of war are not likely to disappear. These problems, for which our military forces are relevant, have a very legitimate claim on our national resources. But there are other problems which military expenditures at best defer and often aggravate such as: population growth, which has only been deferred a decade or two thanks to the "green revolution"; economic and social deterioration, not only in the underdeveloped world but also in the developed world; the adequacy of technology to cope with pollution given the degree to which all nations are flagrantly abusing the world environment; the potentially explosive issue of U.S. (and other developed countries) consumption of the world's resources, now 40% and predicted to be somewhere around 60% by the turn of the century; and last, the need to make our industrial, technical and automated societies fit for satisfying and meaningful human existence. These are not simply matters of national concern and priorities; they are also matters of national security, now and in the years ahead. In this sense, this Administration is correct when it states that we will solve the problems at home and abroad or we will solve neither.

In closing, I would reemphasize the following points:

I believe force levels in the 72 budget are excessive for acceptable confidence in the U.S. capability to respond flexibly to the various contingencies which might jeopardize U.S. and global security. I believe that we can save at least \$7 billion and perhaps as much as \$14-15 billion by cutting major and associated excess forces alone.

I think the mix and efficiency of general purpose forces resources, including Security Assistance, are questionable.

The capability to operate and maintain

new systems sought in the 72 budget must be weighed against the availability of resources in future years.

Finally, I submit this 72 budget—which the Administration has made clear is no longer

a transition budget—raises more questions than it resolves. This Committee can make a great contribution to the enhancement of our national security by pursuing these and other necessary questions.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to appear before you today and will be glad to answer any questions which the Committee may have to the best of my ability.

TABLE 1.—DEPLOYMENT OF MAJOR ACTIVE GENERAL PURPOSE FORCES END—FISCAL YEAR 1970

	Fiscal year—			Air Force, tactical air wings	Navy carrier task forces ¹
	Army divisions	Marines Divisions	Wings		
NATO:					
Europe	4½			7	
Mediterranean (6th Fleet)		½	½		2
Continental United States (CONUS) ^{2,3}	5½	1½	1½	9	10
Northeast Asia:					
Korea/Japan/Okinawa	2	¼	¼	2	
Western Pacific (7th Fleet)		¾			1
Southeast Asia	5½	1	¾	5	3
Total, major units	17½	3	3	23	6

¹ Includes the Shangri-La, a CVS functioning as a CVA for the duration of the Vietnam war.
² Includes ¾ Army division assigned to 7th Army in Germany, and 2 Army divisions and 1½ Air Force wings specifically "earmarked" for NATO augmentation. The remainder are generally regarded as Strategic Reserve Forces (STRAF).
³ These active forces in CONUS were complemented by the following reserve forces: 8 Army divisions, 1 Marine division, 1 Marine air wing, 8½ Air Force tactical air wings and 2 Navy carrier air wings.
⁴ Includes 1 division (5th Mech. Div.) functioning as a training division for troops assigned to Vietnam.
⁵ Includes 3 to 4 in some stage of overhaul and 6 to 7 in some stage of training.

Source: Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Department of Defense Appropriations for 1971, Statement before a Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, 91 Cong., 2 sess., 1970, part I, pp. 13, 20; Gen. Leonard F. Chapman, Jr., *Ibid.*, p. 740; Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, CVAN-70 Aircraft Carrier, Testimony before the Joint Subcommittee of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees on CVAN-70 Aircraft Carrier, 91 Cong., 2 sess., Washington, D.C., p. 135; The Military Balance 1970-71, The Institute for Strategic Studies, London, 1970, p. 3-5.

TABLE 2.—MAJOR GENERAL PURPOSE FORCES AND COSTS OF ALTERNATIVE FORCE LEVELS—AS OF FISCAL YEAR END

	Fiscal year—			Alternative
	1965 ¹ pre-Vietnam "baseline" (actual)	1970 ² (actual)	1972 ³ (estimate)	
Land forces (division):				
Army:				
Active	16½	17½	13½	9½
Reserve	8	8	8	8
Marines:				
Active	3	3	3	3
Reserve	1	1	1	1
Total	28½	29½	25½	21½
Tactical air forces (wings):				
Air Force:				
Active	21	23	21	14
Reserve	7¾	8½	8½	8½
Navy:				
Active	15	14	11	8
Reserve	2	2	2	2
Marines:				
Active	3½	3½	3½	3
Reserve	1½	1½	1½	1
Total (Air Force wing equivalents) ⁴	53¾	55½	50½	40½
Naval forces (active forces):				
Attack carrier task forces CVA's/CV's)	15	15	13	10
ASW carrier task forces (CV's)	9	4	3	0
Amphibious task forces (MEF lift)	2	1½	1½	1½
Cost of general purpose forces (1971 dollars in billions) ⁵	\$44	\$46	\$40	\$32

¹ The Budget of the U.S. Government, fiscal year 1967, p. 76; Charles L. Schultze, *Setting National Priorities*, the 1971 budget, the Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1970, p. 19; the Military Balance, 1965-66, the Institute for Strategic Studies, London, 1965, p. 26; Robert S. McNamara, Department of Defense Appropriations, 1966, statement before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, 80 Cong., 1st sess., Washington, D.C., 1965, pt. 1, pp. 97, 113-115; Jane's Fighting Ships 1969-70, Jane's Yearbooks, London, 1970, pp. 395-404; Robert S. McNamara, Department of Defense Appropriations, 1969, statement submitted to the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, 90 Cong., 2d sess., Washington, D.C., 1968, pt. 5, p. 2739.
² Melvin R. Laird, fiscal year 1971 defense program and budget statement before a joint session of the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, GPO, Washington, D.C., 1970, pp. 127, 134-140, 142-143, 148-149, 153.
³ The Budget of the U.S. Government, fiscal year 1972, p. 88.
⁴ Marine air wings equivalent to about 2 Air Force (or Navy) tactical air wings; see footnote (1), table 5.
⁵ Author's estimates; reflects the estimated peacetime costs of all general purpose forces varying these major force elements. The cost of general purpose forces is the fiscal year 1971 budget cost (\$55,000,000,000) less the incremental costs of the Vietnam war (-\$11,000,000,000) plus the peacetime costs of maintaining 1 Army division force (+\$800,000,000), 1 more than the pre-Vietnam "baseline" (17½ vs. 16½). Of course, in 1972 dollars (with allowance for inflation and pay incentives) all costs would increase.

TABLE 3.—COMPOSITION OF ALTERNATIVE DIVISION FORCES—AS OF FISCAL YEAR END

	Fiscal year—			Alternative
	1965 ¹ pre-Vietnam "baseline" (actual)	1970 ² (actual)	1972 ³ (estimate)	
Active Forces:				
Army	16½	17½	13½	9½
Marines	3	3	3	3
Subtotal, active	19½	20½	16½	12½
Reserve Forces:				
Army	8	8	8	8
Marines	1	1	1	1
Subtotal, reserve	9	9	9	9
Total	28½	29½	25½	21½

¹ Fiscal year 1967 budget, p. 76; Schultze, *Setting National Priorities*; 1971 budget, p. 19. (The difference of ½ active Army division is due to the subsequent distinction between division forces and special mission forces).
² Laird, fiscal year 1971 Defense program and budget, p. 127.
³ Fiscal year 1972 budget, p. 88.
⁴ Includes 1 division activated during the Vietnam buildup for deployment to Vietnam.

TABLE 4.—ALLOCATION OF ALTERNATIVE ACTIVE AND RESERVE LAND FORCES BY CONTINGENCY¹

	Fiscal year—			Alternative
	Army	Marine	Total ²	
NATO Europe	17	(9) 1	18 (9)	
Or Asia (Korea or Southeast Asia)	12	(4) 3	15 (6)	
And minor contingency	½	(½) 1	1½ (1½)	

¹ Total alternative forces consists of 21½ divisions; see table 6 for allocation of alternative tactical air forces.
² Each could be complemented by 7 special forces groups, and various Navy special warfare forces.
³ Excludes 2 active Marine divisions for a temporary holding action in Korea or Southeast Asia
⁴ Excludes 4½ Active Army divisions based in Germany and ¾ division based in Conus and assigned to 7th Army.
⁵ Could be an Atlantic or Pacific-based division component of a Marine expeditionary force (MEF) with amphibious assault capability and a Conus-based airborne brigade.

TABLE 5.—COMPOSITION OF ALTERNATIVE TACTICAL (FIGHTER/ATTACK) AIR FORCES [In Air Force tactical air wing equivalents]¹

	Fiscal year—			Alternative
	1965 ² pre-Vietnam "baseline" (actual)	1970 ³ (actual)	1972 ⁴ (estimate)	
Active Forces:				
Air Force	21	23	21	14
Navy	15	14	11	8
Marines ¹	6	6	6	6
Subtotal, active	42	43	38	28
Reserve forces:				
Air Force	7¾	8½	8½	8½
Navy	2	2	2	2
Marines ¹	2	2	2	2
Subtotal, reserve	11¾	12½	12½	12½
Total	53¾	55½	50½	40½

¹ An Air Force fighter/attack wing has 72 U.E. aircraft. An attack carrier air wing includes about 75 U.E. fighter/attack aircraft, and thus, is equivalent to about 1 Air Force wing. However, a Marine air wing has about 140-145 U.E. fighter/attack aircraft and, therefore, is equivalent to about 2 Air Force wings.
² Schultze, *Setting National Priorities*; 1971 budget, p. 19; Military balance 1965-66, p. 26 McNamara, defense appropriations, 1966, pp. 113-115.
³ Laird, fiscal year 1971 defense program and budget, p. 134-140.
⁴ Fiscal year 1972 budget, p. 88.
⁵ Programmed at the time to become 24 wings for a total of 56¾ wings—exactly twice the "baseline" division force of 28½ divisions (see McNamara, defense appropriations, 1966, p. 113.)

TABLE 6.—ALLOCATION OF ALTERNATIVE ACTIVE AND RESERVE TACTICAL AIR FORCES BY CONTINGENCY¹

[In Air Force wing equivalents; active wings in parentheses]²

	Air Force/Navy	Marine	Total ³
NATO Europe or.....	29½ (19)	2 (—) ⁴	31½ (19)
Asia (Korea or Southeast Asia).....	21½ (11)	6 (4) ⁵	27½ (15)
And minor contingency.....	1 (1)	2 (2) ⁶	3 (3)

¹ Total alternative force consists of 40½ tactical air wings; see table 4 for allocation of alternative land forces.

² See footnote (1) to table 5.

³ Each could be complemented by Special Air Warfare Forces (SAWF), currently in Vietnam.

⁴ Excludes 2 active Marine air wings (or 4 AF equivalents) and 2 active AF/Navy air wings for a holding action in Korea/SEA.

⁵ Excludes 10 active AF/Navy air wings for NATO, including 7 Air Force wings based in central Europe.

⁶ Could be an Atlantic- or Pacific-based air wing component of a Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF), with amphibious assault capability, and a CONUS-based AF/Navy air wing.

TABLE 8.—DEPLOYMENT OF ALTERNATIVE ATTACK CARRIER (CVA) FORCE LEVELS

	In training/overhaul					Total
	Western Pacific	Pacific coast	Atlantic coast	Mediterranean	Other	
End fiscal year 1970 (actual) including Vietnam.....	4(6)	6	4	2	16
Alternative:						
1.....	3	6	4	2	15
2.....	2	4	4	2	12
3A.....	2	4	2	1	±1	10
3B.....	1	2	4	2	±1	10

¹ Admiral Moorer, CVAN-70 Aircraft Carriers, p. 306.

² Could be deployed in either the Atlantic or Pacific to augment existing forces, or to support the amphibious and airborne forces as a hedge against a minor contingency during a major European or Asian contingency.

TABLE 7.—COMPOSITION OF ALTERNATIVE ATTACK CARRIER (CVA/CV) FORCE LEVELS (CVA/CV'S AS OF END FISCAL YEAR)

	Fiscal year—			Alternative ⁴
	1965 ¹ pre-Vietnam "baseline" (actual)	1970 ² (actual)	1972 ³ (estimate)	
CVAN's:				
Nimitz class.....	1	1	1	1
Enterprise class.....	7	8	7	8
Post-World War II CVA's: Forrestal-class.....				
World War II CVA's:				
Midway-class.....	2	2	3	1
Hancock-class.....	4	4	1
Essex-class.....	1
Subtotal.....	15	15	12	10
CV functioning as a CVA: Essex class (Shangri-La).....	1
CV (CVA functioning as dual-purpose CVA/CVS): Forrestal-class (Saratoga).....	1	(1)
Total.....	15	16	13	10

¹ McNamara, Department of Defense appropriations, 1966, p. 97; Jane's 1969-70, pp. 395-404.

² Laird, 1971 Defense program and budget, p. 142.

³ Fiscal year 1972 budget, p. 88.

⁴ To maintain this force level through the 1970's would imply either cancellation of the Eisenhower (CVAN-69) or deactivation of 1 Forrestal-class CVA, the oldest of which (the Forrestal) would be 20 years old in fiscal year 1975.

⁵ In August 1970, deactivation of the Bon Homme Richard (Hancock class) was announced, which reduces the force level to 14 CVA's. In September 1970, the Midway completed a 4-year, \$207,000,000 modernization and replaced the Ticonderoga (Hancock class).

⁶ The Midway or the Oriskany (Hancock class) would be replaced in 1977 by CVAN-70 ("Navy Study on Attack Carriers" p. 93).

⁷ Laird, 1971 Defense program and budget, p. 1421.

⁸ Alternative does not preclude the use of some carriers as CV's.

A DRUG LESSON FROM THE JAPANESE BOOK

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw my colleagues' attention to the admirable concern of the physicians of Huntington, Long Island, about the misuse and abuse of amphetamines. Alarmed by the incident of misuse in their area and wary of the abuse patterns that developed in Japan and Sweden, these physicians decided to limit their prescriptions for amphetamines strictly to the treatments of two conditions for which there are no other drugs available; namely, hyperkinesia and narcolepsy.

As my colleagues know, between 5 and 8 billion amphetamine dosage units were produced in 1969, far in excess of the few hundred thousand that the medical experts told the Select Committee on Crime would be needed to treat hyperkinesia and narcolepsy, and even the first few weeks of diet control programs. So concerned were the members of the Select Committee on Crime that in the last Congress, with the unanimous support of the members of the committee, I introduced a bill to place stricter controls on the production and distribution of amphetamine type drugs, in the hopes that this would curb the abuse of the legitimately produced drugs. Unfortunately, the administration opposed our bill and the comprehensive drug abuse prevention and control bill was signed into law with the amphetamine-type drugs under a limited form of control in schedule III.

This year, with the support of the members of the Select Crime Committee, I have reintroduced the bill to transfer amphetamines, methamphetamines, methylphenidate—Ritalin—and phenmetrazine—Preludin—to schedule II. The administration finally, partially agreed with us and initiated proceedings on May 26, 1971, to transfer amphetamines and methamphetamines to the tighter controls of schedule II. Unfortunately, this is but a half measure. Ritalin and Preludin, amphetamine-type central nervous system stimulants, remain in schedule III under lesser controls. These two were the abused drugs in Japan and Sweden.

In commending the Long Island physicians for their foresight and self-imposed controls, I would also like to point out that a similar move was made by the Utah Medical Association in December 1970 when over half the association decided to cease prescribing amphetamines for the treatment of obesity. It is through the action of responsible groups such as these that drug misuse and abuse can be curbed. All the laws in the country will not prevent abuse without the help and support of the medical profession. It is my hope that the example of these groups will be followed by many.

I include the following two articles in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1971]

A DRUG LESSON FROM THE JAPANESE BOOK

(By Lawrence K. Altman)

The action that the physicians and pharmacists in Huntington, L.I., took yesterday to restrict the use of amphetamines reflects what Americans are now learning about this form of drug abuse—a lesson that the Japanese learned about 25 years ago.

The lesson is that tight controls may be necessary to prevent abuse of drugs such as amphetamines, which are potent stimulants of the brain.

"It is now obvious that not enough weight was given to the observations of the Japanese, who experienced a major epidemic of methamphetamine abuse immediately following World War II," Dr. Jerome H. Jaffee, a psychiatrist at the University of Chicago-Pritzker School of Medicine, said in the current edition of Goodman and Gilman's textbook, "The Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics."

The Japanese problem involved at its peak more than one million people, Dr. Jaffee said, as large stores of surplus methamphetamine, a type of amphetamine, were released for sale to a public "that had been notably free of all types of drug abuse."

Many American physicians have been concerned about the spreading use of amphetamines in view of the known pharmacological actions of these drugs.

"Bennies" (for Benzedrine), "dexies" (for dextroamphetamine) and "ups" are commonly used slang terms that students and truck drivers, among others, use when they swallow the pills to stay awake.

DRUG NOW INJECTED

Now more Americans are abusing amphetamines by injecting the drug as "speed" or "splash." Intravenous injections of amphetamines can cause marked euphoria, a false sense of markedly enhanced physical strength and mental capacity, and a feeling that sleep and food are not needed.

Amphetamine was apparently first studied pharmacologically in the early nineteenth-thirties.

The amphetamines are now known to be among the most potent stimulants of the brain and central nervous system. But the drug affects other organs as well. What the drug can do elsewhere in the body is to raise blood pressure, stimulate breathing, and in high doses, cause the heart to beat abnormally.

Dr. Myron Prinzmetal and Dr. W. Bloomberg are credited with first using amphetamine to treat narcolepsy, a rare disease of unknown cause that produces uncontrollable paroxysms of sleep, more frequently in men than in women.

Narcolepsy was one of the two conditions that the Huntington doctors agreed yester-

day was a legitimate indication for the drug. The other legitimate use, they said, is in hyperkinesis, a condition of overactivity in children.

Uses of amphetamines for depressed moods, like "the housewife blues," and obesity are the major abuses noted. Americans treat themselves with amphetamines that they have obtained from other patients who have obtained the pills on a doctor's prescription. Others are said to obtain the drug easily from illegal sources.

In many such cases, doctors have said, psychiatric care may be needed to treat the underlying, basic problems.

Physicians vary on prescribing or not prescribing amphetamines for patients. Thus some doctors would order the drug for a patient who was refused such a prescription from another physician. This, however, is characteristic of the way medicine is practiced.

EMBARGO ON AMPHETAMINE SET UP VOLUNTARILY ON LONG ISLAND

(By David A. Andelman)

HUNTINGTON, L.I., June 1.—More than half of the licensed physicians and pharmacists in the Town of Huntington have agreed voluntarily to stop prescribing and dispensing amphetamines except in two "medically required instances."

In what was described as the first such agreement in the country, 153 of the town's 240 licensed physicians and 27 of the 42 registered pharmacists agreed to stop prescribing and dispensing amphetamines except in the case of narcolepsy and hyperkinesis, two diseases for which the drug is the recognized treatment.

Narcolepsy is a disease in which the patient is incapable of staying awake and hyperkinesis is an extensive overactivity in small children. In both cases, amphetamines are the "indicated drug of choice," or preferable treatment.

"To such other actions as drug prevention and drug cure must be added drug withdrawal," Dr. Milton Gordon, chairman of the Suffolk County Medical Society narcotics task force that assisted the Huntington Narcotics Guidance Council in implementing the program, said at a news conference today.

Dr. Gordon said that there had been widespread abuse of amphetamines, particularly in the treatment of obesity and depression, sometimes known as "housewife blues."

"There are far better alternative methods of treatment of both conditions," he said, "and amphetamines have no place in this treatment."

REASON FOR PROGRAM

He said that it was felt by residents of the area and the physicians who participated in the program that it was "necessary to crack the drug sequence for all members of the community—that euphoria is possible in America today without the use of drugs."

Dr. Melville Rosen, past president of the Suffolk County Medical Society, told the news conference that the 153 physicians who agreed to the embargo represent "nearly 90 per cent of those physicians in the township who might regularly prescribe amphetamines."

Those who did not return the pledge statements, he said, generally through oversight, consisted largely of specialists such as anesthesiologists and dermatologists who would not normally prescribe the drugs.

Nine refused to sign the pledge, saying that they wished to "retain the freedom to judge each patient individually and prescribe the drug indicated," as one dissenting physician wrote.

An official of the American Medical Association said that the only other case on record of a similar embargo was a resolution

CXVII—1170—Part 14

passed last December by the Utah State Medical Association recommending that "physicians be asked to refrain from prescribing amphetamines or similar drugs for the treatment of obesity."

A.M.A. ACTION POSSIBLE

An A.M.A. spokesman said that his group had taken no official stand on the merits of a voluntary embargo but that the issue might be raised at the annual meeting of the House of Delegates of the A.M.A. later this month.

"On the one hand, people here say that any drug, even if it has a limited value, should be available to licensed physicians," the spokesman said in a telephone interview from Chicago. "On the other hand, physicians should continue to re-evaluate and re-examine their need for such drugs."

A spokesman for the Federal Food and Drug Administration said in Washington that his agency had "no comment" on the Huntington plan, since it did not wish to become involved in the question of what drugs physicians could or could not prescribe.

SEEK STATEWIDE EMBARGO

"The effect of this embargo will be favorable for the physician as well as the patient," said Dr. Rosen. "Too often, we, the physician, have taken the easy way out in cases of obesity or depression. We have said, 'Here is a pill,' when we should have sat down with the patient and gotten to the root of the problem."

Officials of the sponsoring Drug Council said they hoped to extend the pledge to all physicians in Suffolk County and to contact all 300 other drug councils in the state to gain a statewide embargo.

"By example we hope also eventually to make this a nationwide movement," said Arthur Goldstein, chairman of the Narcotics Council. "This is a nationwide problem, although we certainly must start locally."

He said the number of users of amphetamines in Huntington or in the county was not known since prescriptions are often circulated to many individuals other than the one to whom they were issued. He added, however, that 40 amphetamine pills for each man, woman and child in the country were produced by legitimate drug companies each year.

Last Wednesday the Justice Department took the first steps toward placing a production quota on amphetamines by drug companies.

"But these quotas will be set on the basis of how much is actually prescribed by legitimate physicians," Mr. Goldstein said. "Voluntary programs will cut down the base they use in determining production and will further limit the supply available."

"If we want to convince our children not to use drugs," he said, "then we must be prepared to set an example and show that we adults are not dependent on them for our everyday existence."

ANTI-AMERICANISM—NO LONGER A LUXURY WE CAN AFFORD

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, why do people who should know better try to tear American down instead of build it up? Why do public officials make the ridiculous claims that the Nation is captive of corruption and its Government leaders pawns of the military-industrial complex, whatever that may be?

Why do courts interpret the Constitution to allow conduct and speech demonstrably destructive of the very form of government that made the Constitution possible in the first place? Why do children take to drugs to seek through drug-induced euphoria an illusory and deceptive escape from life in the best and freest land of opportunity in all the world?

Who has been responsible for all this tragedy? In a word, the "anti-Americans" and it is about time they knocked it off, for as the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of May 23, 1971, so well points out, if they do not, America's youth will be consumed alive:

STOP IT, ANTI-AMERICANS

Stop it, you anti-Americans! Stop criticizing everything and everybody and every motive and every action except your own. Stop constantly sniping at your government. What in the world is the matter with you? You have the most wonderful nation on earth, a nation that has gone to extraordinary lengths to uplift the poor, feed the hungry, comfort the afflicted, and extend justice to everyone. Yet here you are, applauding the very people who degrade and mock America, who tell you how selfish and corrupt Americans are.

Your own eyes and your own common sense should tell you that in no other land, under no other system, is the individual more respected or better treated. Nowhere is a person as free to do what he wants with his life. Nowhere in the world, despite our occasional overemphasis on getting and spending, are charity and service to mankind more practiced or revered than right here in America.

For the past couple of years you have allowed a small handful of hypocritical critics to flagnellate us and our government. Be realistic, America. Where is your sense of proportion? We aren't a debased or rotten nation. We have our share of criminal misfits, but most of us are pretty decent people—hard-working, law-abiding, God-fearing. All of us want a better life for ourselves and our children, and most of us want a better life for our neighbors too.

But this anti-Americanism is corrupting our national soul. It's having a harmful effect on our children, who are beginning to believe it. This false picture is making it easier for the haters, the doomsmen and the malcontents, those with the biggest mouths and the smallest consciences, to mislead and confuse us. It is twisting our values, making it difficult for our children to know right from wrong.

Thousands of American boys have been killed in Vietnam by being trapped in Viet Cong villages where men, women and children were paraded as villagers, when actually they were armed with Viet Cong cocktails, bombs and what have you. Our boys were trying to be decent to the villagers and suddenly they found themselves completely surrounded by the whole village, armed to the teeth. But the poor bleeding hearts in America, these anti-American so-called patriots, instead of having any sympathy for our boys, who of course had to fight back, felt sorry for the old men and children who got hurt in the mix-up. Of course they would get hurt in that kind of a mess. We had a lot of boys killed in that action. The anti-Americans had no sympathy for our boys, but they had all kinds of sympathy for the poor villagers who were simply used, innocently or otherwise, by the Viet Cong. This is war, make no mistake about it, but these anti-American loudmouths seem to believe we have no right to wage it in our own defense.

One United States senator actually made a statement that the American prisoners of war in Hanoi might as well just stay there,

because they certainly wouldn't have been prisoners of war if they had had enough sense not to enlist for a useless and barbaric war. Well, the facts are they didn't enlist—they were drafted. And many of the very same men who voted to support President Kennedy when he went into Vietnam and who supported the Tonkin Resolution, later, when the war became unpopular, turned about face and blamed the whole thing on President Johnson. And now they are blaming the war on President Nixon, who didn't have a single thing to do with starting this war. But the very men who are loudest in their criticism of President Nixon and the present situation in Vietnam, which is gradually being solved, are the very ones who really helped start the whole mess. This is the worst display of national hypocrisy we have ever witnessed in this country.

It is unbelievable that so small a minority of Americans could create such a terrible atmosphere in this country. If it were not for the loudmouths the world would not know anything about what is going on here, because it is so much more peaceful here, and safer, than any place else in the world. But to hear these bleeding hearts yell, you would think Russia is a Utopia compared to America.

Stop this anti-American rot. Because if you don't, America's youth will be consumed by the stench of this hypocritical rhetoric.

Stop it, America, before it is too late!

GOVERNOR REAGAN SPEAKS ON POW ISSUE

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Governor Reagan is one of our Nation's most eloquent speakers. More importantly, he captures the spirit of America, he finds good in people, and he "tells it like it is" when he speaks on national issues.

Many Californians are missing in action or prisoners of war in Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam, and North Vietnam, so Governor Reagan has a special interest in the POW issue.

Recently in Los Angeles, at a POW/MIA International, Inc., dinner, Governor Reagan successfully put in much clearer perspective a number of issues about POW's, America, our present responsibilities and policies relating to peace in Vietnam.

I commend to every Member the speech of Governor Reagan and include excerpts therefrom in the body of the RECORD at this point:

It is customary for a speaker, when invited to address such a distinguished gathering, to describe the opportunity as a privilege. And I am privileged to be with you this evening, privileged and honored.

No one could stand before this particular assembly without also feeling deep humility and great pride.

Humility because that is the only possible emotion in the face of the human courage and sheer fortitude we are acknowledging by our presence here tonight; and pride because it is an occasion for pride to see so many Americans expressing their personal concern for the fate of a gallant few.

It is these missing men who are the real guests of honor here tonight. And perhaps it is appropriate for us to leave one empty chair on this rostrum and mark it reserved—

reserved for those who cannot be with us, but whose courage and endurance in captivity brought us together.

We are not here for a partisan reason. We are here for a humanitarian cause. And our cause transcends any political divisions. We are not here as hawks or doves. We are here as Americans who are concerned about the plight of almost 1,600 brave countrymen who are missing or held prisoner by the enemy in Southeast Asia.

Some of them have been held captive for six or even seven years . . . longer than any other prisoners in any of our past wars or conflicts. The fact that we do not even know how many are prisoners is a grim reminder of the inhumane and barbaric treatment they are enduring.

In violation of the most basic terms of the Geneva Convention, the enemy has not given us a complete listing of the men they hold prisoner. The North Vietnamese Communists have not allowed Red Cross teams to visit the internment camps to see that these prisoners are receiving humane treatment. They have not permitted release of the sick and injured. And they have not even exhibited a minimum of human decency and compassion * * *.

Instead, time and again, the Communists have cruelly and cynically used the plight of our missing men in a sadistic game to further their own aims.

Only some among us tonight—the wives and families of these brave men—can ever really know in full measure the terrible anguish this inhumanity has caused.

But millions of Americans, from every corner of this land, who can only try to imagine your pain, say to you and to all the other wives and relatives of our missing and imprisoned men: We want with all our hearts to share your burden.

There is an extra element of tragedy in the plight of your husbands, sons and brothers. Unlike other conflicts, in other times, they cannot take comfort in the knowledge that whatever their hardships, America is united behind them.

This is the first group of American prisoners of war who have ever had to endure—along with captivity—the bitter awareness that some of their own countrymen are more concerned about the enemy than about them. No doubt many participate in parades for peace with all sincerity, but I would find that easier to believe if they weren't marching beneath the enemy's flag.

One of the more prominent demonstrators recently said on national television the prisoner of war problem was a "joke" and that there is no way to get them home without setting a firm date for withdrawal in advance.

The issue of the prisoners is not a joke. It is now the single most important issue involved in this long and savage war and we want them back now.

Those in America who speak of "peace" say it can be easily purchased by accepting the terms the enemy has dictated. They imply that the United States and those who serve their country's military forces do not share their desire for peace. Whatever the divisions we may have over the origins of the Vietnam War, the desire for peace is unanimous. And nowhere is this felt more strongly than among the men who know the sight and sound and smell of war.

Some of the ugliest and more lasting scars in this war have been inflicted, not by the enemy on a far-away battlefield, but by divisions among our own people, at home, in our own streets.

Psychological warfare is practiced in time of war to reduce the enemy's belief in his own cause, to make him distrust his own leaders and colleagues . . . to raise serious doubts in his own mind about the justice of his system of government and to make

him lose faith in the stated objectives of his society.

No matter what their declared intent or how sincere the demonstrators' desire for "peace", they have been fulfilling the mission of psychological warfare—not against the enemy, but against our own nation.

And the cost of this has been the unnecessary deaths of thousands of young Americans and an unnecessary prolonging of the suffering and hardships of our prisoners of war.

Peace demonstrators subscribe to many myths easily exposed if only they were interested in the truth. How many students have been assigned Marvin Gettleman's book on the Vietnam War as outside reading? And have any been told to test its blatant propaganda against the historical facts in "Vietnam: Anatomy of Conflict" (by Wesley Fishel)?

Professor Fishel's book commits the apparent academic sin of recalling the *entire* history of the Vietnam conflict, including the fact that that great Vietnamese patriot, Ho Chi Minh, never saw his native land in all the years between 1911 and 1940.

Nor was this because he was in lonely exile. He was a founder of the French Communist Party and in 1924, worked in Moscow as an official representative of the French Communists. When he did return to Vietnam, he did so as a representative of the Comintern, fomenting revolution against the French in that phase of this long war.

Ho Chi Minh was not even a true Vietnamese nationalist. In fact, in 1946 . . . before the National Union movement had actually engaged the French in combat . . . Ho engineered the slaughter of many Vietnamese nationalist supporters . . . those who were interested in a truly free Vietnam.

One of the Communist tactics was simple assassination of all who dared disagree with them. Another was to send the Vietnamese nationalists as a vanguard against the French. In one incident, 2,000 young Vietnamese between the ages of 15 and 20 were left to defend Hanoi while Ho's own Communist forces slipped out the back door. This was hardly original with Ho—it is standard Communist operating procedure.

Or doesn't anyone remember World War II when the Polish and Jewish guerrillas in the Warsaw ghetto were told by the advancing Soviet armies to rise up and strike against the Nazis as the Russians attacked the city.

The signal was given and Warsaw freedom fighters struck with every weapon they had, including rocks and bricks. But, the Soviet army halted its advance and waited—waited until there were no sounds of conflict from the ghetto—not even the cries of the wounded—just a deadly silence. The Communists would not be sharing power with local leaders when they took over Poland from the Nazis.

It only took a few days in Warsaw. In Hanoi the young Vietnamese nationalists betrayed by Ho Chi Minh held out for two months before the benevolent kindly dictator Uncle Ho heard the silence he was waiting for.

Another myth is that at the Geneva Conference on Indo-China in 1954, the United States and South Vietnam agreed to hold free elections to unify the country and that we refused to honor the agreement for fear Ho would win. All propagandists sell this one—Richard Goodwin, Felix Greene, Dr. Spock and Norman Cousins. They often misuse a quote from the late President Eisenhower to support this claim—always carefully omitting the lines which would reveal he was speaking of an election that would have pitted Ho Chi Minh or anyone else against the French puppet Emperor Bao Dai.

The truth is the United States and South Vietnam did not endorse the so-called 1956 election proposal—not because they were not

interested in free elections, but because Ho Chi Minh and the Communists refused to agree to hold such free elections under international supervision. The United States was not included as an official party in the final settlement of the French Indo-China war.

Subsequently South Vietnam repeatedly proposed free elections throughout the country—to be held under international supervision when peace and order was restored. Always it was Ho who refused.

In 1955 the people of South Vietnam proved the correctness of President Eisenhower's assessment of Emperor Bao Dai. In a legitimate referendum with 90 percent of the people participating he was overwhelmingly defeated by the late President Diem.

A year later the Diem government announced that South Vietnam would accept the defacto separation of Vietnam and would not resort to force in an effort to re-unify the country. He urged the re-unification of Vietnam by peaceful means through truly democratic and free elections. Again it was Ho who rejected such overtures.

Then on May 8, 1960, Ho Chi Minh held his kind of election. There was no need for voting booths because there was no secret ballot. The people of Vietnam marked their ballots at tables set up on street corners, helped by Ho's Communist agents. And what do you know? Ho got almost 99 percent of the vote. Less than a third of the other offices were even contested.

All this time there was an International Control Commission set up by the 1954 Geneva agreements. It did very little because the Communists had insisted on unanimous decisions. The representatives were from Canada, India and Communist Poland and the Communist member could be counted on for a consistent veto. Finally in 1962 the representatives of Canada and India charged the Communists of North Vietnam with subversive and hostile actions designed to overthrow the free government of South Vietnam.

This is just part of the history so often edited out of the versions some of our students receive.

But all of this is historical fact—available to anyone who seeks the truth about Vietnam.

For those in the demonstrations and marches, especially those who truly believe in peace and prefer to march under our flag—I have a question: suppose we do what they propose? Tell the enemy we are getting out now—give them a date and unilaterally lay down our weapons? We are told the enemy will leave our departing men unmolested and return our prisoners after we have reduced our presence to zero—demonstrators, Congressmen, Senators and any number of assorted bleeding hearts tell us this.

What if they are wrong? What if there is even one chance that the enemy descends on our retreating forces once their numbers had been sufficiently reduced? What if there is a battle on the beach—a "Dunkirk" with thousands of our young men killed and captured? Do our pleaders for peace have facts not known to the President? Will they guarantee absolutely this will not happen?

The answer, of course, is they have no such facts and they can make no such certain guarantee. They are just sure in their own minds that everything will turn out all right. If it does not—well their purpose was noble. Their only sin was wanting peace—at any price. But someone else will pay that price.

The President has no such easy write-off. As Commander-in-Chief he must take into consideration even that one in a million possibility of disaster—for he must answer to each one of our men and for each one of them.

Into his consideration must go all that he knows of the enemy—the murder of more than 30,000 village leaders, the violation of holiday truces, the slaughter and burial of thousands of men, women and children at

Hue. He must remember the terrorist bombings of school rooms, buses, movie theaters and street corner crowds long before we were even in the war. There are a million refugees who fled North Vietnam to escape the mass executions in the North which were as savage and senseless as the mass murder of landlords by Mai Tse Tung in China.

For four years we have sat at the table in Paris offering bombing halts, cease fires and mutual withdrawal. Never once has the enemy said "If you do this your prisoners will be returned", he has said only that he will talk about it if we will quit.

Some of those who yearn for peace as well as some members of Congress have been playing Russian Roulette again at no risk to themselves. For the gun was always aimed at someone else's head.

There are signs that the enemy—badly hurt in Cambodia and Laos—was putting out feelers indicating he might finally be ready to do business in the Paris meetings. The massive demonstrations, the talk in Congress of trying to vote our capitulation, has given him reason to hang on a while longer, to launch raids and increase American casualties for propaganda value here at home. How many young Americans died and will die in Vietnam because of the parades and speeches in Washington? The enemy has been encouraged to believe he can win the cruel waiting game—not by how many divisions he can put in the field in Vietnam but by how many divisions there are among our own people—here in America.

The President has chosen, as he should, a program of withdrawal geared directly to the ability of the South Vietnamese to assume responsibility of their own defense. And this too is our concern, or have some of us decided we no longer hold out the hand of brotherhood to the downtrodden?

At one of our state colleges recently a speaker was explaining our Vietnam policy. A middle-aged man in the audience began heckling him and of course was immediately joined by a certain element among the students. Then a young man in the audience stood up and addressed the hecklers. He was an exchange student from Vietnam—in fact a refugee from North Vietnam.

He said, "If you don't think it is in your interest to help my country—why don't you get out? It's that easy, you don't have to find a reason—just go." And then he made it plain that his people needed our help, but he asked, "Do you really ever think about our people, wonder about them—do you care about them? If you don't—if you don't want to help us then go home." The crowd was silent—I would like to think—ashamed.

We can hope that meetings like this one here tonight will help Hanoi from fatally misreading the mood of America.

The President has offered the Communists an immediate cease fire throughout Indochina, the immediate release of all prisoners, an all Indochina peace conference, complete withdrawal of all outside forces and a political settlement of the hostilities there. But he has said we will not abandon our men who are prisoners. We will stay as long as we have to and do what we have to, to get them back.

Millions of Americans must endorse this position, must in a thunderous voice tell Congressmen, Senators and the faint of heart—but most particularly the enemy—he is not going to win his way here in Main Street America.

Some of the young ladies on my staff have been wearing bracelets which are distributed by a student group on behalf of our prisoners.

Each bracelet bears a name and date. The name of a missing man and the date he was lost. One reads—Lt. David Rehmann—12-2-66. The lieutenant is a U.S. Navy pilot from Lancaster, California. He is known to be a prisoner—a captive for 4½ years.

I find myself asking, "Where do we find such men?" Young men who leave their

homes and loved ones to go half a world away. They fly out over a strange land through machine gun and rocket fire and then having done their appointed task seek out a dot on the ocean and try to land in stormy darkness on the heaving deck of a carrier.

What produces these young men—where do they come from? The answer is so simple. America produces them and has in every time of crisis for 200 years. They come from our cities, our farms, our small towns.

Last December, T.V. recorded the White House meeting of the President and some of the gallant leaders of that daring attempt to rescue prisoners from a camp in the enemy heartland. The President asked the commander where he had found such men. The answer so quietly given should have thrilled every American. He said, "We could have had thousands, Sir." Thousands willing to gamble their lives to save another—greater glory hath no man.

But even this heroic rescue mission became the object of criticism and debate by some public officials whose carping surely lent some measure of comfort to the enemy.

A decade ago, an American President said that Americans should let the world go forth that we would pay any price, bear any burden, to assure the survival of all those things we hold precious—to guarantee that the freedoms we enjoy will be secured for our children and their children.

Those words should be a reminder of the very meaning and purpose of government; to offer the protection of all to even the least among us wherever in the world he may be. Distance alone must not be allowed to rob a man of his God-given right of life and liberty.

If we are unwilling to make such a pledge to each other then our trumpet will sound an uncertain note and all the world will hear. And therein lies great danger. From the vantage point of history, we look back on wars we might have avoided had an enemy not mistaken our desire for peace or our patience for weakness.

We are not given to bellicose sabre rattling or unnecessary belligerence. But the savage captors of our young men must be made to know that each one of those young men is precious to us; that there will be no peace until they are restored to their families. Our President has said as much. Now it is up to all of us to make it unmistakably clear to the enemy that he spoke only what is in the heart of each one of us. We will not buy our peace by abandoning even one American.

(NOTE—Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in the above text. However, the governor will stand by the above quotes.)

GOVERNMENTAL WASTE

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, one of the main concerns of our people is the high cost of government at all levels. As a result of this high cost, their taxes are at record levels, they are almost more than many of them, especially our senior citizens, can bear.

To bring some relief to these hard-pressed taxpayers, we must practice strict economy at every level of government.

Curtis Warnke, editor of the Wood Lake News, in our Sixth Congressional District, was greatly disturbed recently at receiving a Government telegram an-

nouncing a change of meeting place of an Environmental Protection Agency conference in Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share this thought-provoking editorial with all of the people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. With your permission, I am hereby inserting it:

EDITORIAL BY CURTIS WARNKE

About a year ago we wrote a strong editorial criticizing the various governmental agencies for sending out literally hundreds of thousands of news releases and thus filling our wastebasket at taxpayer expense—the tide has not turned, and as a matter of fact if anything the situation has gotten worse. Most of these so-called "news releases" are blatant attempts at "putting feathers in their own caps" and contribute absolutely nothing to good government. The government payroll, the paper costs, the postage costs, etc., to send out all this propaganda must amount to a staggering figure in dollars and cents. Certainly the taxpaying citizen would be better served if the governmental agencies would curtail or quit this practice. It makes no sense at all!

But even worse than that is the occasional telephone call or telegram the average newspaper receives from these governmental agencies. Some of them are really asinine.

A good case in point was last Friday night. The editor was in the shop working until about ten p.m. He then went to the Wood Lake Cafe for a cup of coffee. At approximately 10:30 the phone rang there and the operator told the proprietor she was trying to reach the Editor of the Wood Lake News. When called to the phone, she told us that she had an "important telegram" to read to us from Washington, D.C. Not knowing what to expect, we told her to read it naturally!

What a tremendous disappointment! The telegram was from some federal agency—something like the Environmental Control Agency or some such animal! And it said something to the effect that the press conference for some Mr. Rumble Rumpleskin or somebody had been changed from the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago to some other hotel for Monday morning. The telegram went on to say that it was necessary to change the meeting room because of a conflict, etc.

Now— isn't that something! As though the Wood Lake News was sending a reporter to hear Mr. Rumble Rumpleskin in the first place. Heaven forbid. We've had it with governmental agencies, commissions, etc. on this publicity bit!

We dare not venture how many newspapers in the country they telegraphed to convey the important message that Mr. Rumble Rumpleskin was taking in another room, but can guess it would number in the thousands. And at \$5 to \$6 a crack, that ain't peanuts! And we'd also venture a guess that not over two people so telegraphed gave a damn one way or the other.

It's high time for the legislatures and the congress to investigate this practice of self-perpetuation engaged in by the "animals" they have created. As you can tell from the tone of this editorial, we are getting sick of it!

TAXPAYERS BENEFIT BY EFFICIENCY IN PITTSBURGH COURTS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the courts revitalization program begun 8 years ago under the imaginative leader-

ship of former Congressman and President Judge of Common Pleas Court Henry Ellenbogen has had several "firsts" and has paid some amazing dividends. Among these, reducing the time lag between date of accident and court hearing to the lowest of any major metropolitan area—one and a half years; 83 percent of cases are settled before trial. All of this, of course, results in lower costs for the taxpayers.

Mr. Charles Starrett was appointed as Pittsburgh's first court administrator, and an IBM data processing machine was installed to gather statistics, the first in a U.S. court.

In his appointment of Judge Ruggero Aldisert, Judge Ellenbogen made another wise selection. In his role of calendar control judge, Judge Aldisert, now a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, has worked diligently with lawyers, judges, claimants, in an effort to really clear the deck and has been able to settle over 25 percent of pending cases in pretrial conciliation conferences.

This month's issue of Reader's Digest carries the Pittsburgh courts story, which I include at this point in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

PITTSBURGH'S PROGRAM FOR EFFICIENT COURTS

(By Murray Teigh Bloom)

In most of the country, the battle of the civil-court backlog is a losing one: every year the interval between the time an accident occurs and the time final settlement is made grows longer and longer. According to the Institute of Judicial Administration, the average time between joining of the suit and trial is roughly three to five years in Chicago, about four years in New York and Philadelphia, and three years in Detroit. As a result, accident victims and insurance companies suffer financial loss, sloppy trial habits flourish, and the public pays increased court costs.

But one U.S. metropolis, Allegheny County (Pittsburgh, Pa.), has won this continuing battle by reducing the time lag to the shortest interval for any major (population more than 1.5 million) metropolitan area—one and one half years. Most lawyers and judges agree that, in order to see how injuries develop, at least a year should elapse before a case is tried.

Pittsburgh's new regime started in 1963, when Henry Ellenbogen, a former Congressman and veteran judge, became President Judge of the Court of Common Pleas. Ellenbogen was determined to improve the court's efficiency. "There were no statistics," he recalls, "so there was no way of knowing how far behind we were."

To find out, Ellenbogen appointed Charles H. Starrett, Jr., as Pittsburgh's first court administrator. Starrett, a newspaperman with years of experience in covering the courts, investigated the possibility of a data-processing system, and in 1964 International Business Machines installed one—the first of its kind in a U.S. court—which told Pittsburgh just how long it took to settle each case.

"But having accurate statistics was the merest beginning," Ellenbogen says. "To slash through our backlog, we would have to settle more cases much more efficiently."

There were obstacles aplenty. In Pittsburgh, as elsewhere, long delay had become a comfortable way of life for the judges, comfortable and profitable for some lawyers. Delay enabled many negligence lawyers to build up an inventory of cases. Some pursued their more lucrative ones and stalled on those they did not want to try. Others delayed cases simply because they preferred, for tax

reasons, to get their contingent fee as a part of their next year's earnings.

In addition, some negligence law firms routinely waited to collect an inventory of cases involving one insurance company so that a package deal could be made with the claims manager. Finally, Ellenbogen found that many lawyers came into court ill prepared, through not knowing the law or the full facts of a case. This meant that the case might take twice as long as it should have.

As a start in promoting earlier settlements, Judge Ellenbogen appointed Judge Ruggero Aldisert—one of the 19 judges who then made up Allegheny County's Court of Common Pleas—as calendar-control judge. Aldisert's job: to get as many cases settled as rapidly as possible before trial. Aldisert, then 43, had been a successful negligence lawyer before going on the bench. "The first thing we discovered," Aldisert told me, "was that the lawyers would cooperate only if they knew that we would get tough."

One of the first get-tough areas was continuances. A trial would often be delayed because one of the lawyers did not want it tried and asked for a continuance. Pittsburgh's courts began a policy of giving no continuances which were asked for on the day of trial. Lawyers then came in with pleas of heart attacks. "When I wouldn't budge," Aldisert recalls, "the attorneys started claiming that they had a trial that day in federal court, which traditionally gets precedence over local court trials. Most of these excuses weren't valid, so we began a regular conference between our clerks and the federal-court clerks on pending cases to get an honest picture of which lawyers would be needed where and when. That ended the phony federal-court excuse."

To make the no-continuance policy more credible, a courtroom, a judge and a jury always had to be available when a lawyer's plea was turned down. Pittsburgh began pre-selecting juries on Friday for trials beginning the first thing Monday morning, thus saving half a day for each trial. Judges cooperated by cutting down on their delays between trials—often three to four hours—to a mere 30 minutes.

But soon a new obstacle emerged. Most cases were being handled by a comparatively small group of lawyers. About 20 law firms represented some 81 percent of the plaintiffs in the area, and about 14 law firms did nearly all the trial work for the insurance companies. Inevitably, these busy lawyers would get so jammed up that the court calendar would call for their trying two or more cases at the same time. Aldisert quickly made it clear that delays would not be allowed on this ground. The solution: the court arbitrarily assigned ready cases to other lawyers in the overburdened attorney's office.

Nevertheless, Ellenbogen and Aldisert knew that the success of their program still depended primarily on the number of settlements they could effect before trial. To facilitate such settlements, both sides now meet with a judge for a conference two to three months before the trial is scheduled. Then, after examining the essential facts and medical reports, the judge has private sessions with each side, at which the lawyers tell the judge, off the record, what kind of settlement they really have in mind.

"Most of the time," says Aldisert, "the basic difference between sides is not what happened at the accident but how much the damages should be. At one of these sessions the complaint's lawyer said, 'Judge, I've got to have \$20,000 on this one.' Then a few minutes later the insurance company lawyer said, 'Confidentially, judge, I can't go over \$25,000. Of course, he thanked me when I got it settled for \$20,000.'

These conciliation conferences settle 25 percent of the pending cases. But if the case is not settled by the day of the trial, a "last chance" conference is called. "Now there's

a great incentive to settle," explains Aldisert, "particularly if the judge is a good mediator." Judge Ellenbogen holds the local record; on one day he conciliated 70 cases. If these had gone to trial, the cost to the public would have been \$280,000.

By their efficient and imaginative methods Pittsburgh's courts have been able to get 83 percent of their cases settled before trial, and only about seven percent of all cases actually get as far as the jury verdict.

Aldisert believed that even this percentage left too many cases on the docket. He began analyzing the work patterns of lawyers who seemed to have a disproportionate number of trials. Every year at a bench-bar conference, the calendar-control judges (there are now two) meet with representatives of the leading law firms. Says Aldisert, "We tell these lawyers exactly how many of their cases are being settled, and at what stage, and how many went to trial. One firm, for example, had three times as many cases going to trial as the average. I told them that by insisting on trial they were not only costing the public money but were losing money themselves.

"What Pittsburgh did is now being copied by other cities," Judge Aldisert told me recently. He is now a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. "And maybe it is time for all of us to think seriously about related problems that don't get as much attention as crowded court calendars, yet have a strong bearing on them. For example, should the taxpayer have to bear the entire burden of civil-court cases over auto accidents? If the litigants knew that they had to pay a good part of the court costs, you'd see less haggling over small amounts."

Judge Aldisert has other ideas about how we can reduce the length and costs of accident trials. "Most of these trials run four days, often because plaintiff lawyers feel that unless the case is extended in court the jury won't be impressed. Actually, the juror's interest is usually lost after the second day; he has heard too many witnesses say exactly the same thing.

"I think that there should also be health checks on all prospective judges. Absenteeism in older judges has put more large city courts behind schedule than almost any other single factor."

Pittsburgh's judges are understandably proud that they have reduced their inventory of cases to a tolerable level. But no one has any illusions. "You can't relax," says Ellenbogen. "New ideas are opposed even by earnest lawyers and well-meaning judges. The only way our changes can spread widely and quickly is for the public to become aware that the courts are *their* courts, run by *their* taxes. Courts should not be run for the convenience of lawyers and judges."

**AMERICA'S MOST DECORATED
WORLD WAR II VETERAN—AUDIE
MURPHY—LAID TO REST IN AR-
LINGTON CEMETERY**

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker at Arlington National Cemetery this morning, Audie Murphy, the most decorated veteran of World War II, was laid to rest among thousands of other American heroes who have fought to preserve the freedom of our great country. He joined the Army in June 1942. He was in Casablanca in 1943 and took part in the landing in Sicily that same year and then landed at Anzio. His company fought

many battles in Italy and southern France. Out of 235 men, Murphy and one supply sergeant were the only ones left of the original group at the end of his foreign tour. Audie Murphy was a brave soldier and among many other decorations he received the highest award that can be bestowed on any American by his country, the Medal of Honor. In January 1945, an American infantry company fighting the huge Colmar pocket in eastern France was besieged by six tanks and waves of German infantry. Second Lieutenant Audie Murphy, who was in charge of the American company, ordered his outnumbered men to withdraw to cover of a nearby wooded area then continued to give fire directions to his artillery on a field telephone. Behind him an American tank burst into flames. As the crew fled for shelter Lieutenant Murphy leaped to the top of the burning tank, grabbed its 50-caliber machinegun and stood there exposed on three sides to the enemy, firing into the German lines. For more than an hour, despite a leg wound he continued firing until he had killed or wounded an estimated 50 Germans. When the enemy began to retreat, Lieutenant Murphy rejoined his men and organized a counterattack and secured the woods. After having been wounded three times, Lieutenant Murphy was returned to stateside duty. In addition to the Medal of Honor, Murphy received 24 war decorations from the American Government including the Distinguished Service Cross, the Legion of Merit, the Silver Star, the Bronze Star, and the Purple Heart. He received three decorations from the French Government, including the Croix de Guerre with palm and was also decorated by the Belgian Government.

Mr. Speaker, Audie Murphy was a fellow Texan. His father was a sharecropper and Audie was one of 11 children who helped pick cotton to help support his family. Despite an early life of poverty, he believed with all his heart in America and her traditions.

In these troubled times in America, it is my fervent hope that the spirit and gallantry of this great soldier will inspire all Americans, especially our young adults, to defend the freedoms which Audie Murphy so valiantly fought to preserve for them.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to convey my deepest condolences to Audie Murphy's wife and their three children over their great loss.

NOISE AND THE WORKER

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in the report "Noise-Sound Without Value," which was issued in September 1968, by the Federal Council for Science and Technology, the number of workers in the United States experiencing noise conditions unsafe to hearing was estimated as being "in excess of 6 million and as high as 16 million." Some experts feel that the

number of workers subjected to potentially harmful noise levels exceeds the number exposed to any other health hazard in the work environment.

This exposure to noise is not merely an irritant to the worker—it is a direct threat to his mental and physical health. Excessive noise can inflict damage on the ear, resulting in temporary and even permanent hearing loss. It disrupts sleep, causes annoyance, interferes with speech. Research has shown that noise can affect mental health, physiological activities, and even workers' efficiency.

Certain effects of noise may lead to industrial accidents by interfering with speech and auditory warning signals and by increasing annoyance and fatigue and decreasing alertness.

On May 29, the Secretary of Labor published in the Federal Register the noise exposure limitations he has promulgated under the new Occupational Safety and Health Act, Public Law 91-596. However, these standards are demonstrably too lax to protect the majority of working men and women. Scientific research has clearly shown that prolonged exposure to noise levels of 85 decibels or more will result in permanent hearing impairment for the average individual. Yet, these new standards afford no more protection than the old Walsh-Healey standards—90 decibels for an 8-hour day.

I believe it is interesting to note that over 2 years ago, in January 1969, the outgoing Johnson administration proposed noise standards considerably more stringent than these, restricting workday exposure to maximum of 85 decibels.

In order to insure more adequate protection for workers from excessive and harmful noise than that afforded by those standards set under the Occupational Safety and Health Act, I have introduced legislation which would amend that act to direct the Secretary of Labor to promulgate noise exposure limitations no less protective than provided in the following table:

Permissible noise exposures	
Duration per day, hours:	Sound level dBA
8 hours	80
6	82
4	85
3	87
2	90
1½	92
1	95
½	100
¼ or less	105

This legislation, the Occupational Noise Control Act of 1971 (H.R. 6990 and H.R. 6991), would produce an across-the-board reduction of 10 decibels from these levels currently in effect. Because of the nature of the decibel scale, a reduction of 10 decibels means that the perceived loudness would be cut in half.

Thirty-five Members of Congress have joined me in sponsoring the Occupational Noise Control Act of 1971. They are: BELLA S. ABZUG, of New York. JOSEPH ADDABBO, of New York. HERMAN BADILLO, of New York. NICK BEGICH, of Alaska. MARIO BIAGI, of New York. JONATHAN BINGHAM, of New York.

FRANK BRASCO, of New York.
 PHILLIP BURTON, of California.
 JAMES C. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire.

JOHN CONYERS, of Michigan.
 RONALD DELLUMS, of California.
 JOHN G. DOW, of New York.
 DON EDWARDS, of California.
 ELLA T. GRASSO, of Connecticut.
 SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York.
 MICHAEL HARRINGTON, of Massachusetts.

KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia.
 HENRY HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey.
 LOUISE DAY HICKS, of Massachusetts.
 ROBERT KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin.
 EDWARD KOCH, of New York.
 ROBERT LEGGETT, of California.
 ABNER MIKVA, of Illinois.
 PARRIN MITCHELL, of Maryland.
 WILLIAM MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania.
 CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida.
 BERTRAM PODELL, of New York.
 CHARLES B. RANGEL, of New York.
 THOMAS M. REES, of California.
 ROBERT ROE, of New Jersey.
 BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL, of New York.
 EDWARD ROYBAL, of California.
 JAMES SCHEUER, of New York.
 JOHN SEIBERLING, of Ohio, and
 LESTER WOLFF, of New York.

The enactment of this legislation would be a major step toward making our factories, construction sites, and places of work more tolerable—and less unhealthy—for the American worker.

At this point I include the new occupational health and safety regulations on noise exposure and an article from the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America's publication, *UE News*, of May 31, 1971, detailing the dangers of on-the-job noise.

The documents follow:

FACTORY NOISE CAUSES GREAT HEALTH DAMAGE, EXPERT WARNS

NEW YORK.—Continuous loud factory noise can do great damage to the health of workers, a leading hearing specialist has explained.

The expert, Dr. Samuel Rosen, internationally known for making major innovations in hearing loss treatment, urged workers "to raise hell with the bosses—noisily" to quiet the plant down, and to use the new Job Safety Act to ask for federal investigations of high noise levels in workplaces.

He made these remarks at the recent Occupational Health Conference, attended by UE representatives, along with representatives from trade unions all over the nation.

There are many ways an employer can safeguard his workers against noise, the doctor continued, but most take the least effective measure—requiring employees to wear ear muffs or ear plugs.

Dr. Rosen stressed that damage to health continues even after workers feel they are used to the loud noises, and that noise not only causes deafness, but contributes to causing a wide variety of other diseases.

"Noise is toxic to the whole body," Rosen said, "and all those who work around loud noises are in danger."

DAMAGE DONE

Continuous loud noises cause those cells in the ear mechanism which help transmit sounds to the brain to tire out. If these cells are given a chance to rest, they can recover.

But if the worker must go back to the factory day in and day out, these cells are not able to rest. The result is that the noise-damaged ear becomes insensitive to normal speaking levels.

Neither hearing aids nor surgical operations can bring back the ability to hear those levels. A man who works six to eight hours a day for ten years, Dr. Rosen estimated, will, at the age of 40, have the hearing of a man of 65.

Also, when you hear a loud noise, your heart beat automatically quickens, your stomach tightens, and you begin to breathe faster. Nature makes us do these automatically.

For millions of years, loud noises meant danger to man, and so he evolved to the stage where loud noises brought about changes within the body that might help fight some unknown danger.

Today, our bodies still go through these changes even when we know that no danger is present, and even when we are not surprised by the noises. And today, those bodily changes themselves are dangerous.

Continually quickened heart beats eventually cause premature hardening of the arteries, and contribute to heart attacks.

If a person's stomach tightens often, it can cause painful ulcers, and can contribute to just about every disease of the digestive tract with which a person could become afflicted.

Moreover, stress on the lungs, forcing them to breathe faster, weakens their resistance to tuberculosis, and other infectious diseases.

And these damages take place even when the individual worker is totally unaware of them. "The brain can become accustomed to loud noises," Dr. Rosen said, "but the heart cannot."

One of the ways scientists have proven the danger of noises, Dr. Rosen said, is to study people living in the African deserts, which are relatively quiet. He, himself, has conducted much of the research.

Heart attacks and nervous tension is almost unknown among these people, and they generally live much longer than those working in noisy places.

EXISTING SOLUTIONS

"We do not have to put up with loud factory noises," Dr. Rosen said. "The technology exists to overcome them."

However, he warned against the use of ear protectors. Bosses try to get workers to wear them in order to put the responsibility for health protection on the workers themselves. Also, they are much cheaper than other steps that might be taken, so they cut into profits to a much lesser extent.

Most plugs or ear muffs are ineffective in cutting down the noise that reaches the ear from most factory machines, the doctor explained.

However, if they are effective, they also cut down on the worker's ability to hear other workers. This could be dangerous in time of emergencies. For example, if a worker is about to be hit by a falling object and another man tries to warn him to get out of the way, he might not be able to hear if he's wearing ear protectors.

Furthermore, workers wearing ear muffs will continually shout to one another to be heard, which does damage to the vocal cords and other parts of the body.

Techniques have been developed to cut down noise—but the employers must be pressured into investing the money to get them installed.

For example, an English manufacturer has developed sound-proof baffles that have cut by fifty percent even the noise made by jackhammers digging into cement. These jackhammers were recently displayed at a trade show in New York.

Also, sound absorbing material exists which can be used to cushion machinery, and can be installed in factory walls. Techniques for mounting machinery have been developed which likewise cut down the operating noise levels.

Finally, properly maintaining a machine will keep it running quieter.

Dr. Rosen said that the noise levels the government considers acceptable are much too high for true safety, but if workers would force their bosses to maintain these levels, some good could be done.

[From the Federal Register, May 29, 1971]

SECTION 1910.95.—OCCUPATIONAL NOISE EXPOSURE

(a) Protection against the effects of noise exposure shall be provided when the sound levels exceed those shown in Table G-16 when measured on the A scale of a standard sound level meter at slow response. When noise levels are determined by octave band analysis, the equivalent A-weighted sound level may be determined as follows:

[Chart is not printed in RECORD.]

Equivalent sounds level contours. Octave band sound pressure levels may be converted to the equivalent A-weighted sound level by plotting them on this graph and noting the A-weighted sound level corresponding to the point of highest penetration into the sound level contours. This equivalent A-weighted sound level, which may differ from the actual A-weighted sound level of the noise, is used to determine exposure limits from Table I.G-16.

(b) (1) When employees are subjected to sound exceeding those listed in Table G-16, feasible administrative or engineering controls shall be utilized. If such controls fail to reduce sound levels within the levels of Table G-16, personal protective equipment shall be provided and used to reduce sound levels within the levels of the table.

(2) If the variations in noise level involve maxima at intervals of 1 second or less, it is to be considered continuous.

(3) In all cases where the sound levels exceeds the values shown herein, a continuing, effective hearing conservation program shall be administered.

TABLE G-16.—Permissible noise exposures¹

Duration per day, hours:	Sound level dBA slow response
8	90
6	92
4	95
3	97
2	100
1½	102
1	105
½	110
¼ or less	115

¹ When the daily noise exposure is composed of two or more periods of noise exposure of different levels, their combined effect should be considered, rather than the individual effect of each. If the sum of the following fractions: $C_1/T_1 + C_2/T_2 + \dots + C_n/T_n$ exceeds unity, then, the mixed exposure should be considered to exceed the limit value. C_n indicates the total time of exposure at a specified noise level, and T_n indicates the total time of exposure permitted at that level.

Exposure to impulsive or impact noise should not exceed 140 dB peak sound pressure level.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 319

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the language of House Resolution 319, which I introduced on March 17, 1971. I was hoping it might catch the attention of the administration:

H. Res. 319

Whereas the President of the United States on March 4, 1971, stated that his policy is that: "as long as there are American POW's in North Vietnam we will have to maintain a residual force in South Vietnam. That is the least we can negotiate for."

Whereas Madam Nguyen Thi Binh, chief delegate of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam stated on September 17, 1970, that the

policy of her government is "In case the United States Government declares it will withdraw from South Vietnam all its troops and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, and the parties will engage at once in discussion on:

"The question of ensuring safety for the total withdrawal from South Vietnam of United States troops and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp.

"The question of releasing captured military men."

Resolved, That the United States shall forthwith propose at the Paris peace talks that in return for the return of all American prisoners held in Indochina, the United States shall withdraw all its Armed Forces from Vietnam within sixty days following the signing of the agreement: Provided, That the agreement shall contain guarantee by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of safe conduct out of Vietnam for all American prisoners and all American Armed Forces simultaneously.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 8, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Clarence T. Mayo, Mount Olive Baptist Church, Cape May Court House, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we come to Thee at this hour to invoke Thy blessings upon the head of our Nation and this assembly, who from day to day are called upon to face the perplexities of a changing order and tasks that need Thy guidance and strength. Leave them not to walk alone, but be to them a very present help in the time of need. Remember in mercy all for whom Christ died and whom it is our duty to remember in prayer, we ask in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4724, 1972 MARITIME AUTHORIZATION

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4724) to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. DOWNING, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. PELLY, and Mr. MAILLIARD.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF GAO

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 50th anniversary of an agency of the Government which has no peer in genuine service to the American taxpayer—the General Accounting Office.

The GAO has been a valuable organization since its inception, but its true

worth has become more and more evident as the Federal bureaucracy has mushroomed uncontrolled since World War II.

There is probably no accurate way to estimate the savings this agency has effected in the past half century, but the sum is truly immense.

I am sure the distinguished head of the GAO, Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats, would wince to hear me say it, but I wish Members of the Congress would call upon the General Accounting Office even more often than they now do to assist in rooting out the waste and inefficiency that all too often lie buried in the nooks and crannies of the vast Federal Establishment.

Because of the enormous size of the Government today, the General Accounting Office is, in my opinion, in danger of losing its war against waste—not because of a lack of talent and know-how, but because of a lack of manpower to do what needs to be done.

The best answer, of course, is a drastic reduction in the size of the Federal Government.

I want to extend my personal congratulations to each employee of the General Accounting Office on the occasion of this anniversary. Each of them should be proud of the knowledge that they are members of a government agency that pays its own way. There are not very many of those around today.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8293, CONTINUATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT ACT OF 1968

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 465 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 465

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8293) to continue until the close of September 30, 1973, the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1968. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such

amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 123]

Abourezk	Frenzel	Pryor, Ark.
Alexander	Gibbons	Rangel
Anderson, III.	Gray	Rees
Aspinall	Halpern	Rodino
Baring	Heckler, Mass.	Rooney, N.Y.
Belcher	Jarman	Rosenthal
Bevill	Kee	Roy
Biaggi	Kemp	Runnels
Blatnik	Kluczynski	Sandman
Brooks	Landrum	Shoup
Celler	Lent	Slack
Chisholm	Link	Spence
Clark	Long, La.	Staggers
Clay	McCulloch	Stephens
Conyers	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Culver	Mahon	Thompson,
Dellums	Mathis, Ga.	N.J.
Dent	Metcalfe	Tierman
Diggs	Mollohan	Vander Jagt
Dorn	O'Hara	
Dowdy	Pelly	
Edwards, La.	Pike	
Ford,	Poage	
William D.	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8293, CONTINUATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT ACT OF 1968

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTI), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 465 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 8293 to extend the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1968.

The International Coffee Agreement Act provides the necessary authority for