

I emphasize once again the possibility—and even the likelihood—of one or more rollcall votes on tomorrow, particularly with reference to conference reports.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, to permit staff members to make any personal arrangements they might want to make, and I give notice that I will reclaim the floor in about a minute or so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). Objection is heard. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk continued to call the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 133 Leg.]

Byrd, W. Va.	Gravel	Mathias
Cranston	Griffin	Scott

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alaska.

The motion is agreed to, and the Sergeant at Arms is instructed to carry out the order of the Senate.

After some delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Allen	Church	Hartke
Bayh	Ellender	Hughes
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Jackson
Case	Hart	Magnuson

Mondale	Percy	Smith
Montoya	Pearson	Spong
Pastore	Froxmire	Williams
Pell	Randolph	Young

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I move that we adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate, in accordance with the previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 30, 1971, at 11 a.m.

#### NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate June 29 (legislative day of June 28), 1971:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Fred L. Hadsel, of Ohio, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE MARTHA GRIFFITHS

#### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the idea of national health insurance has been around for a long time, and it has finally come to the forefront as one of the most important legislative issues of this Congress. MARTHA GRIFFITHS is one of the reasons it has become so important.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS was honored recently at the 66th Annual Conference of the League for Industrial Democracy for her role in making national health insurance a realizable goal, and her contribution to the national health security program—the most comprehensive and well thought out of all the health insurance proposals.

Lane Kirkland, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO, presented the League for Industrial Democracy's 1971 Annual Award to MARTHA GRIFFITHS. His remarks make clear the advantages of the health security program over all others.

I would like to congratulate Mrs. GRIFFITHS, and include Mr. Kirkland's remarks in the RECORD:

##### REMARKS OF LANE KIRKLAND

It is said of some ideas that we can sense when their time has come. The idea that all Americans, regardless of age, race, sex or economic circumstances, are entitled to adequate health care—the time for this idea came a long while ago, when Harry Truman made it an issue. But certainly the time has come to translate that idea into reality.

Even before Harry Truman, there were groups like the League for Industrial Democracy that were advocating the then strange and revolutionary notion that the richest society in the world had an obligation to all of its citizens to see to it that no one should suffer poor health and early death because his pocketbook was empty.

But this notion, after all, was propounded by people given to utopian fantasies and idle and mischievous social scheming—or so their critics said. Today the fantasy is clearly realizable. It is a practical necessity. The time for national health security has come, and the time is now.

The time did not come by itself, however. It had to be pulled, prodded, pushed, and escorted all the way. We are here today to honor one of the people who did the moving. Due in large measure to her efforts, with the full support of the AFL-CIO, we finally have a real chance to reach our goal.

Indeed, those who oppose the National Security program argue that their own proposals would achieve the very objectives they once denounced as utopian. But it is a sign of our times, as this audience knows full well, that radical and utopian rhetoric is everywhere appropriated to dress up conservative programs—in the "whereas," if not in the "resolves."

Nearly a year ago, the President of the United States declared a "massive crisis" in health care. Strong language and accurate, too. Medical costs have been rising twice as fast as other prices, doctors and other medical personnel are in short supply, private insurance companies have not provided adequate coverage, and many Americans have no coverage at all.

But what has been the President's response to this "massive crisis"?

He vetoed a hospital construction bill. He vetoed a measure to provide training for family doctors. He threatened to close down vitally needed public health service hospitals. And he has put before the Congress an utterly inadequate, piecemeal health insurance program.

What is wrong with the Administration's program, is exactly what is wrong with the present system of health care in the United States. It is, as they say, part of the problem and not of the solution.

We need a health program that covers all of the people. The Administration's proposal excludes large groups of workers from coverage.

We need a health program that controls medical costs while providing incentives for quality care. The Administration's proposal would rely on the private insurance companies which have gotten us into our present high-cost, low-quality mess.

We need a health program that expands our medical resources—personnel and facili-

ties—and that reorganizes the delivery of health care. The Administration's proposal would do little to meet these goals, and hence would not curb the inflationary costs of health care.

The Administration's proposal is not the only spurious offering in the field. The American Medical Association has concocted something called "medi-credit", while the private insurance carriers call their proposals "Healthcare". As you might suppose, these are thinly disguised efforts to protect vested interests and insurance company profits.

The position of the AFL-CIO is clear and firm. In a statement issued by our Executive Council in February, we said, and I quote:

"What America needs as the heart of its medical care philosophy is a single primary goal—good health for all its peoples. The profit-making philosophy of the market place—to make money for those who provide and finance medical services—is not an acceptable philosophy for medical care."

For this reason, the AFL-CIO has pledged its unstinting efforts to the passage of the bipartisan National Health Security Program during this session of Congress. This is our number one legislative goal, and we shall not retreat from it.

As the battle shapes up, we know that we can expect to see some alleged "activists" sitting this one out—not in opposition but in boredom. While the issue has come into practical focus, it has not come into radical fashion, and that makes all the difference. To them the issue of national health security does not have that delicious aura of novelty. It belongs in the category of mundane materialistic matters that are lacking in glamour and in revolutionary "relevance".

Maybe, they have a point. After all, enactment of National Health Security will not end the war in Vietnam. (Indeed, it could lead to a lower draft rejection rate). It will not reduce our population growth. It will not end air and water pollution. It will not stop technology in its tracks, re-define the role of universities, or cure alienation.

All it would do is make real the principle that the poor and the deprived and the plain working people of this country have the same right to good health and to life itself as the affluent and the opulent.

We are here this afternoon to honor someone who has dedicated herself to that goal—Congresswoman Martha W. Griffiths.

It is especially fitting that the League for Industrial Democracy, which did much be-

ginning decades ago, to help educate the public to the need for comprehensive health security, should present its 66th Annual Award to someone who has taken the role of leadership in putting this goal on the verge of Congressional enactment.

In the House of Representatives, Martha Griffiths has led the fight for National Health Security. We, in the Labor Movement, who have supported her all the way, are delighted to have this opportunity to express to her our deep appreciation of her efforts.

That appreciation is expressed in the words of the League for Industrial Democracy's 1971 Annual Award.

#### HELP COMING FOR ADDICTS

### HON. ROBERT McCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the President's comprehensive program for meeting the problem of drug addiction affecting our civilian community as well as the veterans returning from Vietnam has met with almost uniform approval.

I was encouraged by a thoughtful editorial which appeared on Monday, June 21 in the highly respected Chicago Daily News.

For the benefit of my colleagues and the others who examine the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting the editorial below:

#### HELP COMING FOR ADDICTS

Congress should give President Nixon full support in his effort to mount a major attack on narcotics addiction. The affliction has reached epidemic proportions, spurring criminal activity in many fields as addicts strive to support the habit by any means at hand—shoplifting, mugging, burglary, armed robbery, prostitution, even murder.

Until now anti-drug abuse programs have involved nine separate federal agencies.

Legislation proposed by the President would set up a central authority—the Special Action Office of Drug Abuse Prevention—over all drug abuse prevention, education, treatment, rehabilitation and research activities. It would co-ordinate state and local programs and provide a clearing house for information for all agencies working on the problem.

Several aspects of the program are particularly heartening:

First, it will fill an acute need for a major co-ordinated research program. Many questions about drugs cry for answers: How effective is the methadone program and what are its hazards? Is there a safe substitute to follow methadone that can cushion the withdrawal shock? Exactly where does marijuana fit into the scale of harmfulness? What are its short- and long-range perils?

Second, it will insure that servicemen hooked on drugs because of their easy availability overseas will have access to thorough rehabilitation courses before they are mustered out. Moreover, the Veterans Administration treatment facilities will be expanded to accommodate all former servicemen who come seeking help.

Finally, a comprehensive program will be undertaken to limit the flow of narcotics into the United States as well as to eliminate the pushers from the domestic scene. "We are stopping less than 20 per cent of the drugs aimed at this nation," Mr. Nixon con-

ceded. Co-operative programs will be undertaken with foreign governments to control the export of narcotics.

We congratulate the President for putting together a program of a scale (\$155 million) calculated to have real impact on the problem. We congratulate him also for tapping Dr. Jerome H. Jaffe, 37, director of the Illinois Drug Abuse Program, to direct the program from the White House. Dr. Jaffe knows the problem and what must be done. With the help of Congress and the President, he has a chance to make history.

#### CULEBRA REVISITED

### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday the Senate Military Construction Authorization Subcommittee held hearings on an amendment offered by the junior Senator from Alaska, Mr. GRAVEL, to the military construction authorization legislation, which authorizes an appropriation of \$50 million to the Department of the Navy to construct an artificial island to which shall be transferred all of the naval bombardment and related training activities now being conducted on the small island of Culebra. In addition, Senator GRAVEL's amendment provides for the termination of all firing operations on or at Culebra no later than June 1, 1975, and stipulates that the Navy must advise the Congress, no later than January 1, 1972, of the action it has taken with respect to building the artificial island. On the same day as the Senate subcommittee held its hearings, I introduced Mr. GRAVEL's amendment in the House as separate legislation and appeared before the House Armed Services Committee on Thursday to urge its adoption, either as a committee amendment to H.R. 8655 or separately.

I commend Senator GRAVEL for the initiative he has shown on this important issue and believe last week's events are most timely. Although the Navy agreed, in writing, to take positive steps to find suitable alternatives and to cease firing and training on and near Culebra, there has been little meaningful action in this regard over the past 6 months. Thus, it is clear that the Congress must give the Navy a clear mandate to pursue the construction of an alternate training site and a timetable in which to complete such action and withdraw from Culebra. The time for backsliding by the Navy must cease and it must live up to the commitments it made to the citizens of Culebra in January.

In order that our colleagues may be aware of the efforts being made to effect a responsible program toward Culebra, I present herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, a copy of my testimony before the House Armed Services Committee; the text of the legislation I introduced on Tuesday; and the statements of Senator Rafael Hernandez Colon, president of the senate of the Commonwealth of

Puerto Rico, the Honorable Ramon Feliciano, mayor of Culebra, and Ruben Berrios Martinez, president of the Independence Party of Puerto Rico before the Senate subcommittee. My distinguished colleague from Ohio (Mr. VANK) has already submitted the useful and interesting testimony of his constituent, Mr. Edward J. Shoupe of Cleveland, the former Navy officer in charge of training at Culebra. In addition, I submit herewith a copy of the agreement which was concluded between the Secretary of the Navy, officials of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the mayor of Culebra on January 11, 1971. I urge that our colleagues give this issue their full and careful consideration and attention. The mouse continues to roar and the cry for fair and just treatment and to be left in peace will not be silenced.

The material follows:

TESTIMONY OF HON. HERMAN BADILLO BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 1971

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your affording me this opportunity to appear before the Committee this morning and to testify in connection with the military construction authorization, H.R. 8655.

My particular interest in this legislation pertains to the funds authorized for the construction of facilities by the Navy in Title II. Specifically, I urge the Committee to authorize an appropriation of \$50,000,000 to the Department of the Navy for the purpose of constructing an artificial island in the waters of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to which shall be transferred all of the naval bombardment and related training activities now being conducted on the small island of Culebra and its cays. Earlier this week I introduced legislation in the House, H.R. 9299, providing for the construction of such an artificial island and the termination of all firing operations on or at the island of Culebra, no later than June 1, 1975.

Mr. Chairman, for more than 20 years the small, 28 square mile island of Culebra has been bombed, strafed, and invaded by U.S. naval and military forces. The approximately 750 inhabitants—citizens of the United States—have lived in constant fear of their own lives and safety and the well-being of their real property and livestock. Because of these naval bombardments the islanders have been the virtual prisoners of the Navy and have been prevented from developing a viable economy. They have even been prohibited from enjoying some of the fine beaches of the island.

On January 11, 1971, an agreement was concluded between the Secretary of the Navy, officials of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the citizens of Culebra. This was the culmination of an 18-month-long cold war which was continually marked by intimidation and deceit on the part of the Navy and its representatives. The agreement was a clear commitment by the Navy to take positive steps to find suitable alternatives and cease its firing and training operations on and near Culebra. Although an agreement was signed only six months ago, the fact that a request for appropriations to construct an alternate target site was not made by the Navy is simply another example of that service's duplicity and its footdragging in seeking to identify appropriate alternatives.

Contrary to the claims of Secretaries Laird and Crafée and others, there is simply no strategic military purpose being served by the bombardment of Culebra and I am convinced that the U.S. defense posture would



not be adversely affected if such training and target practice were moved to another site. In fact, it would probably be to the Navy's advantage as, in an isolated and unpopulated area, the Navy may be able to practice with more sophisticated weaponry rather than the World War II-vintage which is primarily being used on Culebra. While a number of recommendations for potential alternatives have been made, I feel confident that neither the Navy nor the DoD has fully considered them or has undertaken their own thorough exploration of the availability of alternative target locations in an uninhabited area. With its typical self-serving attitude, the military claims that Culebra is the most ideal or perfect location; but it has never said it is the only possible location for its gunnery and training maneuvers.

We cannot fail to bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that we are considering an area inhabited by over 700 American citizens who are simply attempting to peacefully live their lives under the most trying of circumstances. Living, working, going to school, farming and just relaxing are daily challenges. Consider also, if you will, the implications this situation has on our Latin American relations and the fact that the attitude of the United States Government toward Culebra and its citizens has gravely exacerbated tensions which already exist with our Latin neighbors. Furthermore, the bombardment of the island and subsequent actions has seriously aggravated relations with our country's Spanish-speaking community for we consider Culebra to be a symbol of the government's indifference toward our needs and aspirations. The ill-conceived recommendation, which was fortunately rejected last year, that the Culebrans be resettled to some other area was a serious affront to the more than 4 million Puerto Ricans—on the mainland and in Puerto Rico—as well as to our other Spanish-speaking brothers. Are the Culebrans so unimportant that they can be shunted around like cattle?

Aside from the human and moral elements, I believe it is vital that every possible consideration be given to other factors, such as the ecological uniqueness of Culebra. The cays in the archipelago east of Fajardo and the island of Culebra provide important nesting areas for various migrating oceanic birds, including the sooty tern, the nobby tern and laughing gulls. The Bahama Pintail, a rare and endangered species, is found in the lagoons of Culebra, as are the brown pelican. The clear waters surrounding the island and the cays constitute a magnificent sporting and commercial fishing ground.

Mr. Chairman, the Culebrans—American citizens—have suffered emotionally, economically, socially and physically long enough. The time for the Navy to withdraw completely is long past due. Assuming the Navy would be able to get along without having human beings and livestock serve as targets, I am certain that there are a number of perfectly acceptable alternatives—including areas suitable to permit the construction of artificial islands which the Navy could build to its own specifications. I understand, in fact, that one private firm has already indicated its ability to construct such a practice facility and, further, that the Navy's own engineers have stated that an artificial island or platform could be used as an alternative target instead of Culebra.

Earlier this week the Senate Military Construction Authorization Subcommittee held hearings on an amendment to the Senate version of the military construction authorization offered by the Junior Senator from Alaska, Mike Gravel. My bill, H.R. 9299, contains identical language to Senator Gravel's amendment. During Tuesday's hearing important information was presented to the Senate subcommittee regarding the con-

struction of an artificial training facility and the strong sentiment in Puerto Rico that the Navy withdraw completely from Culebra at the earliest possible date. I am anxious to share this information with you and I request permission that the testimony of Senator Gravel; Senator Rafael Hernandez Colon, President of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; the Honorable Ramon Feliciano, mayor of Culebra; and Mr. Edward J. Shoupe of Cleveland, Ohio, be made a permanent part of this hearing record.

Although the agreement reached in January stipulated that the Navy would be afforded a reasonable time to find an alternative, its continued presence in the area remains as a virtual threat and an affront to the people of Puerto Rico. The Navy must be encouraged to and assisted in expediting its efforts to find suitable alternatives. I believe the provisions of my bill furnish much needed impetus in this direction and I feel that the Congress must make it perfectly clear that the Navy must withdraw from Culebra and pursue its bombing and training at some artificial and uninhabited location.

Mr. Chairman, one of my primary purposes in introducing H.R. 9299 was to focus attention on this critical situation and to enlist the interest and support of our colleagues behind the effort to have the Navy cease its bombardment of Culebra and move elsewhere. Of course, it would facilitate matters to have my legislation included as a committee amendment to H.R. 8655 and I urge that you give this issue your fullest, most careful and sympathetic consideration with a view toward taking prompt and positive action.

Thank you.

#### H.R. 9299

A bill to provide for the construction of an artificial island in the vicinity of Puerto Rico which shall be used for those naval training and testing exercises presently carried out on Culebra

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) there is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Navy the sum of \$50,000,000 for the purpose of constructing in the waters in the vicinity of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico an artificial island to which shall be transferred all naval bombardment and other training or testing exercises involving the firing of weapons now being conducted on the island of Culebra and the cays within three nautical miles of such island.

(b) The Secretary of the Navy shall proceed with the construction of such artificial island at the earliest practicable date. He shall submit a written report to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than January 1, 1972, indicating the action that has been taken with respect to the construction of such artificial island, and shall include in such report a projected schedule for accomplishing the transfer of all firing operations from Culebra (and the cays adjacent thereto) to such artificial island or elsewhere.

(c) The Secretary of the Navy shall terminate all firing operations on or at the island of Culebra and on or at all cays within three nautical miles thereof at the earliest practicable date but in no event later than June 1, 1975.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE SENATOR RAFAEL HERNANDEZ COLON, PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

My name is Rafael Hernandez Colon. I am President of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Let me thank you for inviting me to appear here today. I welcome this opportunity to appear on behalf of the Senate of Puerto Rico in support of Senator Gravel's Culebra amendment to the Military Construction Authorization Act.

I have been increasingly concerned since early last year with the importance of finding an early solution to the problem of Culebra, with which the United States Senate has already become quite conversant. Yet, in spite of the strong, unified sentiment of the Puerto Rican people and the express concern of the U.S. Senate, the small, inhabited Island of Culebra continues to serve as a target for U.S. Navy guns and bombs in training exercises.

Along with most Puerto Ricans, I believe that the problem was on its way to resolution last January 11, as a result of an Agreement signed in Culebra by John Chaffee, Secretary of the Navy; Luis A. Ferre, Governor of Puerto Rico; Ramon Feliciano, the Mayor of Culebra, and myself as President of the Senate of Puerto Rico.

By the terms of this Agreement the Secretary of the Navy pledged to investigate alternatives to the training conducted at and around Culebra, with the purpose of finding feasible alternatives that eventually would permit the transfer away from Culebra of all firing operations conducted there.

The Defense Department has now found such an alternative.

A Defense Department report, "Culebra, Overview and Analysis, April 1, 1971," prepared as directed by the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1970, and submitted to this Committee, concluded that "Culebra can be 'replaced' for at most \$50 million . . ." This conclusion by the Defense Department was responsive to the express hope of the three Puerto Rican signatories to the January 11 Agreement, Paragraph 12 of the Agreement stated:

"It is the position of the Puerto Rican Government, Governor Ferre, Senate President Hernandez Colon, and Mayor Feliciano, that the Navy should terminate all training operations on Culebra and its neighboring Cays within a reasonable period. It is the hope of the Signatories listed above that the study that the Department of Defense is required by law to undertake will conclude that this is feasible."

The Defense Department conclusion that Culebra can be replaced also is, I might add, consistent with Senator Symington's view as expressed in the Congressional Record of August 14, 1970. I would like to take this opportunity to express the appreciation of the Puerto Rican people for the firm position taken by Senator Symington and other Senators in favor of the complete prohibition of all naval shelling and air bombardment of the Island of Culebra and its adjacent keys and waters.

The \$50 million figure in the Defense Department Report referred to the cost of constructing an artificial island, preferably 3½ miles east of Vieques, Puerto Rico. Since such an artificial island would be uninhabited, transfer of training operations there not only would eliminate avoidable risk to innocent civilian life but also would make possible less restricted, more realistic and varied and, consequently, superior training. To this extent it should enhance our national security.

The Agreement of January 11, 1971 was, in the view of most Puerto Ricans—including myself—a clear-cut commitment by the Navy to cease its firing and training operations on and near Culebra when a suitable alternative was found. Since that time, however, following a statement by Secretary of Defense Laird on April 1 of this year, there have been growing doubts in Puerto Rico if the commitment were really as firm as we thought. There is particular concern that Secretary Laird's statement may reflect a desire to put off any

final Navy decision until after the 1972 election, in the hope that the Culebrans might then be induced to accept an indefinite continuation of firing operations there. The strong accent in the Defense Department Report on suggested public relations activities at Culebra, and on the desirability of creating additional jobs there, gave further currency to this doubt. In the event that the Navy itself does not testify in support of Senator Gravel's amendment, I believe that this will be viewed in Puerto Rico as further confirmation of the growing fear that the Navy is less than candid in its expressed intent to leave Culebra.

I would like to give you some feel here today, not only of the importance of this issue of Culebra to the Culebrans, but even more of its larger importance for relations between the Commonwealth and the mainland United States.

As you know, we are American citizens, but with a difference. Puerto Rico enjoys a large area of autonomy and self-government within the Federal system, in a completely unique relationship which derives from the fundamental recognition by the U.S. Government of Puerto Rico's right to self-determination. We have exercised that right by choosing to maintain close ties with the United States as a self-governing Commonwealth.

In support of our U.S. citizenship, moreover, we have fought in every American war from World War II to Korea and Viet Nam, and Puerto Rican soldiers have earned a disproportionate share of decorations for bravery in these conflicts. In addition, a large part of Puerto Rico, despite our acute shortage of land, is given over to providing bases for the U.S. armed forces. Puerto Rico, in other words, more than holds up its end in the common defense.

Against this background, it is most unusual when virtually all Puerto Ricans—covering the entire political spectrum—feel so strongly that a specific operation of the U.S. armed forces has become intolerable. Yet that is the feeling of 99% of Puerto Ricans today as regards Culebra. This strong and unanimous feeling is the essential reason why it is so important to resolve the Culebra matter quickly, and without ambiguity or reservation.

Let me give you some insight into the political problems which Culebra has stimulated. We live at a time in Puerto Rico, as in the rest of the United States, of rising discontent and vocal protest, some of it justified. In Puerto Rico, however, the most radical protest takes the form of anti-Americanism—often in conjunction with the New Left in the United States—and is associated with various splinters of the pro-independence movement.

Until a few years ago, the sentiment for independence was virtually non-existent. In numerous elections over the last two decades, the independentists rarely won more than 2% to 3% of the vote. The pro-Commonwealth center, in normal years, consistently won about 60% of the vote and the pro-statehood party less than 40%. However, there is now visible an appreciable growth in independentist activity. Moreover, in my opinion, this heightened independentist drive is at least partially related to Culebra.

The reason is this: Culebra represents, in Puerto Rican eyes, such a clear case of military insensitivity to human considerations, that it is easy for an emotional orator to paint the Navy as a military gargantua, ruthlessly and knowingly suppressing the Culebrans and making their life a hell. You and I may believe that the normal inertia of a military bureaucracy is a far more plausible explanation of the Navy's visible reluctance to give up a target area which it has held

for 35 years. But this is not an easy or comforting explanation to make to the people of Culebra who continue to suffer from bombardments, or to their friends and relatives in Puerto Rico. Therefore, the independentists have seized on Culebra as a rare opportunity to whip up anti-American sentiment, and they have done so with some success.

What this adds up to is that it is most important, in the interests of our larger ties, that every possible step be taken to eliminate quickly any legitimate source of potential anti-Americanism. The other independentist arguments fall largely on deaf ears in Puerto Rico, where the great majority of the people have the good sense to put them in sober perspective. But Culebra, if allowed to fester, is certain to become increasingly a "cause celebre" in Puerto Rico, and one which will lead to growing anti-Americanism and thereby play increasingly into the hands of the proindependence forces. For them, Culebra is a made-to-order issue and a political God-send, which they would like to be able to exploit as long as possible. Already, we are aware of plans by the independentists from Puerto Rico to move in considerable numbers to Culebra, living in tents, if necessary, in order to be able to dominate the voting there in upcoming elections. They seek to take over the Island of Culebra politically and to use it as a base for future operations, and also undoubtedly to stir up anti-American sentiment. For most Puerto Ricans, on the other hand, and particularly for those who support Commonwealth, Culebra is a problem which must be resolved as quickly as possible precisely so as not to allow anti-Americans to feed on the issue.

Therefore, I believe that responsible leaders in Puerto Rico and here in the United States have a particular obligation to deal with Culebra primarily in a political context, to take it out of bureaucratic channels and put it in the jurisdiction of politically-sensitive bodies and, above all, in the hands of the Congress.

We have been grateful that so many senators and so much of the American press have already shown such understanding and support in reacting to the human drama of the Culebrans. In all likelihood, however, there are probably very few persons in the United States, even in Congress, who are sufficiently aware of the political dangers if the Navy remains in Culebra, or even appears to be trying to remain there, despite its firm commitment to leave.

In many ways, therefore, the funding of a suitable alternative is the acid test. If no funds are voted for an artificial island, I fear that at a later date we may hear from the Navy that, since no "feasible" alternate has presented itself for firing operations, it must delay its departure from Culebra—perhaps indefinitely. At that time, moreover, I also fear that the Navy may allege that the Culebrans themselves have had a change of heart, and that they are reasonably contented to allow the Navy to continue its firing.

Any such ploy, however congenial to the bureaucratic mind, would be a political disaster. The U.S. Navy would thereby appear guilty of cynical bad faith and duplicity in the eyes of Puerto Ricans and, by derivation, so would the American Government itself. The anti-American elements and the independentists would have a field day.

Even for the Navy itself, this would be a grave mistake. For the Navy, the greatest risk is that by trying to hold on to Culebra tenaciously, it may so stimulate anti-American feeling that it may eventually compromise its position in far more important bases in Puerto Rico, such as Vieques and Roosevelt Roads. This would be tantamount to elevating short-term tenacity to long-term folly.

I am not unaware that \$50 million is a sizeable sum. But I believe that it is not excessive to retrieve what is already an unfortunate situation, and to avoid one which might become even more damaging both for the United States and Puerto Rico.

I therefore urge you to approve the Gravel amendment, so that an early solution of the Culebra problem can become a reality.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE RAMON FELICIANO, MAYOR OF THE ISLAND-MUNICIPALITY OF CULEBRA, COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. Chairman and Distinguished Members of this Committee: My name is Ramon Feliciano and I am the Mayor of the Island-Municipality of Culebra in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. In that capacity I come before you today.

It has been with great pleasure that I have accepted the kind invitation extended to me by this Committee; and in doing so, I have done it with only one purpose: to reaffirm—with all the force of my mind and spirit—my endorsement to the commitment made by the Navy and the Defense Department of the United States to substitute Culebra and its adjacent cays with an artificial island as a place for target practice.

Senator Gravel's amendment to the Military Construction Authorization Bill, if enacted into law, would transform this commitment into the reality of peace for Culebra. As the only person authorized to speak on behalf of the entire Municipality of Culebra, I wish to inform this Committee that the people of Culebra overwhelmingly support this amendment which we hope will bring an end to the danger and suffering we have so long endured.

This commitment that I have pointed out is contained in paragraph eleven of the accord signed in January of this year. That accord was signed by all the parties involved *uberrimae fidei*—of utmost good faith. For that reason, and being one of the signers, I am mystified—and cannot accept—the recent proposal advanced by Secretary Laird to study new alternatives in relation to this matter and to hold, later on, a referendum among the citizens of Culebra.

The reality is that a referendum is not needed because the pulse of public opinion in Culebra has been taken on at least four different occasions during the long and anguished years in which we have dealt with this problem. On all those occasions the Culebrans have expressed their firm determination in the sense that the Navy should totally abandon Culebra.

That determination continues firm today even though the Navy is creating jobs in Culebra to try to satisfy us in that manner.

I would like to point out two things and make one proposition in relation to this—not concerning the intentions of this initiative, which I know are the best; but over the way the program is being carried out.

First, the administration of it is in the hands of people who wish that the Navy stay in Culebra; this being in direct conflict with the desires of the great majority of our fellow citizens and of the best interests of the Island. This situation has created a charged political climate and has involved the Navy in a sterile public debate from which no one will derive any benefit. Second, employees from the Roosevelt Roads Base—and I say employees, not officers of the Navy—are trying to get non-Culebrans to move to our Island to take advantage of the new job opportunities and later to vote in the proposed referendum. The situation created is an intolerable one and is, additionally, a clear intromission into the rights that the Culebrans have to decide what course of action they wish to follow, how to use and enjoy their



land and the opportunities that may appear in it.

This set of facts moves me to propose to the Navy that it immediately stop negotiating with a group of isolated citizens and instead offer its backing to the local government—which is the legitimate and constitutional representative of the people—and to channel the economic aid that it may wish to offer us through the Mayor's office so as to attain a more equitable distribution of it.

Taking these steps the Navy would be reaffirming its good faith and would be contributing to bring back the ambient of mutual cordiality and sense of justice that made possible the signing of the historic Agreement of this year and which should be the ambient in which to deal with all of our future relations.

That, gentlemen, and nothing less than that, is the position of the people of Culebra.

Thank you.

**STATEMENT OF RUBEN BERRIOS MARTINEZ,  
PRESIDENT, INDEPENDENCE PARTY OF PUERTO  
RICO**

One year ago, I came to this Congress to demand in the name of the national interests of Puerto Rico the immediate withdrawal of the U.S. Navy from the island of Culebra, and to declare our unalterable intention to make life unbearable for the Navy in Culebra through all the means at our disposal within the context of our philosophy of civil disobedience, non-cooperation, and peaceful militancy. Up to now, we have done what we believe is right to fulfill that promise. But up to now, what has the U.S. Navy and U.S. Executive done with respect to the Culebran problem? That is a question to which we propose to give an opinion regarding the amendment today. There has been in Puerto Rico and this Committee should be informed about it, a history of deception during the last year. There has been in Puerto Rico during the last year and particularly the last six months, a history of deception which this Committee should be aware of in order to take a position. In January, the U.S. Navy, using its colonial subjects in Puerto Rico for the approval of a pact which amounted to no more than bombardment by consent. The pact, hailed by the Secretary of the Navy and the colonial delegates as the "solution" of the Culebra issue did not solve the problem posed: the presence of the Navy in Culebra. It was nothing more than a fraud and a mockery of international respect.

But it did not achieve its objectives, this nor any of the others publicly stated. First because the Navy did not abide by dispositions and violated it constantly. And secondly and mainly because it contradicted the expectations and aspirations of the Puerto Rican and Culebran people. Nobody in Puerto Rico was deceived by the trick. The explicit confession of the fraud and deception was the Department of Defense study on the Culebra situation published first of April. But this study was another escalation in the history of deception.

1. Nowhere does the study stipulate or order or even recommend the withdrawal of the Navy from Culebra. It only says that a decision would be taken by the Secretary of Defense by late 1972. After the 1972 elections.

2. On the other hand, it presents some recommendations that establish the conditions for the postponement of the solution of the issue:

a. It recommends the "improvements of community relations" in Culebra. As if the acute economic and spiritual problems of

the Culebrans could be solved by the magical fiat of public relations:

b. It proposes the employment of more Culebrans by the Navy. A classical example of an attempt of buying out the conscience of the people.

In fact, these hearings today are an admission of the failure of the study despite the claims of the federal government and the colonial authorities to the contrary.

The third stage in this drama is constituted by these hearings. Their purpose is to discuss the feasibility of the construction of an artificial island for the relocation on it of the military maneuvers up to now executed in Culebra.

But the Puerto Rican Independence Party has always insisted that Culebra must and should not be considered as an isolated case. Culebra is the symptom and crisis of the U.S. military's presence in Puerto Rico. The edification of an artificial island near Vieques would mean the reinforcement of this military colonialism in Puerto Rico.

We demand not only the withdrawal of the Navy from Culebra. We demand the complete cessation of the militarist use on the part of the U.S. of Puerto Rico. This implies that:

a. We insist first on the withdrawal from Culebra;

b. That military training be relocated outside of Puerto Rico;

c. We clearly express our determination to struggle for the demilitarization of Puerto Rico; that is, for the complete eradication of the U.S. military colonialism in Puerto Rico.

The mere fact of discussing the construction of an artificial island reflects a colonial near-sightedness totally outdated in the course of modern history in our opinion. This colonial mentality has expressed itself by means of the argument that it is in the "national interest" to proceed with the military utilization of Puerto Rico and our islands. We ask: Whose national interest? Certainly not the interest of the Puerto Rican nation and people, and as the events of the last week, relating to the disclosure by the New York Times and the Washington Post of the secret escalation of the Vietnam War, have clearly dramatized, not even the interests of the American people. Once again, it appears that what is termed "national interest" refers only to the interest of the United States military establishment.

By now, I do not have to stress this issue to you. The U.S. Congress, who in the American constitutional theory and tradition has the power to decide over peace and war, to provide the appropriations relative to the conduct of war, has seen itself the object of an unprecedented deception in the case of the undeclared Presidential Vietnam War.

We, Puerto Ricans who fight for the national liberation of our fatherland since its intervention and military occupation at the turn of the century, are not willing to tolerate deception or fraud anymore. We warn you that we will carry our struggle up to the last consequences until Puerto Rico takes upon itself the control of its history and destiny.

In Puerto Rico, we have overcome the stage of "credibility gap" suffered by the American people and Congress. For us, there is absolutely no credibility at all regarding the U.S. military establishment.

Regarding the specific issue of Culebra, we suggest the following: that you adopt any of the first two alternative sites mentioned by the Department of Defense study for the relocation of the military training taking place in Culebra, namely Marquesa Key (southwest of Key West) or the Virginia Capes area. I am sure both Florida and Virginia will be willing to contribute in such a

way for the national defense of the United States and to receive the benefits that the study of the Defense Department says that proceed from such military maneuvers.

We repeat that we will continue defying the U.S. military activities in Puerto Rico for considering them detrimental to the Puerto Rican sovereignty and the well-being of our people. In the past we have shown our determination to translate into liberating actions our will for freedom.

Thank you very much.

**AGREEMENT**

The dispute over the Navy's use of Culebra and its offshore cays for weapons training has dramatically posed the problem of balancing the need to conduct the training essential for our national defense with the legitimate desires and aspirations of our private citizens. All persons of good will who are interested in the continued close relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States, the security of our nation, and the aspirations of the people of Culebra have hoped that this problem could be amicably resolved. Through the dedicated efforts and good will of all concerned a mutually acceptable balance has finally been found between the training needs of the Navy and the desires of the people of Culebra. We are pleased to announce the terms of that agreement, and to pledge our continuing efforts to assure that it is carried out in good faith.

1. The Navy will not shoot the Walleye missile at Culebrita or at any other target in the Culebra complex, and the Navy will not obtain the easements on the east end of Culebra that were approved by the House and Senate Armed Services Committees.

2. The targets off the east coast of Culebra will be phased out by January 1, 1972, and the lease on North Cay will be terminated on that date. Culebrita and the other target cays in the area will be declared excess as of that date except for several acres on Culebrita near the lighthouse where the Navy intends to establish a small electronics warfare installation (several vans) for use in training fleet units in the open ocean north of Culebra.

3. In addition to the shoreline already announced for release, the Navy will declare excess to its needs the shoreline on the east coast starting at a point immediately east of the base camp and proceeding around the east end of Culebra to the beginning of the Navy property holdings on the north coast (Swell Bay) (see attached map). The Navy will cooperate in preserving the ecology of excess areas as requested by the Municipality and by appropriate federal and commonwealth agencies.

4. The Navy will relocate its bulls-eye target on Agua Cay to Cross Cay by January 1, 1972.

5. The north-south line bordering the northwest peninsula safety zone will be reoriented as shown on the attached map. The parcel of land marked "A" on the attached map will therefore no longer be part of the naval gunfire support safety zone.

6. The Navy will initiate and support an amendment to the executive order creating the defensive sea area around Culebra so that the order will cover the safety zones for the ship-to-shore gunfire and for the west-range air-to-ground targets (see attached map).

7. Governor Ferre, Mayor Feliciano, and Senate President Hernández Colón solemnly pledge to use all regulatory and legal devices available to the Commonwealth and the Municipality of Culebra to assure that no dwellings or other habitable structures are constructed in the northwest safety zone for as long as the Navy uses the northwest peninsula for naval gunfire support training. If

landowners in the area complain that their property is being taken without due process of law or if, despite the above-mentioned regulatory and legal devices, individual landowners take steps to construct dwellings or other habitable structures in the safety zone, then the Navy will pay such landowners the fair value of foregoing the right to construct said dwellings or other habitable structures.

8. Since the Navy is giving up a substantial number of targets, its remaining targets will become that much more important. In consideration of this action by the Navy and in recognition of the Navy's need to schedule the use of the remaining targets more tightly, Governor Ferre, Senate President Hernández Colón, and Mayor Feliciano will use their best efforts, including moral suasion, to obtain the cooperation of everyone in keeping the land and sea safety zones for the remaining targets clear of people during scheduled training operations.

9. No training operations around Culebra will be conducted on weekends or holidays except to meet an urgent operational commitment. In the event that this becomes necessary the Admiral commanding the Caribbean Sea Frontier, or in his absence the officer acting in that capacity, will be personally aware of and will have personally approved such operations, and the Mayor of Culebra will be personally notified by an authorized representative of the Commander of the Caribbean Sea Frontier at least twenty-four hours in advance of any such training operations.

10. The Navy solemnly and definitively agrees to abandon its plans to acquire easements or any other interest in land on Culebra and its adjacent cays by eminent domain or other means except as provided by paragraph 7 of this agreement.

11. There will be no time limit on the duration of this agreement, but the Navy promises to continue to investigate both technological and geographical alternatives to the training done around Culebra. The purpose of these investigations will be to find feasible alternatives that will eventually permit the transfer away from Culebra of the training that will be conducted after January 1, 1972.

Dated the 11th day of January 1971.

JOHN H. CHAFFEE,

*Secretary of the Navy.*

LUIS A. FERRE,

*Governor of Puerto Rico.*

RAMÓN FELICIANO,

*Mayor of Culebra.*

RAFAEL HERNÁNDEZ COLÓN,

*President of the Puerto Rican Senate.*

12. It is the position of the Puerto Rican Government, Governor Ferre, Senate President Hernández Colón and Mayor Feliciano that the Navy should terminate all training operations on Culebra and its neighboring Cays within a reasonable period. It is the hope of the Signatories listed above that the study that the Department of Defense is required by law to undertake will conclude that this is feasible.

BAYH: LIGHT OR HEAVYWEIGHT

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I believe that most observers of American life today will agree that one of the outstanding figures in the U.S. Senate is the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana, the Honorable BIRCH BAYH.

The record of leadership that Senator BAYH has compiled in the Senate is commanding more and more attention across the country.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the text of an article about Senator BAYH by Richard Paisner, published in the June 1971 issue of the journal, *The New Democrat*.

The article follows:

BAYH: LIGHT OR HEAVYWEIGHT?

(By Richard Paisner)

A reporter from a national publication, as listless as the liberals around him, doodled in his note pad. Finally, when Bayh began to catalogue pro-war statements by Nixon dating back to 1954, the reporter printed his final assessment of the Indiana Senator in block letters across the open notebook: "lightweight."

He was not the first, nor will he be the last, to level this charge—with its clear implications about Bayh's ability to govern the nation. Shortly after his upset victory over Homer Capeheart in 1962, another magazine sent a team of reporters to Indiana to do an in-depth study of the new Senator. After several days in the state, they reported back—not enough depth to justify a story—and Washington had a label ready before Bayh arrived.

What does it mean to call a politician a "lightweight"? Is it possible to question the political sagacity of the man who got to Washington by unseating Capeheart, Indiana's only three term Senator; and, who organized and led the Senate opposition to two poor Supreme Court nominations—Haynsworth and Carswell? Author Richard Harris, who is not one to save a reputation unnecessarily, gives Bayh enormous credit for the Carswell defeat—noting his courage in undertaking the task when other liberals shied away; his parliamentary skill in gaining the critical pair of votes that finally beat the Administration; and his impressive moral commitment. Harris's study was a two-part series in *The New Yorker* which should be required reading for all Bayh-watchers.

FROM THE FARM

The Bayh life history has already become part of American Presidential lore. Indiana farm family, AB from Purdue in agriculture, University of Indiana law degree. Though he failed the Indiana bar his first time around, Bayh was elected to the State House of Representatives at about the same time he reached voting age. By his thirtieth birthday, thanks to a dramatic Democratic landslide and a fortuitous combination of circumstances involving aging leaders and key counties, Birch Bayh was Speaker of the House. From there—as Minority Leader when the Republicans recovered control—he jumped into a Democratic Senatorial primary fight against the Mayor of Indianapolis, beat him and went on to shock Capeheart by 12,000 votes (aided immeasurably by President Kennedy's missile crisis triumph).

A successful vote-getter, an accomplished political-fighter, with all this, could he still be a lightweight? Yes, he could be. But he's not. Given the complexity of the demands that will face the next President, the shrewdness and the luck—as Bayh readily admits—that have carried him this far could prove inadequate to the task. But, as one studies his record in Congress, especially over the past two years, it becomes clear that there is more to the man than the political cunning of the second-rate hack.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

As a Senator, Bayh's specialty has been the Constitution and, as one high-ranking staffer

of Americans for Democratic Action (a man who views Bayh as a third or fourth choice for the nomination) admits, the Senator understands the Constitutional issues. Following the assassination of President Kennedy, Bayh guided the 25th Amendment through Congress, fixing a legal definition of Presidential disability. In addition, in the current session, bothered by the real possibility of chaos in the 1972 elections unless states adopt the 18-year-old vote already passed by Congress, he has led the successful fight for a Constitutional amendment to speed this process. Further, after five years of staff study, Bayh offered last year a proposed amendment on the direct popular election of Presidents and Vice Presidents. On March 18 of this year, he introduced Bill S1127, a comprehensive attempt to reform the system of military justice by eliminating completely "all danger of command influence, the possibility—or even the appearance—that the commanding officer of an accused man could affect the outcome of his court-martial."

Admittedly, all the research and most of the inspiration for these proposals emanated from staffers or outside sources. Bayh acknowledges this but argues that no President would be expected to develop legislation. "Perhaps I'm not as heavy a weight as I'd like to be," he says, "but I've come to realize that I have an unusual ability to get things done." Part of getting things done is finding a staff that can help you. In the past few years, Bayh, relying heavily on his long-time aide Bob Keefe, has assembled a high-powered group of assistants—young, liberal, efficient. One Bayh supporter in the field reports that several of the newer men demanded—and got—commitments from the Senator on the major issues: the war, the cities, etc. Armed with those commitments, they are now steadily pushing him to the left.

Understandably, the "lightweight" label bothers all those who surround the candidate. Most of them acknowledge that the Senator played a rather small role in national affairs in his first term, but they insist that the last two years have been a broadening of their man. When this happened, and why, is a complex subject.

Mace Brodie, who knew Bayh in the early days in Indiana thinks that the key to the "new" Bayh was his 70,000 vote reelection margin over William Ruckelshaus (now head of the Nixon Administration's Environmental Protection Administration) in 1968. Until then, Brodie argues, Bayh was constantly worrying about winning another six-year term in a state where—according to a poll commissioned by Sen. Hartke in 1970—only 12 percent of the voters consider themselves "liberals." Afterwards, according to this explanation, he decided he could take some chances.

NATIONAL AWARENESS

While this appears to be a fairly accurate analysis, it is not complete. The Senator himself dates his ability to function on a national level to the Haynsworth battle. It had to be heady stuff: Eric Sevareid told America, Bayh "looks more and more like a mid-west John Kennedy. . . . His record of accomplishment as a Senator already outshines the Kennedy record in the Senate. . . . The image is almost too good to be true; if it holds a serious flaw, that hasn't shown up yet." Jeremy Campbell wrote in the *London Evening Standard* that "this handsome, young blue-eyed Senator with both guts and charm is a new star suddenly setting the dim firmament of Washington politics ablaze with promise."

He had taken on the President of the United States and beaten him. Yet one piece of the publicity was not highly favorable. Robert Sherill, writing in the *New York Times Sunday Magazine*, questioned Bayh's



depth on the issues in such harsh terms that, says one Bayh staffer, the Senator said that if it were an accurate description of a political candidate, he wouldn't support him. For about three weeks after the piece appeared, the staffer continues, Bayh was in a "blue funk." Bayh himself admits to thinking deeply about the Sherill criticisms, and his press secretary dates the present deepening concern over the issues to the doubts raised by the article. Finally he came to the staffer with a note he had written to be sent to Sherill: "Dear Bob: Thank you very much for giving me a better look at myself."

Whether the man actually changed—and how much—after Haynsworth-Carswell, one thing is certain: his horizons widened. Gradually assembling what Newsweek recently called "the best countrywide organization . . . and most professional Presidential campaign of them all," Bayh began seeking greater recognition.

The mechanics of Bayh's campaign, as fascinating as they are, are tangential to the purpose of this assessment. It is probably adequate to say that as a traveller and an organizer, Bayh has been extremely adept. Should the friends he's making, especially among the second-echelon Party members around the country, stick by him, the 1972 Convention could produce some surprises.

#### BAYH'S CONVICTIONS

Because of that—just because Birch Bayh might somehow squeak through the primaries to challenge for the nomination—it makes sense to ask exactly what this man believes. Beyond his obvious triumphs, there can still be legitimate questions about what he would do as President. It is there that the doubts lie: not in his ability, but in his soul.

Forget for the moment that he announced against the SST in 1971 (though a blizzard kept him from the actual vote). Remember that in 1968 and 1969 when Ed Muskie and George McGovern joined William Proxmire's futile attempts to block the SST, Birch Bayh was still on the aerospace team.

Forget that Birch Bayh voted against the ABM, the most publicized of the anti-Pentagon issues in 1969; remember that he voted against a Proxmire amendment cutting back the cost-overrun C-5A military transport, pending a report by the Comptroller-General.

Forget for the moment that Bayh has attacked the surveillance tactics of the Nixon Administration; remember that he voted to allow the Nixon Administration's sop to the right wing—the assignment of Otto Otepka, liberals' arch-villain—to the Subversive Activities Control Board. Forget that he helped Richard Hatcher become Mayor of Gary, Indiana, against strong Party boss opposition; remember that he refused to take a stand in the 1968 Indiana Primary between Robert Kennedy, Eugene McCarthy and Governor Branigan.

Recognize that for all the high-sounding phrases, Birch Bayh scored lower than any other Presidential candidate except Henry Jackson on the 1970 Americans for Democratic Action ratings. Though Bayh participated in Earth Day celebrations, his 1970 voting record on environmental issues was far worse than that of Hughes, McGovern or Muskie. The only groups that gave him perfect voting records were labor organizations, COPE and the AFL-CIO, but then Bayh has long been known as a close friend of labor.

Recognize all this and give it due weight, but then recognize also that Bayh has little intention of campaigning for the Presidency on the hard kinds of "issues" that figure so prominently in ADA or FOE standings. He doesn't do well with issues in a public forum.

On a trip to New York in late April, Bayh appeared at the Statler-Hilton for a speech

to the Model United Nations. Unrecognized, he walked up to a pair of teenage girls at the UN registration desk. "I'm Birch Bayh," he said. "Where should I be?" Flustered, one of the girls replied, "Birch Bayh! But you are upstairs speaking!" Bayh laughed, stepped onto the escalator, then turned around; "That must be an imposter speaking, but he'll probably give a better speech than I will." His speech on ways to reform the UN, indeed, like a speech later that night on Vietnam, was pedestrian and boring.

#### A LEADER

But, on both occasions, all was changed when he stepped back from his speechwriters and conveyed his personality to the audience. Like John Kennedy in 1960, apparently Bayh has come to think that American people will respond more to a morally strong, dynamic personality than to just another liberal, attractive, Democratic Senator. He is thus seeking to fill the leadership gap—issuing statements on Administration actions, but couching those statements in terms of what is the proper, moral course, not in terms of what is liberal or conservative.

Perhaps the best example of this strategy (if indeed the application of a system of values to political issues can be called a strategy) is Bayh's response to Nixon's intervention in the Calley affair. When the President promised to add his extra legal ingredient, Bayh was out of Washington, campaigning. Reportedly more incensed by the President's action than he had been at the Carswell nomination, Bayh told his D.C. office to prepare a response. Several staffers counseled restraint; Bayh insisted. Though the statement by Calley prosecutor Audrey Daniel obscured Bayh's attack, there was no mistaking how completely he outbid the other Presidential Senators. Skirting the liberal dilemma of whether Calley should be exonerated because he was just a pawn in other people's war, Bayh concentrated his attack on the President's determination "to play politics with the Calley decision and the entire Mylar tragedy." Well-prepared to the point of knowing the charges (ignored by the President) against the 115 other servicemen court-martialed for premeditated murder of Vietnamese citizens, he charged Nixon with undermining the integrity of the legal system that "is what Americans have defended in past wars."

"Most of us today," he continued, "are concerned about the alarming increase in the rate of crime. . . . Well, I happen to believe that law and order is taught by example as well as by exhortation. And I do not believe the President's action is designed to strengthen support for our system of law and order. It is far easier to talk about principles than it is to live up to them."

#### INTEGRITY, NOT ISSUES

His will be a campaign that attacks hard the leadership of the Republicans. He will play the moral tune probably more than he will deal with substantive issues. He will criticize actions more because they appear to be illegal—like the recent decision to reduce corporation depreciation taxes by Executive Order rather than Congressional Act—than because they are incorrect policy, though he might believe the policy misdirected. With faith in the Presidency at a low level, Bayh will seek to capitalize on his deserved, though not unbesmirched, reputation for integrity and political courage. Where John Kennedy played his youth as an alternative to Republican lethargy, Bayh will play Haynsworth-Carswell as an alternative to the moral decay of the Republicans.

The approach is having some success. The Washington Star reported on a meeting of delegates to the California Democratic Council: "Bayh, who spoke yesterday after Muskie and McGovern had departed, received by far

the biggest ovation, after giving a hard-hitting, emotion-filled speech. There appeared to be a feeling among many delegates, even some who said they were for Muskie, that Bayh could develop into a hot property."

United Press International, noting that Bayh's mail had been running 1000 to one against the Calley verdict when he took his stand, predicted that "when public opinion shifts . . . Bayh's forthright stand will be taken correctly as an act of political courage, rather than a gamble."

One of California's more prominent black politicians thinks that Bayh has the most appeal to minority groups. Comparing the Indianan's willingness to plunge into ghetto crowds with Robert Kennedy's, the state legislator said the blacks and chicanos know Bayh's record on civil rights is as good as any of the other candidates—despite Indiana's Ku Klux Klan past—and they welcome his straightforward manner.

#### LAW AND ORDER

If the Calley case is a good example of Bayh's "moral role of law" approach to sensitive issues, then his intervention in two recent racial hot spots supports the argument. In March of 1970, Bayh pressured the Justice Department to investigate a shooting incident at the Indiana Reformatory at Pendleton. Though both the local grand jury and the state police had whitewashed what was essentially a racial attack on unarmed inmates by 11 armed guards and a civilian, Bayh insisted on, and got, a clarifying judgment. Again, he spoke about the structure of the law, not the racial incident itself.

Similarly, in April of this year, Bayh urged the Attorney-General to "undertake a thorough, impartial investigation of complaints my office has received from Texas residents alleging widespread violation of the civil rights of members of the Mexican-American community by law enforcement officers." As Bayh later wrote to the Dallas Times-Herald, he was not making any charges regarding the treatment of Mexican-Americans in Texas, merely seeking to ensure, as "a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee," that no one's civil rights were being violated. No emotional defense of minority rights there—though the minority groups certainly get the message—just going by the book.

#### YOUTHFULNESS

To be President, one must evidently sound like Moses but also look like Richard Widmark—troubled but dignified and above all, aging. If Bayh has another weakness as a candidate, it is probably the same boyishness that gave John Kennedy so much trouble eleven years ago. As ridiculous as that sounds, Bayh's youthfulness lacks the gravity which lends weight to a politician's statements. The incredible rapidity of his rise to national prominence leaves him, even today, less knowledgeable than many of the other candidates, particularly McGovern. He lacks experience with the Eastern money-men and on a trip to New York early in the spring, allowed his nervousness to show through to the dismay of the potential contributors. Usually, in person, he is straightforward and sincere with a quality so rare in a politician these days—awareness of his less than god-like capacities. Whether experience will give him added polish and improve his public-speaking stature, whether his speech writers will get a better idea of their boss's natural cadence—something quite different from the Kennedy-Sorensen rhetoric they provide him—these things remain to be seen.

If Bayh's past history is any indication, he will probably overcome these problems. His is a career marked by a remarkable ability to adapt to his surroundings. Just as each man must try to adjust to the varying environments of his life, Bayh has grown and changed with each new political office. Ap-

parently, he has decided that the environmentally proper posture for a Presidential candidate in 1972 is one of personal courage, integrity and honesty. After the Carswell vote, Bayh was asked whether his role in the battle would hurt him back home. "Sure it'll hurt," he said. "It'll hurt like hell. But you have to stand up for what you believe in. I don't have to be a Senator all my life." As phoney as that sounds to hardened political people, it must be said that Birch Bayh either believes it or if he doesn't believe it, has had remarkable success in convincing others that he does. Whichever it is, Bayh is committed to a hard fight for the nomination. It would be a mistake to underestimate him and thus, his chances.

**PETITION COMMITTEE FOR  
SOVIET JEWRY**

**HON. JACK F. KEMP**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I was quite pleased to receive a letter from Mr. and Mrs. Enoch Silverstein from Evanston, Ill., informing me of the petition drive which they are sponsoring on behalf of Soviet Jewry. It is to their credit that they have taken upon themselves a task of such mammoth proportions and in the best tradition of the American spirit.

Mr. Speaker, this summer I am planning to visit the Soviet Union with the Education and Labor Committee on which I serve. I hope to take that opportunity to present to the Soviet leaders a petition signed by members of the Buffalo Jewish Community. Should I be unable to enter the Soviet Union with these petitions, I will make every effort to present them to the Soviet Embassy in Washington or to their United Nations delegation in New York City.

At this point I include the aforementioned letter, the petition, and an article from the May 7, 1971, Chicago Sun Times.

The material follows:

**PETITION COMMITTEE  
FOR SOVIET JEWRY,  
June 18, 1971.**

HON. JACK F. KEMP,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEMP: We are sponsoring the enclosed petition project for Soviet Jewry, as illustrated in the enclosed reprint.

You, as a prominent American, can help Soviet Jews in this effort, if you will lend your support and join the growing list of Americans who signed this petition to release the Jews.

In the interest of humanity and justice, please sign the enclosed petition and return it to us, so we can present it to the Soviet Government.

Very truly yours,  
Mr. and Mrs. ENOCH SILVERSTEIN.

**TO THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT**

We demand that you stop your inhuman persecution of the Jews in the Soviet Union.

We demand that you allow the Jews to leave the U.S.S.R.—this is their legal right, guaranteed by your government. This right of emigration is in "the universal declaration of human rights," article 13-2. The

language is clear and unequivocal—"Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own." Your government is a party to this essential human right. You must honor your word!!

JACK KEMP,  
Member of Congress.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 7, 1971]  
**FOR THE JEWS IN RUSSIA: 70,000 PETITIONS  
MARK THEIR DECISION TO ACT**  
(By Paul Galloway)

Like most people Enoch and Marjorie Silverstein try to keep up with what's going on in this country and in the rest of the world. They read newspapers and magazines, watch network news on TV, talk about issues and events with friends.

And like most people, Enoch and Marjorie Silverstein feel very strongly about injustices. They want to do something to help, something more than to make stirring speeches at the dining room table, talk back to Walter Cronkite or mutter cynically.

But unlike most people, Enoch and Marjorie Silverstein did something. They acted. And so far, as a result, they have a basement stacked with more than 70,000 petitions.

**PETITIONS FOR SOVIET UNION**

The petitions are addressed to the leaders of the Soviet Union. They contain two demands. The first is that the persecution of Jews be stopped. The second is about a citizen's right to emigration, and it is aimed at the Soviet Union's refusal to allow many Soviet Jews who want to emigrate to leave the country.

What prompted the petition drive? "It was frustrating," Enoch says. "We'd go to meetings and listen to speeches and become eager to do something. Then we'd feel this sense of futility that there was nothing we could do. We'd go home and get back to normal living."

One night two months ago, they sat in the den of their home in Evanston, talking about it. "We decided we should stop saying 'Something should be done' and do something," Enoch said.

"Then we started down the list of ways to translate our concern into action. We rejected any kind of wild emotional approach. We felt our appeal should have a legal basis, because this kind of approach would be the hardest for the Soviet Union to answer. We settled on the idea of the petition."

**5,000 COPIES OF PETITION**

They took the final text of the petition to a printer and ordered 5,000 copies. It cost about \$35.

"We wanted one signature rather than many on each sheet. We felt it would give a greater sense of identity and participation for the signer," Enoch says.

The first time they took the petitions out was a meeting at Mather High School. They set up a booth in the back of the room, and after the main speaker finished, what earlier had been a trickle of signers became a torrent.

"In three or four days, it became apparent that we were going to need more petitions," says Enoch. "I went back and ordered 5,000 more. Then in a few days another 5,000. Then 10,000."

The petitions have since been distributed by 1,000 volunteers in shopping centers, schools, churches and synagogues, at meetings and door-to-door.

**MANY VOLUNTEERS PITCH IN**

"We haven't solicited any organization, but many have voluntarily joined. One had 40,000 of them printed at its expense."

Besides the stacks ("They must weigh a ton") in the Silverstein basement, at least 120,000 more are being circulated.

"I'm overwhelmed," Enoch says. He has

already spent several hundred dollars on the project. "We have had such wide support—every race and creed and all ages have been in on it."

Enoch's motivation is particularly personal. His parents were immigrants from the Ukraine and met in the United States, but his mother's sisters and brothers remained behind and were killed by the Germans in 1941.

The Silverstein petition cites Article 13, Paragraph 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, of which the Soviet Union is a signer:

"Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own."

**HOPE TO TAKE PETITIONS TO WASHINGTON**

"With the information (about treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union) coming to light, how can one ignore it?" he asks. "Some one has described the situation as a spiritual rather than a physical holocaust. How can anyone be indifferent?"

Enoch says he and his wife want to put the petitions in a truck and take them to Washington to present them.

"We're not sure of the protocol, and I'm really open to suggestions about how to use them," he said.

"I really believe they'll do some good," Enoch added. "Great nations are sensitive to public opinion, and I think it'll be an amalgam of many efforts, including ours, that will change the policy."

And, say, Enoch and Marjorie Silverstein there still is room in their basement for another ton or so of petitions.

**TRADE SHOWDOWN—THE UNITED STATES READIES FOR WAR ON INTERNATIONAL RULES FOR EXPORTS, IMPORTS**

**HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the Wall Street Journal carried an excellent article by Mr. Richard F. Janssen concerning the attempts of the United States to update the rules of the international trading game so that we may have at least an even chance to compete.

Mr. Janssen put the matter into proper perspective when he discusses some of the reasons for our imbalance of trade—such as the export of our technology—for which we have spent billions of dollars—to low-wage countries; artificial trade barriers such as tariffs, subsidies, and the value added tax which allows rebates to exporters thus distorting free trade since they work against our greater efficiency in many areas; and the outdated rules of GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

One GATT staffer correctly pointed out a major dilemma in our foreign trade policy—we have none. Policy is spread over several bureaucracies, such as the Commerce, State, and Defense Departments, and the Tariff Commission. Another problem is the creaky working of the international monetary system with its reliance on fixed exchange rates. Some rates are out of line, and the imbalance raises the prices of U.S. exports and cuts the prices of U.S. imports.

Obviously, a trade war would be a losing proposition for everyone concerned.



But by the same token, industries that are going out of business or curtailing their activities, and millions of unemployed Americans, will not be impressed by the fact that we have spent billions of taxpayers' dollars to restore to a healthy state those very countries which are now denying us our rightful access in the world marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, the timely Wall Street Journal article follows:

**TRADE SHOWDOWN: UNITED STATES READIES FOR WAR ON INTERNATIONAL RULES FOR EXPORTS, IMPORTS—AMERICANS SAY STACKED DECK, LETS OVERSEAS GOODS IN, BUT BLOCKS THE UNITED STATES ABROAD—WILL "NIGHTMARE" COME TRUE?**

(By Richard F. Janssen)

The U.S. government is getting ready for a new cold war—against the rest of the free world.

The field is the presumably peaceful one of international trade. The object: updating the rules to give the U.S. an even break in the \$300 billion-plus game of world trade.

Spurring Washington to act is a vision that Europeans deride as "the American nightmare": a dark picture of a world in which other nations combine the newest technology with lower wages to rout U.S. goods from both home and foreign markets. Some in Washington see this situation being hastened by the fact that present trade pacts are enforced slowly, unfairly, or not at all. Says one U.S. strategist: "How do they expect us to survive—as a nation of coupon-clippers and welfare recipients?"

U.S. officials and lawmakers complain that the present system doesn't stop Europe from offsetting the greater efficiency of American farmers through steep tariffs against U.S. foodstuffs and generous subsidies for its own farm exports. They charge, too, that existing rules let other countries encourage exports with special tax rebates, permit growing regional groups to do business duty-free among themselves and allow Japan to keep quota limits against numerous U.S. items while flooding the U.S. with autos, radios and synthetic textiles.

#### THE RESPONSE

In response, the U.S. is taking an increasingly tough stand in international economic organizations, is launching probes of foreign trade practices and is acting more vigorous against allegedly unfair imports ranging from French molasses to Japanese glass. Some officials hint, moreover, that the U.S. ought to cut its military commitments abroad unless there's less discrimination against U.S. wares.

The risks of the undertaking are high. The new American posture threatens to shatter the tenuous constraints against anything-goes competitive practices and protectionism abroad, and American planners concede that their trade aims could strain diplomatic and military relationships.

But they feel there's urgent need to plow ahead anyway. President Nixon was said to have been "bowled over" by the dismal trade projections of Peter G. Peterson, the head of his new Council on International Economic Policy. Mr. Nixon is devoting much time to the situation, aides report, in part because of the world political ramifications. The potential trade conflicts are greatest with Japan and West Germany, the industrial powers that he is said to deem "the key to peace in the world" now.

The first phase of the effort to revise the rules appears to be going smoothly. After Secretary of State William P. Rogers cautioned in Paris this month that "many in the U.S. aren't convinced" that the international trade rules are being applied fairly, the 23-nation Organization for Economic Co-

operation and Development agreed to start sorting out the issues.

#### BRITISHER'S ADVICE: HAVE FAITH

But this may be the easiest phase. Serious negotiations may follow in two years or so, and this country's trading partners are determined to defend the status quo. "We understand the U.S. concern, but I'm not so sure we find it justified," says a British trade official in London. While admitting that imports are making sharp inroads in such key U.S. industries as autos, steel and consumer electronics products, he advises the administration "to have faith that one's scientists and engineers will come up with something else."

But administration men fear that any product innovations will swiftly be picked up for cheaper manufacture abroad, mainly through the foreign subsidiaries of U.S. businesses. "Technology gets transferred in a great hurry now," frets Mr. Peterson.

The apprehension is underscored by statistics showing that the U.S. imported \$215 million more goods in April than it exported. Officials still expect an export surplus for the full year, but they fear it will be slimmer than last year's \$2.7 billion and so will do less to offset the big dollar outflow for military, investment and other purposes.

Nor will technological progress do much good in the longer run, U.S. officials fear, if other countries continue to frustrate American export attempts by what these officials call unfair manipulation of the fair-competition rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the 90-nation authority based in Geneva. "The rules will have to be changed" or at least enforced more evenhandedly, Treasury Secretary John B. Connally declares. Another official adds bluntly, "We've lost confidence in GATT. The Europeans have GATT going their way and why the hell should they give it up?"

#### A MUTUAL MISTRUST

The mistrust is mutual. At GATT headquarters, a pale-green hilltop villa with a breathtaking view of Lake Geneva, an aide describes the Nixon administration attitude as "fantastically dangerous" for the future of a liberal trade order. He denies that the rules or their applications are at fault, and he says the Nixon administration simply doesn't understand GATT.

"I know the U.S. feels cheated" because GATT hasn't swiftly arrested, say, the surge of Japanese textile exports to the U.S., he says. "But GATT isn't a court with police to enforce laws," he says. Rather, it's "a forum for negotiations on the basis of agreed rules and procedures" set up in 1948.

GATT works mainly through "moral suasion," officials say. The most it can do if this fails, they add, is to sanction retaliation by an aggrieved member against an offending one, such as restoration of higher tariffs on some products. To insist directly that a nation stop a disputed trade practice, an official warns, "can unravel everything" by setting off a chain reaction of rule violations or dropouts from GATT membership.

To use GATT successfully, a staffer chides, "a country must have a foreign-trade policy—and the U.S. has none." If the Nixon administration had had a clear concept of how to dovetail the U.S.-Japanese textile dispute with such other policy problems as steel imports and the return of Okinawa to Japan, the official suggests, "we could have helped" by providing a secluded setting and technical support for serious negotiations. But as in other trade issues, GATT analysts complain, the administration couldn't get agreement among such agencies as the Commerce, State and Defense departments and the Tariff Commission to do this.

The administration recognizes this internal disarray. President Nixon's formation early this year of the council headed by Mr.

Peterson was intended to unify policymaking. And at least some trade experts in Washington agencies agree that GATT can't be expected to make crisp, legally enforced rulings. "It's more of a foot-shuffling and throat-clearing process," one says.

Nor is GATT totally "loaded against us," some officials concede. It provided the forum for the widely acclaimed lowering of tariffs that President Kennedy initiated, and it routinely extends a rule waiver permitting the U.S. to impose import quotas on cheese, cattle and other agricultural products. Rather than change GATT's basic rules, "we should seek to improve its operations," testifies Nathaniel Samuels, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Still, the U.S. dissatisfaction runs deep, not only in the administration but also on Capitol Hill and in the business community. The GATT rules "should be redrawn" because they date from the early post-World War II time when "the U.S. held a virtual monopoly over production and trade," asserts a report by the staff of the Senate Finance Committee. The GATT principles of fair play "are being violated right and left," charges N. R. Danelian, president of the International Economic Policy Association, which represents big U.S. companies.

As U.S. officials start exploring possible reforms, here are some complaints they'll likely make—along with objections they're apt to encounter from other governments:

#### TARIFFS

The most basic GATT principle is that each member should apply to the products of all other members a duty no higher than it applies against the same goods from the "most favored nation." The same rule requires that any other "favor" granted the goods of one nation must also "immediately and unconditionally" be granted to like products from all others.

The U.S. generally honors this principle, it's widely agreed, but GATT permits so many exceptions for others that Mr. Danelian contends the U.S. has fallen into a "least-favored-nation position." The six European Common Market nations are allowed to levy duties against U.S. goods while collecting none from each other, for instance and they have a growing network of more favorable rates for Mediterranean and African countries.

Europe yawns at the American alarm. The poorer, developing countries that make up two-thirds of GATT membership "need special measures to help them expand their exports," asserts Olivier Long, GATT's director-general, and others argue that GATT negotiations have brought tariff rates down so much since World War II that they no longer mean much anyway. The Common Market stresses that by January its rates on industrial goods will average 6.9% of their values, compared with the U.S. average of 10.9%.

#### TAXES

GATT permits "indirect" or sales-type taxes to be rebated to exporters and to be levied against imports, but it doesn't allow this to be done with such "direct" taxes as the corporate income tax. In the U.S. view, this gives a wide pricing edge to countries that rely on sales taxes, such as the European "value added tax" levied at various stages of handling goods.

The distinction is based on an "extreme and arbitrary" economic theory, the Senate staff report charges, and it notes that European countries have sharply raised their sales-type "border taxes" over the decades. But European authorities argue that their income tax rates have gotten roughly as high as American rates, and they suggest that if the U.S. really believes that having a stiff national sales tax is such a good thing it ought to enact one. (The administration is

studying the possibility of a "value added tax" for the U.S., but apparently not with any great urgency.)

#### NON-TARIFF BARRIERS

This is the broadest and thorniest area of trade disputes. GATT has compiled—by asking each member to tell the nasty tricks others are pulling—a catalog of 800 such obstacles to free trade. They are often "complex and deep-rooted," says Robert McLellan, Assistant Commerce Secretary for Domestic and International Business, and are of "considerable concern" to the administration because they're often directed especially against U.S. products.

These restrictions are often subtle. Foreign governments may offer lower rates for their export goods than for other freight on state-owned railways, or they may encourage their export industries to get together without fear of antitrust actions. There is a "general reluctance" among other nations to give up such practices, Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans says.

The U.S. has formally complained to GATT that Western European nations are developing uniform standards for electronic and electrical products. Washington suspects the aim is to exclude a wide variety of U.S. goods. A European trade official blandly denies that this is "necessarily" the motive. Instead, he argues that on such a highly technical matter "it is simply easier to get agreement among a few countries than among many."

#### COMMENTS ON THE McNAMARA PAPERS

### HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is critical to put the entire question of the stolen McNamara papers in proper perspective.

I wish to present the following article from Monday, the Republican National Committee's hard-hitting publication. In addition I include a statement I made to the question of the right of America's press media to determine what is in the best interest of national security:

#### ALLIES UPSET OVER DISCLOSURE OF McNAMARA PAPERS, SURVEY SHOWS

Contrary to what the publisher of the New York Times has implied, there is widespread concern among America's allies over publication of the so-called McNamara Papers. Times publisher Arthur Ochs Sulzberger was quoted in the N.Y. Post on June 9 as replying: "Oh, that's a lot of baloney. I mean really," to a question about the U.S. Government's claim that publication of the papers will destroy the faith of foreign governments in the ability of the U.S. to keep confidences.

Monday spoke with an official source at the State Department who strongly disagreed with Mr. Sulzberger. "Almost all our allies in Western Europe and East Asia feel that while it's Top Secret material on Vietnam today that the Times and other papers are publishing, it may well be Top Secret material about their country tomorrow," the State Department official explained. "A second point virtually ignored by the press," the source pointed out, "and this is absolutely crucial, is the chilling effect this publication has on all of our Government's representative's abroad who communicate in writing, and this means almost all communication. If these people feel they cannot report

in full frankness what is going on in a given country, this prevents the U.S. from knowing what's going on abroad. And this could have disastrous consequences on our foreign policy."

#### COUNTRIES MOST CONCERNED

The State Department source said countries most concerned about the publication of the classified material are Canada, Thailand, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand. All these countries, the source said, upon publication of the documents immediately asked the U.S. for special meetings to discuss the matter.

A Monday random survey of embassies in Washington also showed concern over the publication of the classified material:

A spokesman of the Israeli embassy explained that because of the situation in his country they are "extremely security conscious" and the disclosure of the material in the Times hit Israel "exceptionally hard." To the people back home, the leak of Top Secret documents is "unthinkable," he declared. "Perhaps we will communicate more orally, I don't know. I don't think the press has the right to declassify such material. They do not have the whole story."

#### FRENCH CONCERNED

A spokesman at the French embassy explained that his country has "a great interest" in and is "very concerned" about the publication of the material. "Such leaks are very likely to happen elsewhere, our government knows this," he declared. "While the material today being published is about Vietnam, tomorrow it could be about France. We are quite concerned. And our concern is definitely not baloney."

A spokesman at the British embassy shared the concern of the French. "There is no question that the publication of this material is unsettling and might have an effect on what we commit to paper in the future," he said. "We most likely will be more hesitant to put things in writing. The publication of this material has wider repercussions than just about Vietnam."

A spokesman at the West German embassy said: "We realize that in the future documents embarrassing to us could be made public. To that extent we are concerned."

#### SOUTH VIETNAM

A spokesman at the South Vietnamese embassy said: "The whole thing is of concern to us. It is upsetting and will probably change the way we communicate in the future. But at this point it is not clear how."

#### TIMES-POST CHANGE VIEWS

Also virtually overlooked and unmentioned by the press in the whole NEW YORK TIMES-WASHINGTON POST-Vietnam Papers Caper is the 180 degree policy change exhibited by both papers in their publication of the classified documents. As far as the TIMES and POST are concerned it appears that there are good security leaks and bad security leaks. It all depends on who is leaking what to whom.

For example:

In the 1950's, during the so-called Army-McCarthy hearings, Sen. Joseph McCarthy was editorially lashed by both the TIMES and the POST for suggesting that he felt it the duty of every Federal employee to give to his Committee any information they might have about "graft, corruption, Communist and treason." McCarthy said there was no loyalty to a superior officer which could tower above and beyond their loyalty to their country.

#### INVITATION TO ANARCHY

The Times, in an editorial titled "Invitation to Anarchy" blasted McCarthy for "undermining the structure of our Federal system" and encouraging every "malcontent, every disgruntled office holder or office seek-

er . . . every political sycophant" to disregard the whole fabric of "law and order" that holds this or any government together.

The Post was equally indignant and in an editorial titled "Above the Law" took McCarthy to task for what the paper called "an open defiance of the laws."

In an editorial titled "Breach of Security" in December of 1962, the Times roasted authors Stewart Alsop and Charles Bartlett for a story in the Saturday Evening Post about what went on in a National Security Council meeting during the Cuban missile crisis. Although the Alsop-Bartlett article contained no word from any NSC report or any other secret document, unlike the Vietnam report published by the Times and Post, the Times asserted that the "secrecy of one of the highest organs of the United States Government has been seriously breached."

#### TIMES DEFENDS SECRECY

The Times asked rhetorically: "How can advisers to the President be expected to give advice freely and easily and at all times honestly and with complete integrity if they have to worry about what their arguments will look like in print a few weeks later? What kind of advice can the President expect to get under such circumstances? How can there be any real freedom of discussion or dissent; how can anyone be expected to advance positions that may be politically unpopular or unprofitable? Does no one in Washington recall the McCarthy era and the McCarthy technique? . . . it is to the point to reiterate the White House statement this week that the various positions of the members of the N.S.C. taken during deliberations must remain secret 'in order to permit access by the President to the frankest expression of views.' The integrity of the National Security Council and of the advice received by the President, is at stake."

In 1963, when State Department security officer Otto Otepka furnished a Senate subcommittee with two classified documents to prove that certain of his superiors had lied under oath regarding him and Department security procedures, both the Times and the Post lambasted Otepka. In an editorial titled "The Congressional Underground" the Times declared: "Orderly procedures are essential if the vital division of power between legislative and executive branches is not to be undermined. The use of 'underground' methods to obtain classified documents from lower-level officials is a dangerous departure from such orderly procedures."

#### POST ATTACKS OTEPKA

The Post labeled what Otepka did "unlawful" and "unconscionable." "He gave classified information to someone not authorized to receive it . . . he had no authority to give it . . ." said the Post. "If any underling in the State Department were free at his own discretion to disclose confidential cables or if any agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation could leak the contents of secret files whenever he felt like it, the Executive branch of the Government would have no security at all."

As columnist Stewart Alsop wrote last week in Newsweek magazine: "Indeed, the Times series, by the Times' own standards, is the most serious 'breach of security' in modern history. Yet those who wait for the Times to denounce this particular breach will have a long wait."

#### EDITORIAL REBUTTAL—KHS RADIO, LOS ANGELES

(By Congressman BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.)

While freedom of the press must be defended, at the same time the press must be responsible. It is not responsible for the press to defy the law by releasing classified documents of the United States Government. The New York Times and other newspapers



showed gross negligence in publication of the Pentagon papers. They have set a dangerous precedent for the release of other material in the future. Can a newspaper editor now decide what is in the best interests of our national security? Can he act above the law of the land? Now, I admit that the process of classification is sometimes overused and some of the material need not remain classified. However, it remains as an established procedure under the law to maintain our national security. Any change must be made through either the Congress or the courts. No newspaper editor has the right to make a decision of what laws should or should not be obeyed. No man or business is above the law, including the New York Times.

THE DUCKSPEAK OF THE  
"EXPERTS"

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, to date this so-called "new era" of U.S.-Red China relations has been all one-sided.

A major relaxation of trade restrictions, complete removal of travel restrictions, kind, hopeful and optimistic words on the part of the United States—and in return, my newest copy of Peking Review, June 18, 1971, carries on page 11 this common Red Chinese slogan, not attached to any article in particular:

People of the World, Unite and Defeat the U.S. Aggressors and All Their Running Dogs!

One article in the Review is headed "United States-Japanese Reactionaries Warned"—concerning joint U.S.-Japanese naval exercises off Korea—and another article is a reprint from a Japanese Maoist monthly, Mao Tse-tung Thought, with this heading:

Japanese People's Struggle—A Link in Struggle by World's People Against U.S. Imperialism and Its Running Dogs.

Yet a third is headed:

Shining Example of Small Countries Defeating a Big Country: People of Indochina growing stronger as they fight in the war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation.

And now we have the experts starting to come out of the woodwork. There are rather disturbing indications that these experts prefer to draw wishful conclusions based on what they think it should be, rather than what it is. We have the above examples to go from, also the fact that to date there has been not one single reciprocal act from Peking, in spite of all our scraping and crawling. Yet, it is most disturbing to me to read that, in a letter to the New York Times on Saturday, June 26, from the co-director of the East Asia Studies Center at Dartmouth, the following; the letter commented on the actual new generation of China scholars:

These young China specialists don't look on China as an enemy. That there are unfathomable—even frightening—aspects of the People's Republic, few of them would deny. But they know the Chinese language, read everything they can about China, talk

to travelers and Chinese diplomats abroad—and conclude that the Chinese experiment is a great, and even a noble one . . ." (italics supplied)

Also, last week, the director of East Asian Legal Studies at Harvard told the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that the United States should apologize to Peking for espionage activity, as a way to get four Americans jailed by the Red Chinese released from their prison cell. This expert said there was a new climate—his word—in Peking toward the United States. I would find this easier to believe if the pages of Peking Review reflected it. From the examples in the June 18 issue, the climate has not changed one whit.

This great and noble Red Chinese experiment meant the deaths—and the total figure will never be known—of an estimated 10 million Chinese. It has resulted in—and even pro-Peking Westerners admit this—a rock-hard, rigid regimentation of the Chinese millions into a gray and faceless mass, tramping along in unison to the thoughts of Chairman Mao.

It has meant the psychotic, thoughtlessly irrational excesses of the Great Cultural Revolution, and the rampages of the Red Guards—which got to be too much even for Mao. It has meant destruction—or attempted destruction—of all that was truly great and noble and a heritage of China's past.

As for the apology suggestion, I would think a simple quid pro quo to Peking concerning the prisoners would be in order: we have gone this far, and we might go farther if, and only if, these men are released.

But not one further step on our part until they are, not one, and make this clear to the Red Chinese ruling hierarchy.

The poet Virgil wrote in his Aeneid the famous line:

I fear the Greeks, even when bringing gifts.

For myself, and I think the above examples of duckspeak will bear me out, there is reason to fear these self-anointed experts and especially when they come bearing advice. I trust that the administration will deal with Red China on more sound and realistic premises.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF  
KOSSOVO

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the Battle of Kossovo, the day on which the Serbs commemorate this event of great historical significance. While the battle was fought on June 15, 1389, its anniversary is June 28 under the Gregorian calendar.

The kingdom of Serbia, which had been in existence since 1168, became a great empire during the 14th century. The empire collapsed as a result of the

Serbian defeat at Kossovo, when not only Tsar Lazar I but the flower of the aristocracy met death on the battlefield.

Serbia existed as a vassal of Turkey until 1459 when it became part of the Ottoman Empire. It was not until 1878 that it once again became an independent monarchy.

Since World War I, Serbia has been the major part of Yugoslavia, which includes the Croats, Slovenes, and other groups. At the moment, the people of Yugoslavia, who have been subject since 1945 to a Communist government, are concerned with the complications inherent in the Brezhnev doctrine as well as the economic stagnation in the country which results from the fundamental defects in Communist ideology.

Although they have had historic and modern stresses and strains among themselves, the many ethnic and major religious groups present in Yugoslavia co-exist in an imperfect, yet impressive, fashion. The yearning for true freedom throughout the history of their respective peoples is evident each year in Yugoslavia, and this is notably so among the Serbs.

I, therefore, take note of this historic anniversary commemorated by the Serbian people. I wish to commend them for their perseverance and unquenchable thirst for freedom and to express my conviction that the tenacity of the Serbs will, in the future, produce a government consistent with their great history and traditions.

DRUG ABUSE—A PROBLEM OF  
TRAGIC PROPORTIONS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress an excellent editorial published in the June 14 edition of the Concord Transcript which makes clear the need for answers to the drug dilemma.

By use of examples, it explains the phenomenal proportions of teenage drug abuse that is occurring in the Concord area as well as an illustration of the crisis across the Nation. But more, it offers a positive solution in beginning to cope with the difficulties faced in contending with this tragic problem.

I include the editorial as follows:

DRUG ACTION A MUST

Concord has a problem of tragic proportions: drugs. It is a crisis which must be overcome through the efforts of not just some. It must be faced by every citizen.

For those who do not see the problem, those who may wish to bury their heads in the sand, let's look at the record in just the past week.

Police raided a home and seized 35,000 secobarbital capsules, the largest seizure in county history. Secobarbital is a depressant. The capsules are most commonly known as "reds."

Nineteen kids between the ages of 13 and 16 have been detained by police officers be-

cause they were unable to care for themselves. Twelve had to be treated at hospitals.

A 14-year-old boy was arrested and admitted pushing "reds" at Glenbrook Intermediate School. A second teen, age 17, was also arrested. Six hundred pills were seized. Mark S. Hudson, age 15, was fatally shot. Police say the suspect arrested in the case was high on "reds."

We could go on, but the point is clear enough. As Lt. Robert Redfern of the Concord Police Department puts it: "Very definitely it's a hell of a problem here and it seems to be getting greater."

In just a few short days, Concord hopefully will open its Discovery House. That will be thanks to a few, comparatively speaking, dedicated citizens. That Discovery House must open and it must have the support of virtually every resident of Concord. Any other programs which come along must, too, have the support of the community.

The problem of drug abuse by our teenagers cannot and will not go away by itself. We must make it go away.

## MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gleason Glover, the executive director of the Minneapolis Urban League, is a tireless worker for programs which are vital to the well-being of Minneapolis.

His testimony at the recently concluded Minneapolis health care hearings emphasized:

The health service agencies responsible for the delivery of health services to the minority and disadvantaged communities have only minimal representation from these communities at the decision-making levels in these agencies.

The following testimony and study conducted by the Minneapolis Urban League bear out this point. We must reverse this inequality since widespread participation at the decisionmaking level is essential to the health of our democratic society.

The material follows:

#### STATEMENT OF MR. GLEASON GLOVER

Congressman Fraser and fellow citizens, Medical care in the United States is a gigantic, expensive business dwarfed in costs only by the business of defense: (estimated expenditures for 1969: 85.2 billion).<sup>1</sup> In 1969, medical care cost the people of this nation almost 63 billion, roughly 7% of the gross national product and more than we spend either on social security or on the education of our children.<sup>2</sup> Despite the huge investment, the United States ranks 17th among all nations in the life expectancy of women and 14th in the rate of infant mortality.<sup>3</sup> Life expectancy is lower and infant mortality is even higher among the black and the poor. Despite this huge investment, most of our nation's 313,000 active physicians work alone as private entrepreneurs, largely responsible only to themselves.

Another dimension of our national and local health care problem is the absence of health insurance for a large segment of minority and disadvantaged population, especially those who are under 65, who have no health insurance plan. Even those enrolled in health insurance plans have significant gaps on their coverage and therefore, can-

not make extensive prolonged use of the health care services currently available. This is most acute for the unwed mother and families who have mental or physically handicapped children.

To compound this already complex health problem is the fact that the health service agencies responsible for the delivery of health services to the minority and disadvantaged communities have only minimal representation from these communities at the decision-making levels in these agencies. The severity of this problem has been clearly indicated in a study completed by the Minneapolis Urban League in the spring of 1969,<sup>4</sup> and our current experiences as a result of the League's Consumer Health Education Program.

This program is designed to train and place the minority and disadvantaged consumer in decision-making positions on Boards of Directors and committees of those agencies and hospitals responsible for the delivery of health services.

Of the 68 private and public health service related agencies and 11 hospitals at the state, county, and local level it was ascertained that only 31 minority and disadvantaged consumers were involved in decision-making process concerning the delivery of health services. Although these institutions provide approximately 90% of health services to the minority and disadvantaged community. It should be noted that three of these institutions and agencies were responsible for approximately 50% of the minority and disadvantaged involvement.<sup>5</sup> One hospital, which had 60 employees and served over 2,800 black patients, had no black Board participation.

The aforementioned factors clearly indicate a need for radical surgery of our ailing medical care system.

The Minneapolis Urban League, in accord with the recommendations of the National Advisory Panel of Health to the National Urban League, (of which the speaker happens to be a member), urges your leadership and support of a national health care system based on the following assumptions:

1. The national health system should be conceived and function to meet the needs of the consumer and provide opportunity for appropriate consumer participation and control of the system which will serve them—consumer oriented rather than provider oriented.

2. The national health system should be oriented to health and its maintenance rather than disease.

3. More effective delivery of health services to the consumer cannot be achieved without the development and proper utilization of health personnel in innovative job classifications. This is based on a redefinition of roles and tasks and reorientation from disease to preventive health.

4. The most comprehensive health services can only be realized when the disadvantaged consumer has a representative decision making position at all levels in the national health system.

5. The health care system must be designed to provide an even distribution of comprehensive health care services in all communities.

6. A system of tax supported public education with a service commitment for all health professionals is essential to achieve an equitable solution to the manpower needs. The success of this educational system to provide sufficient manpower personnel will require a redefinition of roles and tasks.

In summary, the primary goal of a national health system should be to provide high quality, comprehensive, dignified medical, dental and mental health care and environmental protection for all people in the United States, regardless of race, sex, location, citizenship status or income.

The World Health Organization defines health as a state of complete physical, mental,

and social well-being—not merely the absence of infirmity or disease. The Minneapolis Urban League urges your leadership in making this a reality not only for the minority and disadvantaged but for all citizens.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> New York Times Encyclopedic Almanac, 1970.

<sup>2</sup> Faltermeyer, E. K., "Better Care at Less Cost Without Miracles," *Fortune* 81:80, January, 1970.

<sup>3</sup> Medical Tribune, May 4, 1970.

<sup>4</sup> "A Study of the Participation of Black People on Boards, Staff and Committees of Selected Public and Private Health, Education and Welfare and Employment Agencies in Minnesota," *Minneapolis Urban League*, Spring, 1969.

<sup>5</sup> The statistical information in this presentation does not include minority and disadvantaged membership on Pilot City Health Center Health Board or the planned Advisory Consumer Health Committee for Mount Sinai Hospital.

#### A STUDY OF THE PARTICIPATION OF BLACK PEOPLE ON BOARDS, STAFF, AND COMMITTEES OF SELECTED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE, AND EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES IN MINNESOTA

##### INTRODUCTION

In 1963 The Minneapolis Urban League conducted a study to determine "The Participation of Negroes in Selected Private Health and Welfare Agencies in Minneapolis." Information was primarily sought "as to whether Negroes were excluded from agency services by policy or circumstance; whether Negroes were served by the agency as a result of a general open door agency policy, and whether Negroes were specifically recruited for agency participation." The main hypotheses of the study were directed toward participation of Negroes in agencies as recipients of service. However, board and staff participation statistics were recorded.

Since 1963 major historical events have affected the lives of all peoples of the United States and particularly those who are Black.

The Civil Rights Movement gained public recognition in 1955 with the city wide bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama. The boycott was instigated by Rev. Martin Luther King and Ralph Abernathy.

The tempo of the movement increased under the varied direction of such leaders as King, John and Robert Kennedy, Stokely Carmichael, and Malcolm X.

The struggle for equality culminated during the summer of 1967 in a series of violent outbreaks in the black ghettos of Detroit, Newark and other large cities. As a result, President Lyndon Johnson established the Kerner Commission to study: "1) what happened in the summer of 1967? 2) why did it happen? 3) What could be done to prevent it from happening again?"

After a year of study the Kerner report was issued March 1, 1968. His ultimate conclusion was that: "what white Americans have never fully understood, but what the Negro can never forget is that white society is deeply implicated in the ghetto. White institutions created it, white institutions maintain it, and white society condones it... our nation is moving toward two societies—one black, one white—separate and unequal."

A careful examination of American history will reveal that large numbers of Black Americans have been systematically excluded from the decision making. The Black Power that Mr. Whitney Young espouses in his "New Thrust" program for The National Urban League represents a systematic attempt to reverse that practice and to make legitimate participants, not simply recipients, out of Black people. In the process of pursuing this goal it is hoped that many of the existing exclusivist social, political and economic institutions can be transformed.



## GENERAL INFORMATION

*Purpose of the study*

The purpose of this study was to determine whether Black people living in Minneapolis have not as yet been given an equal opportunity in the decision making processes in the major areas that affect their lives.

These major areas are defined as Health, Education, Welfare and Employment.

*Focus of the study*

In order to compare some statistics this study followed the general outline of the 1963 survey. However, it was determined to expand the study beyond the private agencies to the public agencies. State and county agencies were included as well as city.

One hundred and fifteen agencies were selected. All agencies provided services relating to the major areas defined above. The director of each agency received a letter from the director of the Urban League. The letter explained the purpose of the study and requested cooperation. Included was a short questionnaire.

*Method of study*

The study was divided into two separate components. The first consisted of the questionnaire. It contained ten short questions requesting statistics on the total number of personnel employed by the agency, and number of Blacks on the staff, board or committees of the agency.

The second phase consisted of interviews with directors of 38 of the selected agencies participating in the study. Each interviewer followed an 18 point interview format. The questions were designed to provide basic information regarding the nature of agency services. Two questions sought to determine whether the personnel of the agency had been involved in any Black sensitivity training programs, and whether the agency anticipated any changes in agency programs that would affect the Black community.

Upon completion of the questionnaires and interviews the numerical data was categorized and tabulated; the general information was summarized.

For comparative purposes the agencies were divided into 15 categories, 1) Family and Child Welfare, 2) Care of Emotionally Disturbed Children, 3) Settlement Houses and or Group Recreation, 4) Service to the Elderly, 5) Corrections, 6) Education, 7) Parks and Recreation, 8) Employment, 9) Health Services, 10) Hospitals, 11) Youth Work, 12) Poverty Programs, 13) Welfare, 14) Rehabilitative/Education Services for Specific Disease Entities, 15) Unclassified.

*Special problems of the study*

In 1962 the Urban League adopted a resolution regarding social statistics with a racial designation. Realizing the possible misuse of such statistics they nevertheless concluded that for the present their value outweighed the danger. They requested all agencies to keep pertinent statistical data by race in order to aid in research and in program planning.

It was the intent of the staff to interview directors of 60 selected agencies. Time and special circumstances limited the interviews to 39. In spite of this request most agencies have not kept records on the percentage of services directed to Black people. Most of the statistics gained in the interview were rough estimates. However, in the areas of board, staff and committee participation the information given on the questionnaire was precise.

*Overview: Facts and figures*

118 questionnaires were sent out. Two agencies had merged and the statistics on one questionnaire applied to two related organizations. Thus 115 agencies were contacted. 84 questionnaires or 73% were returned. Contact by phone was made with the remain-

ing 27%. Three agencies refused to participate, the others agreed to, but failed to return the questionnaire.

39 interviews were conducted with directors of the agencies by the staff of the Urban League.

In all statistics reported the two Poverty Program Agencies, Pilot City and Model City, were treated separately because of their innovations in the areas studied.

*Totals: Personnel—Boards—Committees*

The total number of personnel employed by the 82 agencies as reported on the questionnaire was 18,627. Of that number 717 were Black. Total board membership of those agencies having official boards was 1,902, 85 of whom were Black. Of all agencies reporting active committees a total of 3,051 people were listed as actively participating. Of that number 158 were Black.

## BOARD MEMBERSHIP

*Breakdown by Categories* (All numbers refer to Black Members unless otherwise indicated.)

*Family and Child Welfare:* Family and Child Welfare Agencies showed an increase of 7 board members. One agency reported 4 new members, another 2.

*Emotionally Disturbed Children:* Agencies dealing with emotionally disturbed children had no Black representation on boards.

*Settlement Houses/Group Recreation:* Settlement Houses and Group Recreation Centers revealed an increase from 14 to 23. 15 of these members represent one agency.

*Services to the Elderly:* 3 of the agencies rendering services to the elderly had no Black board members. One agency had 2.

*Corrections:* Correction service agencies revealed incomplete data as 2 large departments had no formal board structure. Of note in these departments was the precise data available regarding racial designation of those individuals incarcerated. Similar data was not available regarding employed personnel, governing bodies or committees.

*Education:* In education one single system employing the largest number of personnel of any of the agencies in any category had only one board member. A private institution with a faculty of over 250 and a student body of over 1,500 had no representation.

*Employment:* Public employment agencies referred approximately 225,000 individuals for jobs in 1969. One agency stated that approximately 10% of the 6,500 they served were Black. Only 1 Black man was listed as a board member in employment agencies.

*Health Related Agencies:* In Health related agencies an increase in board membership was noted from 4-16. Interestingly one agency, Planned Parenthood, was responsible for an increase of 5 members. 7 of their 45 member board were Black.

*Hospitals:* Hospitals including Federal, County, and Private, revealed no board participation by Blacks. One hospital had employed 60 and served over 2,800 Black patients.

*Youth Work:* Organizations working with youth showed an increase of 8 members. Five of those were appointed since 1966.

*Welfare:* In both State and County Welfare Departments no board participation was reported.

*Rehabilitation/Education:* Rehabilitation and Education Services for specific diseases had the largest number of agencies of any category. Of 17 agencies surveyed only 5 had board members.

*Poverty Programs:* The 2 Poverty Programs in Minneapolis-Pilot City and Model City, were treated separately. Both had shown innovative approaches in developing organizational structures that involved Black people on many levels of decision making. The two programs served different areas of the city. Both areas have a high concentration of the minority population. The two programs had a total staff of 89, 26 of whom are Black

Model City with a total board of 107 had 16 Black members. Pilot City with a total of 32 had 11. 25% of the total committee membership was Black. The Committee involvement by Black people in these two agencies alone equals 25% of the total involvement of the 82 other public and private agencies.

## GENERAL DATA RELEVANT TO CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*Public Agencies:* Public agencies employed the largest number of personnel (14,125), and with only a partial listing served 653,000 people. However, only 5 board members served in organizations where boards were used. Departments without formal board structure showed no participation in decision making roles. 613 Black people were listed as staff members. The majority of these positions were of a clerical or building maintenance nature.

*Board Participation:* The total board membership (Black and White) for the agencies surveyed was 1,902. 85 of that number were Black. 80 of the 85 were board members of private agencies. Only five men were members of boards of public agencies. Of those five two were appointed since 1966. In the private sector 49 new board members had been appointed since 1966. However, this figure represents 28 of the 82 agencies. 29 agencies had no Black representation on boards. The remaining agencies showed some participation but no increase.

*Staff Participation:* The total staff (Black and White) listed for all agencies showed an increase of approximately 4,000 since 1966. The total 18,627 employed in 1969 represented 717 who were Black. This is an increase of approximately 176. However, the increases were all within 24 of the 82 agencies. 15 agencies showed a decrease, 25 had no Black staff. The remaining agencies retained the same number or did not report in this category. Generally the public agencies showed the greatest increase in total staff as well as Black. A total staff of 14,125 was reported with 614 of those Black.

*Sensitivity Programs:* Thirty five directors responded to the interviewer's question regarding sensitivity type training programs for staff. 9 agencies had no experience with this, one of these had plans for a course this summer. 10 agencies had "someone to talk" for one class. 10 agencies had one session conducted by various members of the Black community. 5 agencies reported workshop types of programs. One agency had 5 groups for its clientele but not staff.

*Plans for Change:* Eight directors were "thinking of" plans for future sensitivity programs. 5 agencies planned "outreach" programs into "target areas" as soon as finances and staff were available. Although statistics on new programs were not recorded, some agencies had developed experimental projects to improve their delivery of services to minority groups.

## CONCLUSION

It is recognized that all agencies surveyed have in the past and are at the present providing important services for disadvantaged and minority people. It has however, been demonstrated that it is possible for agencies to plan and implement changes to develop new ways of effectively delivering their services. It has also been demonstrated that it is possible for an agency to seek and to find competent Black people to participate in the decision-making process of the agency.

However, it has generally been supported by the data in the study that basic structural and attitudinal changes which will open the way for equal life results for Black people have not been effected in most agencies. This is particularly evident in the public agencies which affect the greatest numbers of all people.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. No agency should be satisfied with having the "opportunity available" for Black people

to participate. This opportunity should be reflected in concrete policies and procedures of the agency which promote that participation.

2. Agencies should develop new institutional structures emphasizing community participation and some policy making representation of all constituent groups. This may involve a restructuring of the Board of Directors. If necessary agencies should be encouraged to develop leadership-responsibility workshops to prepare some constituents for active participation.

3. The Urban League staff should maintain contact with the directors whom they interviewed. Cooperative programs could be sponsored to develop and pursue the goals of each agency. Plans for methods to increase decision making roles for Blacks could be made.

4. Areas of communication among all agencies need to be established. There is mutual lack of knowledge, thus lack of coordination support and use of existing programs and plans.

5. The Urban League should reiterate its request to all agencies to keep data by race in order to aid in research and in program planning.

6. Lastly and fundamentally—A concentrated effort should be made that all staff of all agencies be involved in some systematic and professional sensitivity training programs. There is an urgent need to increase communication across racial lines to destroy stereotypes and halt polarization.

APPENDIX A

Code number and categories of agencies surveyed

Family and Child Welfare

- (1) Family and Children's Service.
- (2) Catholic Welfare Service.
- (3) Children's Home Society.
- (4) Lutheran Social Service.
- (5) Public and Parochial School Child Welfare Committee.
- (6) Seton Residence.

Care of Emotionally Disturbed Children

- (39) Washburn Child Guidance Center.
- (40) Oak Park Center.
- (37) Volunteers of America.
- (38) St. Joseph's Home for Children.

Settlement Houses/Group Recreation

- (55) Plymouth Youth Center.
- (54) Phyllis Wheatly.
- (53) Hospitality House Boys Club.
- (52) Boys Clubs.
- (51) East Side Neighborhood Services.
- (50) Pillsbury Waite Branch.

Services to the Elderly

- (7) Senior Citizen Centers.
- (8) Walker Methodist Home.
- (9) Ebenezer Home.
- (10) Stevens Square.

Corrections

- (12) Department of Court Services.
- (11) Correctional Service.
- (13) Department of Corrections.
- (83) City Workhouse.

Education

- (59) Minneapolis Public Schools.
- (60) Augsburg College.
- (61) Department of Social Work (University of Minnesota).

Parks and Recreation

- (42) St. Louis Park—Parks and Recreation.
- (41) Suburban Recreation Center.
- (71) Park Board (Minneapolis).

Employment

- (69) Minneapolis Civil Service Commission.
- (70) Department of Employment Security.
- (68) Minnesota Civil Service Department.

Health Services

- (35) Minnesota Association for Mental Health.

- (31) Minneapolis Health Department.
- (32) Visiting Nurse.
- (34) Red Cross Area Chapter.
- (33) 3rd District Nurses.
- (36) Planned Parenthood.

Hospitals

- (58) General.
- (57) North Memorial.
- (56) Veterans.

Work with Youth

- (43) Big Sisters.
- (44) Big Brothers.
- (45) Camp Fire Girls.
- (46) Boy Scouts.
- (47) Girl Scouts.
- (48) YWCA.
- (49) YMCA.

Poverty Programs

- (74) Pilot City.
- (75) Model City.

Welfare

- (66) Hennepin County Welfare.
- (67) Minnesota Department of Public Welfare.

Rehabilitative/Educational Services for Specific Disease Entities

- (27) American Cancer Society.
- (26) Arthritis Foundation.
- (25) Glen Lake Sanatorium.
- (28) Society for Prevention of Blindness.
- (29) Curative Workshop.
- (30) Opportunity Workshop.
- (14) Goodwill Industries.
- (15) Minneapolis Rehabilitation Center.
- (16) Society for Cripple Children and Adults.
- (17) Sheltering Arms.
- (18) Cerebral Palsy.
- (19) Respiratory Disease.
- (22) Hearing Society.
- (23) Dental Services.
- (24) American Rehabilitation Foundation.
- (21) Society for the Blind.
- (20) Association for Retarded Children.

Unclassified

- (76) Council of Churches.
- (78) Council of Americanization.
- (79) Legal Aid.
- (80) Community Information and Referral.
- (81) Minneapolis Federation of Jewish Services.
- (82) Minnesota Community Research.
- (84) Travelers Aid.
- (62) Junior League of Minneapolis.
- (63) Womens Club.
- (64) Career Clinic for Women.
- (65) National Council of Jewish Women.
- (72) Veterans Administration Center.
- (73) Housing and Redevelopment.
- (77) Department of Indian Work.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 319

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 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 Viet-

nam 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 insuring 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.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the statement by Mr. Charles W. Poe, Jr., executive director of Ramsey County Community Action programs focuses with startling effect on the pressing health needs of the inner city. Mr. Poe's analogy between the Nation's highway system and health care delivery system is apt. It is one more indication that we must reorient our thinking about health needs in order to eliminate the myths that have burdened our system for so long.

The statement follows:

HEALTH CARE: A NEED FOR NEW DIRECTION

I would like to thank you for this opportunity to appear before you and to speak about the health care problems that are presently facing our community and our Nation. As you already know, Ramsey action programs is the local community action agency for St. Paul, and for Ramsey County. As executive director of this agency, it is a special privilege for me to come before you, because during the past few months, our resident board has designated health care improvement as a specific project during our coming program year. If we are going to be successful during the coming year, we will need more of the kind of concern and support that is being shown here today.

Because our agency's constituency is limited to Ramsey County, I will be limiting my remarks to the problems and aspirations that are apparent in our area. However, I am confident that many of the same problems and aspirations are evident in many other communities throughout our region.

Today, I would like to speak to you about health care in somewhat general terms, but in doing so, I would hope that we could see that there are problems which encompass the entire philosophy of the delivery of health care. In my estimation, these broader concerns must be dealt with before we can develop any effective programs which can provide specific kinds of health care. After discussing these broader concerns I will provide you with some basic guidelines which I hope will be helpful to you and to your colleagues in preparing, or in examining, legislation, which can provide us with the tools necessary to do our job, here, at home.



As I said before, there are some general concerns which have been brought to our agency's attention. Of course, the first of these concerns is the continually rising cost of health care. In his statement of February 18, 1971, President Nixon told us that nationally, the cost of medical care has risen 170 percent in only the past 10 years. In the same period of time, the median annual income of an American family rose only 74.1 percent. In Ramsey County, this same situation is reflected in a 127 percent increase in the cost of a hospital room, with only a 79.0 percent increase in the annual per capita income. Consequently, the burden of medical costs becomes greater and greater each year.

There is aid available to many people through medicare, and medicaid. However, medicare and medicaid are being utilized by only 12.7 percent of the population. And with this use, these recipients may face the problem of having their choice of service limited, simply because they are unable to pay for medical care without the help of public assistance.

As of 1968, we know that approximately 2,200,000 people or about 60% of the residents of Minnesota were enjoying the security of having complete coverage from medical insurance. This is impressive at first glance. But, when we add this 60% with the percentage of people eligible for medicare or medicaid, we find that almost 30% of the people have only partial protection, or no protection at all. These are the people who are the working poor. They are not eligible for medicaid, they cannot afford insurance, yet they are not financially stable enough to stand the shock of a major medical expense.

We are well aware of the results of these prohibitive health costs. People begin to neglect health care because of the cost. And because of this neglect, they increase the possibility of needing more intensive medical care in the future, and in all probability, they will not be able to afford the care at that time. In a very real way, they are faced with a problem that offers no solution.

A second problem which faces our community, is inavailability of quality health care on a comprehensive basis. In Ramsey County, we are fortunate enough to have a total of twelve hospitals; all located within the boundaries of St. Paul. Each of these hospitals offers a wide spectrum of medical services. We are also fortunate enough to have 756 physicians practicing medicine within Ramsey County. This may be calculated to a ratio of 124.7 doctors per every 100,000 residents living in the county. At face value, it would seem that our community would have ample facilities and personnel to provide service to all who need it. However, this is at face value.

Upon closer analysis, we find that health care facilities and personnel are not readily available to a great number of people. For example, of the twelve hospitals in St. Paul, only one, St. Paul Ramsey, is a public hospital. The other eleven hospitals are privately owned and admit the vast majority of their patients through the request of private physicians. Of the twelve hospitals, only St. Paul Ramsey has a comprehensive outpatient clinic which is open to all residents of Ramsey County, and which provides care, payable on a sliding-scale according to family income. I could go on, but I think that I have pointed out what I wanted to say. We do have a large number of hospitals, but this does not mean that they are providing sufficient care to all of our residents.

Certainly, all health care is not obtained within the walls of a hospital. As I have said, there are 756 physicians practicing medicine within Ramsey County, and many of these physicians have offices or clinics located throughout the neighborhoods. Upon closer inspection, we find that of the 756 physicians,

411 doctors are specialists in the fields of surgery, orthopedics, ophthalmology, research, and so forth. This leaves only 345 physicians who are general practitioners, or a ratio of 38 doctors per every 100,000 residents. In itself, this is below the national average. However, this becomes even worse when we find where these general practitioners have their practices. Statistics show that these doctors are migrating away from the inner-city and setting up their practices on the fringe areas. As the doctors move, health care becomes less and less available to the poor and the elderly who are forced to live within the inner-city.

We recognize the fact that health services are being provided through channels other than hospitals and private practice. For example, the St. Paul Bureau of Health offers neighborhood clinics, as does the family nursing service. However, these clinics are by and large offered to a select and limited constituency. Separate and periodic clinics for family planning, immunizations, or maternal and infant care, do serve a purpose in our community. But, they do not offer the comprehensive medical care that is needed for all of the residents. Care, that not only services the children and the young mothers, but also the low-income male, the senior citizen, and women who are not raising a family.

A third major concern that has been brought to our attention, is the apparent inability of the medical profession to meet the demands for more and better medical care. The first indicator of this is the seeming lack of coordination and planning within the medical community, itself. In preparing this presentation, we contacted a number of agencies, organizations, and groups for the purpose of information that is actually available on health care in Ramsey County. A classic example of this is our contact with the Ramsey County Medical Society. When asked how many physicians were presently practicing medicine within Ramsey County, the executive secretary of the society was unable to tell us. We also contacted no less than ten agencies and organizations, regarding the cost of health care in our community with very minimal results. In such instances, a community cannot plan an effective health program, when such elementary information is not readily available.

A second area of concern is in the updating of the method of health care delivery.

As a recent Carnegie Commission medical study reported in the 1970 issue of *Commonwealth* said, "... what is wrong is not a lack of money, nor inferior doctors, nor faltering technology. What is wrong is the inadequacy of the system by which medical care is delivered."

The traditional insistence on the qualifications of medical personnel who may be eligible to perform various medical duties, remains unrealistic and detrimental to the efficient and expanded delivery of care. Our primary concern should be: What is most convenient for the health care recipients not what is most convenient and beneficial to the supplier of health care services. The utilization and location of health care personnel merits scrutiny. A change in the use of professionals and para-professionals would help not only the medical community, but also health care recipients.

As I said at the beginning of my presentation, I have spoken about health care problems on a broader basis. I have spoken about the rising costs of medical care, the unavailability of care, and the need for updating the methods of delivering medical services. There is a final concern that is by far the most important. That is the total lack of the community's control of their health services.

The provision of health care is not an open market. People are given options, that real-

ly provide them with no choice at all. If they are not satisfied with the type of service offered, they have no recourse but to continue to use that service because no other is available. In the field of health care, we are faced with a seller's market, not with a buyer's market. And at the present time, the sellers have decided to offer the public, particularly those of low-income and the elderly, a product that deals with sickness, not the prevention of it. A product that is inferior and is not always useable. And finally, a product that refuses to change, regardless of the demand for change.

Until this climate changes, until health care consumers begin to have a greater say in the types of care that are offered to them, our present condition will continue to exist, and will probably worsen. We must again make the health care market, a buyer's market. A market that does not favor the prosperous at the expense of the poor, but rather a market that favors the recipient, at the expense of inflation, inefficiency and unavailability.

How do we achieve this? The first step is to insure that any new programs that are proposed include a significant amount of resident participation from their very concept. We must realize that health care programs can not be designed and implemented while operating in a vacuum. Traditionally, programs have been designed for people. This is a major reason for the difficulties we now face. It is absolutely imperative that these programs be designed with the constituents who will be using the services. The programs must meet the needs of the total community, as they exist, not the needs of a few, as perceived by an even more select few.

Secondly, the approach of the delivery of health care must be changed. We must become concerned with maintaining the health of our people, as well as, treating their illnesses. Prevention of illness should be our primary objective and our source of greatest satisfaction.

Thirdly, our delivery of health care must be comprehensive and available to all recipients. We should strive for the establishment of neighborhood clinics which can provide care of all types to anyone who walks through its doors at any time. Clinics which provide care that is personable, efficient, and effective.

This kind of approach to medicine is beginning to blossom in Minneapolis, and St. Paul. It is being called community medicine—where a multi-service facility is being used to treat a community's health needs while providing necessary ancillary services. These community medicine projects are cropping up in many diverse communities. Presently, they are depending on volunteer labor from concerned health care professionals; professionals who volunteer their time because others who could act decisively, are not moving far enough or fast enough to meet the growing need for service.

To achieve our goals, to move far enough—fast enough, we will need decisive action at the national level. We will need a national health insurance program which will make insurance available to all of our people. We will need incentives which will allow communities to redirect their present systems of health care delivery, placing an emphasis on health maintenance. Most of all, we will need support in changing the provision of health care to a buyer's market, rather than a seller's market.

And today, the buyers are giving us a clear indication of what that market should include:

1. Comprehensive medical-dental services;
2. Mental health programs;
3. Pharmacy services;
4. Nutritional counseling and low-cost wholesome food; and

## 5. Health education.

As well as ancillary services such as:

1. Legal assistance;
2. Housing information;
3. Financial counseling; and
4. Community information and referral.

We must insist that control of health care be returned to the people and that they not only be allowed, but that they be requested to determine the future of their health program.

It might be interesting to speculate on what might happen if we operated our Nation's highway system as we presently operate our health care delivery system:

1. Most of the streets and highways would close at 5:00 p.m.—with only a few being open at night and on the weekends—for emergencies.

2. The great majority of the roads could only be traveled if you had a referral card from your private physician.

3. Regardless of the road, there would be toll gates, every mile. A few of the toll gates would charge nothing at all. Many of the tolls would be so high that they would prohibit use of the road. Most of the toll gates would collect whatever would seem appropriate.

4. Road construction would be extensive in the suburbs and in the fringe areas of the cities. Dirt roads would have to suffice in the rural areas or in the inner-city.

5. Public transportation would only be available to those receiving medicare or medicaid, in the form of over-crowded buses going nowhere in particular.

The working poor would ride in horse-drawn wagons. And the affluent? They would ride in their air-conditioned limousines, paying their tolls in monthly billings, but never paying more than 70% of the toll fee.

Thank you.

### STUDY MAKES CASE AGAINST CLEARCUTTING

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Des Moines Sunday Register of June 13, 1971, carried an excellent report by James Risser under the heading of "Study Makes Case Against Clearcutting." So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be aware of this report, I include the text of the news item at this point in the RECORD:

STUDY MAKES CASE AGAINST CLEARCUTTING—MAY VOID CLAIMS ON FOREST REGROWTH  
(By James Risser)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Experiments now under way in an agency of the Interior Department cast serious doubt on the major justification given by the U.S. Forest Service and the timber industry for the clearcutting of timber in national forests.

Complaints about the aesthetic and ecological havoc wreaked by stripping all trees from large sections of the forests have traditionally been met with contention that clear-cut logging is the only way to achieve regrowth of Douglas fir—a prime source of timber from national forests in the West.

Preliminary findings by the Interior Bureau of Land Management (BLM) indicate otherwise. Not only can Douglas fir be regrown without clearcutting, but in some cases clearcutting actually prevents regeneration, BLM believes.

The time-honored argument, generally ac-

cepted by both friends and foes of clear-cutting, was stated in full-page newspaper advertisements placed last month by the American Forest Institute, an industry organization.

#### CLAIM SUNLIGHT NEEDED

Douglas fir and some less important eastern hardwoods, the ad asserted, "require sunlight to sprout and grow. Without openings in the forest, these would become endangered species. Others would shade them into oblivion."

Arnold Ewing of Eugene, Oreg., a timber industry spokesman, recently told the Senate public lands subcommittee: "It is a well-established fact that Douglas fir is a species that needs full sunlight to do well."

And Edward P. Cliff, chief of the U.S. Forest Service, said nearly the same thing. Clear-cutting of Douglas fir, he told the senators, stimulates the natural phenomena that gave birth to the old forest stand. Douglas fir, he said, develops and grows best "in full sunlight."

These arguments apparently have persuaded the Senate public lands subcommittee, which at the moment has decided not to even hold hearings on anti-clear-cutting legislation introduced by Senator Gale McGee (Dem., Wyo.).

BLM, which extensively uses clear-cutting in its western Oregon fir forests, has begun to modify the practice and to eliminate it in some areas.

Boyd Rasmussen, BLM director, mentioned to the Senate subcommittee that clear-cutting has recently been found to present regeneration problems, particularly on southern slopes, and may be replaceable by other timber-harvest methods which keep a "continuous canopy" of trees and foliage over the forest floor.

In an interview, Rodney O. Fety, acting chief of BLM's Forestry Division, said clear-cutting on BLM lands in southwest Oregon has resulted in serious regeneration problems. Even with artificial replanting, the young Douglas fir trees would not grow, he said.

#### HEAT BECOMES LETHAL

BLM foresters found that removal of all trees subjected the soil to such intense sunlight that "the heat became lethal"—up to 140 degrees on south slopes—and killed seedlings, Fety said.

As a result, BLM dropped clear-cutting as a permissible logging practice in that area, going instead to a three-phase cutting which maintains a canopy of trees to protect the regenerating trees from too much sun.

More importantly perhaps, BLM began studies at its Tillamook experimental area in a cooler, more rainy area in northwest Oregon. There, clear-cutting and regeneration seem compatible, but environmentalists have long complained of the scenic damage and the destruction of recreation potential.

The Tillamook experiments are aimed at finding alternatives to clear-cutting of Douglas fir, particularly through what BLM calls "continuous canopy management."

The results are not certain yet, Fety cautioned, but so far the young Douglas fir trees are "growing to beat the band" even though they are being raised in partial sunlight under a canopy of bigger trees.

Whatever use is made of clear-cutting on BLM lands in future years, Director Rasmussen has said it must be done in smaller patches and in ways that blend with natural features of the area.

BLM already has a policy of clear-cutting areas of not more than 40 acres, insulated from each other by intervening timber stands, and with provision for full reforestation, he said.

The Forest Service, whose National Forest

timberlands are 25 times as large as BLM's, has not observed restrictions of that type. Areas of 500 acres and more have been clear-cut in Montana's Bitterroot National Forest and in West Virginia's Monongahela National Forest. Only recently has the Forest Service agreed to cut back some of its clear-cutting in response to growing outcries from local citizens.

It still strongly defends clear-cutting of Douglas fir and such eastern hardwoods as black cherry and poplar.

However, one witness at the April hearings of the public lands subcommittee, Syracuse University forestry professor Leon S. Minckler, testified that "it is simply not true that clear-cutting is necessary to establish more valuable timber species such as ash, cherry, oak and yellow poplar."

Minckler said his research in the Kaskaskia Experimental Forest showed that these trees regenerate well when logged "by group selection or by cutting small patches," a system which he said "maintains a continuous forest on the area, preserves integrated uses, and at the same time encourages desired reproduction."

Critics of the Forest Service argue that the agency's use of clear-cutting actually results mainly from industry assertions that it is a more economical logging method.

George R. Staebler of Tacoma, Wash., a forester for the Weyerhaeuser Co., told the Senate subcommittee that "clear-cutting relatively large blocks of trees (100 acres, rather than 40-acre or 10-acre plots) requires less investment in equipment and access roads and reductions in other logging costs, as well as greater per-acre yield and more certainty and greater quality of reforestation."

Forest Service Chief Cliff said logging methods other than clear-cutting "usually require relatively more money to prepare, and many more roads."

A recent analysis of clear-cutting by a forestry consultant for the Sierra Club argues that the industry is wrong about clear-cutting being more economical. The cost of logging the small trees that are taken in clear-cutting averages about \$18.36 for each thousand board-feet of lumber obtained, compared with only \$7.05 per thousand board-feet from larger, more mature trees harvested by selection cutting, according to the analysis.

A recent study by the Forest Service in California showed a logging cost of \$11.37 per thousand board-feet in a redwood forest where selective cutting was used, and a cost of \$11.45 per thousand board-feet where clear cutting was practiced, the Sierra Club said.

#### MULTIPLE USE REQUIRED

In any event, critics argue, the use of clear-cutting, even if it is more efficient from a logging standpoint, represents a mistaken philosophy about the uses to which national forests are supposed to be put. By law, timber harvesting is one of five multiple uses required of the national forests. The others are recreation, wildlife and fish management, grazing and watershed protection.

The public lands subcommittee will wind up its current hearings on timber management practice in the national forests on June 29, when representatives of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the National Association of Home Builders testify.

There are tentative plans to hold field hearings later this summer on a tough "Forest Lands Restoration and Protection Act" sponsored by Senator Lee Metcalf (Dem., Mont.) and another timber bill introduced by Senator Mark Hatfield (Rep., Ore.). A third bill, by Senator McGee, would halt clear-cutting for two years while an independent commission examines the practice, but it appears to have little chance.



REGULATION OF CHEMICALS MUST  
BE CALM, DELIBERATE

## HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, the growing controversy over the use of pesticides and insecticides is of concern to all of us. It is of particular interest to those whose livelihoods are derived from agriculture. Mr. Marvin Russell, the distinguished editor of the Nebraska Farmer, has recently written an article pointing up certain aspects of this controversy that we cannot ignore. I wish to present this article for the consideration of my colleagues.

REGULATION OF CHEMICALS MUST BE CALM,  
DELIBERATE

The attack on agricultural chemicals may be leading us down the primrose path to disaster.

A drastic statement? Perhaps.

But I'm beginning to run scared.

The reason? In a nutshell: Stifling of continued research, particularly on the part of pesticide manufacturers.

As of right now, I can't name any research by a public agency to develop improved herbicides or insecticides. The role of the public agencies has been to check out new pesticides as they come along—rather than to develop new, improved ones.

This means the fantastic development we have seen in the past 25 years in chemicals to fight weeds, diseases and insects has been the result of research by private companies.

But now what is the future of such research? I have been visited from time to time by representatives of chemical companies "telling me their troubles" as more and more restrictions have been put upon them. Frankly, I have taken these with at least a small grain of salt, figuring they could be just "crying wolf."

Now, however, I have in front of me a copy of a speech made by Mahlon L. Fairchild, chairman of the department of entomology, University of Missouri. It was published in the Missouri Ruralist, state farm magazine for Missouri.

Fairchild reports on some checking he did with a number of basic manufacturers of agricultural chemicals.

## CONCERNED WITH FINDINGS

"I was quite concerned with my findings," he reports. "The future research programs in industry range from a complete elimination of research in some companies to much curtailed programs in other companies . . .

"Not only is the research on chemicals for insect control in industry being reduced, but one company that was actively working on biological agents has almost eliminated its research program. This is rather discouraging at a time when the request is for new non-persistent selective compounds . . .

"The real impact of today's reduced research and development programs will not be felt for 5 to 7 years. We have compounds available today that are gradually being lost to either resistance or label, but we can foresee a much more serious problem within the next 5 to 7 years when no new compounds will be coming down the line to replace these."

What must be done to reverse the trend described in Fairchild's foregoing remarks?

A spokesman for the chemical industry has put it this way: Responsible regulation, developed in an atmosphere permitting calm, deliberate judgment, is what is needed—not

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

hysteria which has become evident on the part of many who have become excessively concerned with "the environment."

At the same time, all of us in agriculture must recognize our responsibilities to use pesticides and other chemicals with the greatest care.

## AMERICANISM AND PATRIOTISM

## HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as the July 4th Independence Day approaches, it is fitting and appropriate that we renew and reaffirm our faith in our great Nation and its heritage.

In this connection, the latest issue of The New Age includes an American creed by Miss Faye McKinney. This excellent article stresses the importance of Americanism, patriotism, and love of country.

Because of the concern of my colleagues and the American people in our great country, I place this article in the RECORD herewith.

The article follows:

## TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Faye McKinney)

I am an American! The Golden Rule is my rule. In humility and with gratitude to Almighty God, I acknowledge my undying debt to the Founding Fathers who left me a priceless heritage, which now is my responsibility. With steadfast loyalty, I will uphold the Constitution of the United States of America. I will treasure my birthright of American Ideals. I will place moral integrity above worldly possessions. The problems of my country, shall be my problems! I will count my right of voting as a sacred trust, and I will diligently strive to prove worthy of that trust. I will give my full support to upright public servants, but those with unclean hands I will firmly oppose. Each obligation that comes to me as a true American, I will discharge with honor! My heart is in America, and America is in my heart! I am an American! I have patriotism. I stand when the flag goes by, and I light fireworks on the Fourth of July. But patriotism is not only marching behind a band and puffing out your chest. Patriotism is not a flash of fireworks one day of the year. Patriotism is not found in the whooping of the crowd or maudlin flag waving. Patriotism is the sum of three cardinal virtues—Faith, Hope, Charity. It is Faith in the principles of our government, Hope in the future of our country, Charity toward all, and malice toward none.

Patriotism is that spirit that makes us help our neighbors when they are in distress, and extend sympathy when they are stricken. Patriotism is the emotion that makes a lump rise in the throat when some intrepid spirit strives to achieve something that no human being ever before has achieved.

Patriotism is to be unashamed at the moisture that comes welling up into our eyes with the passing of some great and noble soul, who unselfishly devoted his life to the cause of mankind. Patriotism is loving one's country, respecting its traditions, and honoring its people—high or low—rich or poor. Patriotism is standing firm and unselfish for the right for the common good, for the peace and well-being of all; it is sacrificing self, if need be, and standing tall and unafraid against all opposition.

June 29, 1971

THE FAST TAX WRITEOFF TAX  
GIMMICK

## HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposals to accelerate depreciation writeoffs for equipment and eliminate the present reserve ratio test are bad economics, and of questionable legality. The Treasury's authority extends to making rules to enforce existing laws, but not to making new laws. Eliminating the reserve ratio test is not enforcing any existing law.

If this measure were put before Congress, I seriously doubt that it would be approved. It is a case of blatant partiality to big business, and lack of concern for the taxpayer. And it is very unlikely to accomplish its stated goal—promotion of economic expansion. With industry operating at 73 percent of its productive capacity, it is clearly pointless to offer incentives to invest in new equipment. Most of the multibillion-dollar tax break will probably end up as hoarded but unproductive wealth.

Nat Goldfinger, chief economist for the AFL-CIO, has clearly explained the deficiencies of this plan in an article in the June issue of the American Federationist. For the information of my colleagues, I am including this article in the RECORD.

[From the AFL-CIO American Federationist, June, 1971]

## THE FAST WRITE-OFF TAX GIMMICK

(By Nat Goldfinger)

A tax giveaway that benefits mainly wealthy businesses runs directly counter to the urgent need for tax reform. The Administration proposal to accelerate depreciation tax write-offs of business outlays for machines and equipment by 20 percent is a tax giveaway which in the main will flow to the nation's largest and wealthiest corporations and unincorporated businesses and add new inequities to the federal tax structure.

This \$3 billion to nearly \$5 billion annual tax bonanza to business is a wrong-headed move, which will have very little, if any, early effect in providing a much-needed stimulus to boost sales, production and employment.

This proposal is the wrong remedy for the present economic ills that have pushed the number of unemployed up to 5 million, or over 6 percent of the labor force, and cut industry's operating rate down to about 73 percent of productive capacity. In the longer run, it presents a serious danger of adding to the national economy's instability.

The American economy needs steady economic growth, full employment and maximum use of plant and equipment to create jobs, curb inflation, lift the economy out of stagnation and sluggishness and provide the improved public facilities the American people need. It does not need gimmickry to reduce business taxes, which will result in a windfall to business and the eventual development of another lopsided, inflationary capital goods boom, followed by another recessionary decline.

The legality of this action by the Treasury Department is questionable. The economics of the measure is dead wrong—19th century trickle-down economics applied to the 1970s.

It is fantasy to attempt to induce businesses to significantly boost outlays for ma-

chinery and equipment when over one-fourth of productive capacity is currently idle.

The Treasury's proposed ruling would:

Speed-up depreciation write-offs of machines and equipment by 20 percent. The guideline lives will be cut by one-fifth. If, under present Treasury rules, a machine is written off in 10 years, the new Treasury rules would permit the firm to write it off in eight years.

Eliminate the present reserve ratio test, which requires business to actually replace machines and equipment at about the rate they are being written off. Once the so-called guideline life is set, the determination will not be questioned. The relation between tax depreciation write-offs and actual replacement will be broken.

Permit business to boost the write-off in the first year. The new rules will permit a business to take a full year's write-off on all machines and equipment that are put into service at any time during the first half of the year. In addition, a half-year's write-off will be permitted for assets put into service at any time during the last half of the year.

The proposed rule goes far beyond a 20 percent acceleration in allowable depreciation write-offs. Through this rule, the Administration is proposing a radically new and different system for determining the amounts of depreciation cost that can be written off against annual income. By eliminating the current "reserve ratio test"—which assured that some relationship existed between the actual useful life of the assets and the tax write-off—depreciation costs become arbitrary decisions between the Internal Revenue Service and the business taxpayer. As a result, the concept of profits for tax purposes becomes equally arbitrary and therefore meaningless.

The immediate windfall tax bonanza resulting from these actions, according to the Treasury's own estimates, will be \$800 million for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$3 billion next year and a peak of \$4.7 billion by 1976.

Over the decade, \$37 billion of business tax revenue would be wiped out—\$37 billion that could be used for rebuilding the urban areas, mass transit, education, health-care and pollution controls.

Corporate taxes generally would be cut by about 7 percent. For some corporations, the tax reduction could go as high as 10 percent and many high-income unincorporated businesses would receive even greater windfalls.

On top of this, several hundred million dollars' worth of taxes will be forgiven businesses that have failed to comply with depreciation rules under 1962 laws and the liberal transition period instituted in 1965. These firms under the new rules will not be required to fully repay the Treasury for their past excessive depreciation write-offs. In effect, these businesses will be rewarded for their foresight in not conforming to present lawful depreciation procedures.

Although this tax giveaway is being labeled and merchandised as a means to promote economic expansion and improve the administration and enforcement of the tax laws, it will not serve any of those causes. Rather, it is merely another in a series of efforts by the Administration to heap more of the tax burden on the shoulders of wage and salary earners and redistribute still greater shares of the nation's income and wealth to those who need it least.

This pattern was set soon after this Administration took office. It has been followed ever since:

In September 1969, with tax reform as the claimed objective, the Administration proposed a \$1.6 billion corporate tax cut and recommended a substantial trimming of the House-passed tax-reform measures to bring tax relief to those of low and moderate income.

In May 1970, the nation's balance of trade was used as the Administration's excuse to advocate a corporate tax bonanza of up to \$1 billion—the so-called Domestic International Sales Corporation Proposal.

In July 1970, curbing inflation and abating pollution were the veils for legislative proposals to postpone scheduled reductions in federal excise (sales) taxes and to put a new tax on leaded gasoline—taxes borne entirely by the consumer.

Throughout its tenure, Administration spokesmen have launched trial balloons, threatening new consumer taxes, such as the so-called value-added tax, or new corporate tax giveaways such as the reinstatement of the investment tax credit.

Except for the excise tax extension, Congress has not gone along with any of these proposals. Congress, given an opportunity to study and act, would probably also reject the Treasury's proposed accelerated depreciation rules.

Moreover, the depreciation ruling was announced in January, only weeks after the President vetoed a bill passed by both houses of Congress to provide federal funds for the creation of public service jobs for the long-term unemployed and seriously underemployed; it came only weeks after the President vetoed congressional appropriations for housing and urban development; and only weeks after he vetoed funds for education. On the heels of these vetoes of funds to create jobs for the unemployed and provide improved public facilities and services—and at a time when the Administration has frozen billions of dollars of appropriated funds for expanded public facilities—it is incredible that the Administration could announce its decision to provide business with a tax bonanza, through the device of depreciation gimmickry.

The first specific objection to the proposed rulemaking is that this tax giveaway adds to the inequities in the nation's tax structure and runs counter to the completion of the unfinished business of tax reform.

This proposal boils down to the addition of a new loophole in the tax structure. In the main the benefits will flow to the larger and wealthier businesses. And, like most tax incentives, large amounts of public revenues will be totally wasted, since businesses will receive this tax reduction whether they increase their rate of investment in machinery and equipment, decrease it, or carry on as before.

In its most basic sense, every dollar of taxes given away to business and industry is a dollar more that must be paid by someone else, or a dollar's worth of public facilities and services that are foregone. That "someone else" is mostly the American wage earner. He now pays more than his fair share of taxes and increasingly finds it difficult to convince himself that he's getting his money's worth.

The Treasury's ruling would add to the unfair tax burden that is now borne by middle- and low-income taxpayers. Not only would it add a new loophole to the federal tax structure, it would also provide a regressive shift in income, adding to the income-shares of business and major stockholders while reducing the share that goes to the vast majority of Americans.

Ten years ago the corporate share of the federal-tax burden was one-third; individuals paid the balance. In 1968 and 1969, the corporate share was approximately 29.5 percent. By 1970, the corporate share had fallen to less than 27 percent of total federal income-tax receipts. For the current fiscal year, the Treasury estimates that only 25 percent of the federal income tax will be borne by corporations. Part of the decline in 1970 and 1971 is due to the impact of the recession on corporate profits. But the Treasury estimates that only about 28 percent of the federal income-tax burden will be borne by corporation in fiscal year 1972, even assum-

ing that corporate profits and the cash-flow will bounce back.

A similar shifting of the tax load away from business and onto individuals—primarily middle- and low-income taxpayers—is shown by a recent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations' study of state and local business taxes. The study shows that between 1957 and 1967, the business tax share dropped from 34.2 percent of the state and local tax load to 29.4 percent. Thus if businesses had kept up their relative share of the tax burden, another \$4 billion annually at 1967 tax rates would have been available to help ease the fiscal pressures faced by most states and virtually every local government.

The inequities in the proposed rules, however, are not limited to the increase in the relative tax burden of individuals, compared to business. The Treasury action creates serious and haphazardly applied inequities within the business tax structure itself.

For example:

Depreciable assets represent only one production cost—a cost which varies considerably among industries and firms. The tax windfall benefits will be substantial for those industries and firms whose depreciable assets represent a large part of costs, while other—typically smaller firms and industries with relatively small capital investments—will benefit little.

Large corporations and high-income unincorporated businesses will receive the greatest benefits. Since their tax brackets are higher, the value of the additional deduction, provided by the increased write-offs, is greater.

Since salvage value will not be taken into consideration in determining annual cost write-offs under the new rules, businesses which resell their machinery or equipment at high prices will receive disproportionately high tax benefits. This part of the Treasury's proposal adds insult to injury. The Treasury's proposed rules will permit additional depreciation write-offs through the new salvage procedure—business will not have to take salvage into account in its annual depreciation write-offs.

The second specific objection is that by eliminating the reserve ratio test, the Treasury is eliminating any rational basis for tax depreciation write-offs and, therefore, is destroying the concept of business profits for tax purposes.

The so-called guideline lives for machinery and equipment, under present procedures, are quite liberal. They are short for most businesses and depreciation write-offs for tax purposes are typically faster than could be justified by actual experience. However, because of the "reserve ratio test," the business taxpayer could be called upon to demonstrate to the Internal Revenue Service that his depreciation write-offs are consistent with his actual replacement patterns. If the firm failed to meet this test, the Internal Revenue Service could disallow the excess write-off deductions.

However, the Treasury now proposes to eliminate this relationship between actual replacement patterns and depreciation tax write-offs. As a result, the write-off would be, merely a determination between the firm and IRS and the relationship between the write-off and the reality would not be subject to question. Tax depreciation write-offs, therefore, would simply be determined by the firm and IRS. The rational basis for tax depreciation write-offs would be eliminated.

Since depreciation is a cost of doing business—and a major cost for industrial firms—the amount of this important cost factor would be determined by the needs of the company and the whims of IRS. Moreover, under this procedure, the determination of the tax depreciation write-off would obviously affect reported profits, which are a residual, after deducting reported costs.

Therefore the Treasury's proposed rules



will not merely inflate reported depreciation costs for tax purposes and destroy the conceptual foundation for tax depreciation. They will also reduce reported profits and destroy the concept of profits for tax purposes.

In effect the firm and IRS would determine both reported depreciation write-offs and reported profits—with no government test of their relation to reality. Arbitrary determinations will be substituted for the existing concepts that provide some rational foundation for determining reported depreciation costs and reported profits.

In addition the legality of this proposal seems questionable. It is our understanding that the Treasury's rule-making authority is to enforce the Internal Revenue Code and assure that appropriate methods are used in the determination of income for tax purposes. Eliminating the reserve ratio test, however, does not enforce any existing law.

The proposal represents a broad, sweeping switch from a depreciation system, based in principle on actual replacement patterns, to a system of arbitrarily determined capital-consumption allowances. Such a change does not enforce the Internal Revenue Code. It does not improve the determination of income for tax purposes; on the contrary, it destroys it.

Prentice-Hall, Inc., in its authoritative Accountant's Weekly Report, made the point very clearly: "These new depreciation rules are truly revolutionary and depart from long-established practices."

The Treasury's action is offered as a device to stimulate the economy through the reduction of business taxes. To our knowledge, neither the Employment Act of 1946 nor any subsequent legislation confers this authority to the Executive Branch generally or to the Treasury rule-making process specifically. And unilateral actions of this nature and magnitude are inconsistent with American concepts of public policymaking and just plain good government.

Finally, the proposed multi-billion dollar tax bonanza to business will provide very little, if any, significant lift to the economy in the short run, it will add to economic instability in the long run and provide additional after-tax funds to business for investments in foreign subsidiaries, which displace U.S. production and export American jobs. Stagnation and sluggishness are evident in most parts of the economy, following the recessions of 1969 and 1970.

Industry, according to the Federal Reserve Board, is operating at a rate of merely 73 percent of its productive capacity. This rate of capacity utilization is slightly lower than in 1958, the year of a deep recession; it is substantially below industry's operating rates in the recession years 1954 and 1961.

As a result of this very low level of sales and production, in relation to industry's capacity to produce, the real volume of business outlays for plants, machines and equipment moved down in 1970 and in the first quarter of 1971 it was below the peak reached in the final months of 1969.

The reasons for this situation are clear. The unsustainable capital goods boom of 1963-1969 was encouraged and subsidized by the federal government's policies—witness the step-up of depreciation write-offs of 1962 and the 7 percent tax credit for investment in machines and equipment, adopted in that year. In almost every year of that period, business outlays for fixed investment shot up much faster than the Gross National Product or any other sector of the private economy. In the six years between 1963 and 1969, the real volume of such outlays soared almost 56 percent or close to 9 percent per year. This unsustainable capital goods boom generated inflationary pressures in the economy. It was inevitably building up for a leveling off or decline, since it was adding to

the economy's productive capacity at a much faster pace than the demands for goods and services.

The other major cause of the present very low rate of capacity utilization has been the Administration's engineered recession of 1969-1970, followed thus far by stagnation and sluggishness in most parts of the economy. The inherent and inevitable build-up of troubles of the unsustainable capital goods boom was compounded by the Administration's decision to curb the rise of sales and production. The result has been a decline of industrial production, while new productive capacity was being added. Thus the very low rate of capacity utilization is largely the result of government policies which created economic instability.

The fact that the real volume of business investment outlay has declined somewhat since the end of 1969 stems clearly from the reality that sales and production are substantially less than industry's capacity to produce. What the economy now lacks is enough customers for the goods and services that current productive capacity can produce.

The weakness is insufficient sales and production—not insufficient plants, machines and equipment. The urgent need, at present, is for measures to lift sales, production and employment.

The rational and economically sound way to obtain an increase in the real volume of business investment is to boost industry's operating rate from its present depressed state—through a substantial lift of sales and output. And, in the long run, the major incentive for the sustained expansion of business investment is high levels of capacity utilization and an increasing volume of sales and production.

The American economy, at present, needs increased public investment and increased consumer expenditures. But the current economic situation is one of widespread sluggishness and stagnation.

Under these conditions, it is a fantasy, based on 19th century trickle-down theory, to expect the Treasury's proposed tax bonanza to business to produce any significant rise in the real volume of business outlays for capital goods. Businessmen don't invest money just for the sake of investing money; they're not going to buy machines merely for the sake of buying machines. Businessmen invest money in new machinery and equipment in the hope that they will be able to use the machinery and equipment to produce goods and sell them at a profit.

Business Week, on Jan. 16, pointed out: "There is also scant evidence that liberalizing depreciation at this time will induce many companies to change investment plants." And there is good reason to believe that this tax windfall would be paid out in increased dividends, retained in surplus accounts or used for added investments in foreign subsidiary operations, until the rate of capacity utilization improves substantially.

The clear relationship between industry's operating rate and the volume of demand for capital goods was indicated in a report in the Wall Street Journal quoting J. T. Bailey, president of Warner & Swasey Co.: "Historically, an operating rate of 80 percent is required to produce a good level of orders for machine tools." And a good level of orders for other types of capital goods may require an operating rate of 85 percent or more.

So the problem gets back to not enough sales, not enough customers, not enough public investment, not enough consumer buying power and consumer confidence about the future of jobs and income.

In the short run, therefore, the Treasury's proposal will be entirely—or almost entirely—a windfall to business and to major stockholders, with the probability that part of the tax bonanza will be exported for foreign sub-

sidary operations, with the loss of American jobs and displacement of U.S. production.

In the long run, after the rate of capacity utilization improves, the Treasury's proposal poses the serious danger of another lopsided, inflationary capital goods boom, as in 1963-1969, followed by another recession. American economic history is full of such instability and the experience of the past eight years is merely the most recent. Moreover, if such a trend develops again, the boom period will probably be much briefer and the recessionary decline may be deeper.

Our recent problems are in no small measure related to the high rate of capacity accumulation that took place during most of the years between 1963 and 1969—fed by misguided tax policies such as the investment credit, depreciation gimmickry and the failure to enact a corporate tax increase soon enough and high enough to stem the capital goods boom.

The Treasury's proposal is as dangerous as it is inequitable. The multi-billion dollar tax bonanza to business will be paid by middle- and low-income taxpayers. It will add yet another loophole to the federal tax structure at the expense of urgently needed public facilities, ignoring the decay of America's cities and urban life.

#### CLEANUP CAMPAIGN OF MASON-DIXON SCOUT COUNCIL

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last June 5 the Mason-Dixon Scout Council sponsored a massive cleanup campaign in Washington County, Md. and the Pennsylvania counties of Fulton and Franklin.

The campaign was a huge success. Over 7,500 Americans, both young and old, managed to clean the area of 900 tons of trash.

Although this campaign is aimed only at the visual form of pollution, I see in this form of civic action the concern and determination of citizens to combat pollution on all fronts.

Mr. President, I applaud the Mason-Dixon Scout Council's campaign to help make America a more beautiful place to live and of all such efforts of concerned citizens elsewhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Keep It Beautiful" that appeared in the June 9 edition of the Morning Herald of Hagerstown, Md., be printed in full in the RECORD.

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

#### KEEP IT BEAUTIFUL

Thanks to a cooperative effort that perhaps set a record for the tri-state area, 900 tons of trash have been removed from the countryside. The Boy Scout-sponsored Keep America Beautiful project attracted 7,500 adult and youthful volunteers and from all reports it was a genuine success.

Now that the countryside in Washington, Franklin and Fulton Counties is more beautiful and more visible, let's keep it that way.

There's no excuse for dumping the hulks of automobiles, mattresses, bottles and cans

in fields and along the roadside. There are designated landfills conveniently located for the purpose of disposing junk and trash in large sizes and small.

Harpers Ferry, W. Va., is making cleanup a weekly activity. Citizens gather up their bottles and deposit them for return to recycling plants.

Other communities have gotten into the spirit of the thing and are cooperating in efforts to keep unsightly trash out of eyes' reach.

The Saturday cleanup effort in the Mason-Dixon Scout Area was a success because people were made aware of the litter and decided to do something about it. The idea is to make every day a cleanup day and not permit a return of the clutter.

#### JUSTICE ON TRIAL

### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Miss Cindy Hansen of Rockford, Ill., in which she discusses "the astonishing conditions of the justice system" in America. Her letter describes to what extent our courts and jails are overcrowded and antiquated, and why there has been a corresponding decline in respect for our legal system and its officers. She concludes:

Some form of action is needed now or these problems will become more serious. Congress should discuss this immediate problem and come up with a realistic solution of reform. Nothing can be gained by waiting and nothing can be lost by trying.

At this point in the RECORD I include the full text of the letter from this concerned young constituent, and commend it to the reading of my colleagues:

JUNE 3, 1971.

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON,  
Longworth Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Recently, the article "Justice on Trial" was published in the March 8, 1971 issue of Newsweek magazine. It was an informative but frightening article revealing the astonishing conditions of the justice system which presently exist in America. The courts, the jails, and the police all need reforming, and need it now.

The courts definitely are in need of repair. They are bogged down with too many cases, they are undermanned, and they are badly managed—and these are just a few of the many problems which are present in the court system. The system is at its worst in regard to the juvenile and misdemeanor courts where it ought to be at its best. The article states: "Half the nation's judges in juvenile courts don't have college diplomas." Sometimes it gets so bad that they get 300 cases a day. The increase in crime has jammed the courts, but most of the cases crowding the courts are due to the victimless crimes such as: prostitution, drunkenness, drugs, gambling and homosexuality. The article states that "every second case on the Los Angeles criminal-court docket is a pot offense, every fourth arrest across the nation a drunk case" and, says Portland District Attorney Desmond D. Connall, "a drunk clogs up the system more than a felony first offender." Delay is also common in the courts. Often cases are bargained down if a man

pleads guilty, his sentence will be reduced. This, too, will need reforming. Former New York Judge Bernard Botwin said, "the lower courts have never functioned well anywhere in my lifetime," and he is 70 years old.

Some solutions to these problems recommended in the article are very reasonable. First of all, the tightening of professional standards, that is, the conduct of the judges and jurors, should be improved upon. Also, the management should be more organized by having court executives handle the administrative and technical aspects such as keeping records. Another suggestion would be to relieve the overcrowding of the "victimless crimes" and to handle them in minor courts instead. Finally, setting some standards for the selection of judges should begin. These are only a few ideas, hopefully more and better solutions to this problem will develop in the near future.

Another problem in the justice system is the deplorable conditions of the jails and prisons. Most of them are old and decrepit, dirty and unsanitary, overcrowded, and usually lacking rehabilitation or educational programs. The prisoners are often involved in riots, homosexuality, beatings, rape, whiskey, drugs, and even suicides. Is this the way the jails should be run?

Suggestions for reform are: first of all, an increase in probation to relieve the overcrowded conditions which exist in the jails and prisons. As for the criminals in the jails, the starting of more work-training and rehabilitation programs would be beneficial. Repairs of the buildings and cells themselves are definitely needed. Also it is necessary to have more better-trained guards in the jails. President Nixon and Governor Ogilvie have started some good reform programs, but more action should be taken for the improvement of all the jails in the United States.

As far as the policeman is concerned, he doesn't have a very popular job these days. The police are low-paid, understaffed, abused verbally, and run the risk of endangering their lives. The Negroes especially look down upon the police which therefore creates a feeling of alienation in the police. They're only trying to help and protect the people and the country and this is what they get in return. As stated in the article: "the cops remain under intense pressure on one hand to catch criminals and on the other not to bend any rules in the process." Many policemen are crooks, however, and make deals with the criminals. Again the article states, "The best officers are still compromised by the brutality and corruption of the worst. The cops involved in the bloodiest confrontations of recent years usually are cleared in the courts, but the trade still resents the outraged liberal reaction." It's a rough job and hopefully their jobs can be made easier with some improvements in the system.

The following are suggestions for the reform of the police: more rough treatment of the criminals, more police cars to help catch the criminals, and more moral support from all the citizens. These will all help the police become a better part of the justice system. The article again states: "the mood is not a happy one for the future of justice: policemen so inflamed by their own discontents begin to look on a large sector of society as the enemy." Let us help them change this outlook on society.

Thus, these three essential parts of the justice system are becoming worse with the close of each day and reform is definitely needed. Some form of action is needed now or these problems will become more serious. Congress should discuss this immediate problem and come up with a realistic solution of reform. Nothing can be gained by waiting and nothing can be lost by trying.

Sincerely,

CINDY HANSEN.

#### RHODESIA: AN UNSOUND POLICY

### HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the United States is assisting the Soviet Union in implementing her announced goal of burying the United States economically. This is a strong statement, but justified by the facts. By refusing to purchase chrome from Rhodesia, the United States has been forced to rely on Russia as the primary supplier of chrome ore. The Soviet Union has upped the price of the substance exorbitantly; thus, the United States is fattening the coffers of her chief ideological and military foe.

Having become increasingly concerned over the foolish path which our country has taken, I cosponsored the Collins bill in the House which would remove economic sanctions against Rhodesia. Hopefully, sufficient support can be gained for this position, so that this senseless ban may be lifted.

An editorial which appeared in the Northern Virginia Daily on June 12 emphasized the gravity of our present course regarding Rhodesia. Further, it recognized the mounting congressional effort for changing our policy toward this friendly country. It properly gives credit to the senior Senator from Virginia, Mr. BYRD, for the leadership he has exercised in the Senate. I insert below excerpts from that sound editorial:

#### THERE'S HOPE FOR RHODESIA

Because of U.N. sanctions, which the U.S. supports, we have made ourselves dependent on Soviet Russia for strategic chrome, a vital material necessary in the manufacture of military hardware. This dependence is especially ludicrous for two reasons. The first is that Communist Russia could immediately cut off our supply in the event of war, seriously crippling us. The second is that the price has jumped since 1965 from \$25 per ton to \$72 per ton, an increase of 288 percent which makes it look like we are being taken for a ride price wise.

For many long months, Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr. has waged a lone fight in the Senate to have the embargo against Rhodesian chrome lifted on the grounds that it is a wholly insupportable position against a friendly nation. At long last the Byrd bill (S. 1404), and a companion bill in the House introduced by Rep. Collins (H.R. 4712), which would nullify the current ban against the importation of Rhodesian chrome, have begun to get some powerful supporters.

Among them is Sen. Howard Cannon, chairman of the Armed Services Committee's subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves. The latest adherent is Sen. John Tower who commented:

"If it is all right to review the trade policy vis-a-vis Red China, a power that constantly threatens the peace of the world and is directly involved in the death of American soldiers in Vietnam, a power that has practiced genocide in Tibet, then it is certainly in order to review our policy of trade with Rhodesia, which was our ally in World War II and Korea. I call upon the Administration to review its policy in this regard and allow those companies who have a need for chrome to buy it from Rhodesia, if that is what they desire."

In our opinion Sen. Byrd deserves the thanks of the nation for his continued and



for a long lonesome struggle to eliminate the inequities of the Rhodesian embargo. When this is finally accomplished, as common sense dictates it must be, both the economic and military posture of our nation will be vastly improved.

#### A PROPOSAL TO CREATE AN EMERGENCY LOAN GUARANTEE BOARD

**HON. RICHARD T. HANNA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in June of last year I predicted in this body the failure of this administration's piecemeal reaction to economic crises in the country. At that time I categorically stated that the fire brigade approach being pursued would be inadequate and would merely serve to exacerbate the problems. We see now the accuracy of my remarks—our industrial output continues at a reduced pace and our unemployment has now passed 6 percent. We have seen enough of these failures.

Yet we, today, are seeing but another fire bucket being pushed upon us in the form of a loan guarantee for Lockheed Corp. As I noted almost a year ago, while this action may well serve to bolster temporarily this failing giant, it in no way reflects any realization by this administration of the requirements of our economy in remaining healthy. In addition, we serve neither equity nor the principles of our free enterprise system by such selective assistance. And, as for the specific goals noted in the administration's proposed legislation, we shall see achievement only in a microcosm, and an inadequate microcosm at that.

My good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman MOORHEAD, recently addressed himself to this problem before this body and analogized these loan guarantee requests by this administration as mere "aspirins at best to treat symptoms." While I do believe that aspirins are necessary from time to time, and that treating symptoms can avert disaster until a panacea may be found, I also feel that Congressman MOORHEAD has introduced a certain quality of candor and considerable insight into the dilemma which now faces us, and I concur in much of his evaluations.

It still remains our responsibility, however, to seek these larger solutions while dispensing from time to time aspirin as needs be. And this larger solution is, I believe, embodied in the legislation which I introduce today.

I propose today, Mr. Speaker, the creation of an Emergency Loan Guarantee Board, comprised of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, and the Comptroller General of the United States. This Board will have limited powers to guarantee loans made by private lenders only when the failure of the borrower "could adversely and seriously affect the economy of the Nation or a major region

thereof." In contrast to the administration's suggestions, this Board will be a continuing financial entity, available to provide apolitical consideration to such loan requests as we will soon be considering. In further contrast to the administration's request, such a board would be much more consistent and compatible with both the principles of our society and with the much larger and more significant national economic goals which we must responsibly pursue, by confining itself only to activities directly affecting our national security.

The bill which I am sponsoring is, many of my colleagues will no doubt note, similar to measures previously sponsored by the highly respected chairmen of the House and Senate Banking Committees, Congressman PATMAN and Senator SPARKMAN.

I have made, however, some very important changes to two parts of this bill. My most significant concern with the current situation regarding the Lockheed loan guarantee request relates to the potential abuse of such legislative actions for political ends. I am concerned lest the ultimate action taken on this request will, on balance, be in response more to political considerations than to economic and national security principles. In this regard, I felt the three-member Board as envisioned in the earlier versions of this bill might well be responsive to a single branch of our Government. I have, therefore, included in the Board the Comptroller General. We are now guaranteed that any action to guarantee loans can only come about with the support of an independent Board member. This factor, combined with the constant exposure of the Board's actions to the public eye should minimize purely political influences.

Second, my bill expands the criteria under which the Board may guarantee loans. I have included what to my mind should be a common input all such considerations—the authority of the Board to impose management supervision and changes as felt necessary to protect the Government's interests in the guaranteed activity.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this measure I am sponsoring, while not meeting certain of the deficiencies inherent in our freely fluctuating economy, will serve to meet the crises confronting our Nation in circumstances similar to the Lockheed problem. With this Board in existence, this particular fire brigade activity will cease and we may move, in the Congress, on to matters more correctly here considered.

I am including at this point, Mr. Speaker, two items which elaborate on my topic and which I commend to my colleagues in the House preparatory to our consideration of the Lockheed matter:

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR F. BURNS, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS, U.S. SENATE

I appreciate your invitation to present the views of the Board of Governors on legislation to authorize government guarantees of loans to business in emergencies.

The need for prudent provisions to deal with credit needs in emergency conditions has been newly underscored by developments over the past year or so. Last spring, within a few months after I assumed my present duties, financial markets suffered an erosion of confidence severe enough to cause widespread concern that the country might face a liquidity crisis—a situation in which even creditworthy firms might be unable to borrow the funds they needed to carry on their business.

The sharpest contraction of credit came in the commercial paper market, following the insolvency of the Penn Central Transportation Company, a prominent borrower in that market. Since commercial paper is wholly unsecured, investors backed away from issuers about which there was any question. Concern spread throughout the credit markets, fed by fears that some borrowers might be unable to obtain sufficient credit from alternative sources to refinance maturing commercial paper and thus be forced into bankruptcy. With investors generally becoming more cautious, companies with credit ratings less than Aaa experienced increased difficulty in borrowing through the bond market, as was evidenced by the sharp widening of spreads in the structure of corporate bond yields. In short, there appeared to be a risk of bankruptcies spreading to firms that in other circumstances would be regarded as perfectly sound.

Confronted with an incipient crisis, the Federal Reserve System acted promptly to assure the availability of loanable funds to meet the credit needs of firms that were being squeezed by the contraction of the commercial paper market. First, the System made it clear to member banks that the discount window would be available to assist them in meeting such needs. Second, the Board suspended ceilings on the rates of interest member banks could pay on certificates of deposit of \$100,000 or more. In this way banks were placed in a much better position to attract funds to lend to their hard-pressed customers.

These two actions helped to restore confidence, and fear of a liquidity crisis abated. We can all take comfort from the fact that the money and credit markets met the tests of mid-1970 successfully. Looking ahead, however, we need better assurance that temporary liquidity problems of major corporations will not be allowed to damage the national economy.

Traditionally, this country has relied on private financial markets to determine whether credit should be granted or denied. I firmly believe that this is a sound principle, and I am concerned, as I know you are, about how we can preserve this principle and at the same time provide standby authority under which the Government might backstop the private financial markets in emergencies. In authorizing Federal credit assistance, the Congress has understandably concentrated largely on helping homebuyers, small businesses, farmers, and others who will, in ordinary circumstances, need such assistance far more than big businesses do.

In extraordinary circumstances, however, even a large, well-established, and creditworthy enterprise may experience difficulty in obtaining needed credit, and failure to provide that credit could be extremely costly to the general public—in terms of jobs destroyed, income lost, financial markets disrupted, or even essential goods not produced. We should be able to find a way to deal with this problem without injuring the free enterprise system.

In testifying today, it is certainly no part of my purpose to suggest that Congress delay its decision about Lockheed. My aim is rather to recommend that your Committee, with Lockheed fresh in mind, address itself to the question of devising more general standards

and procedures to govern credit guarantees in possible future emergencies.

The Board believes there are several guiding principles that should be followed in designing such assistance. First, assistance should be offered only to protect the economy against serious injury. I have mentioned the mid-1970 experience as just one example of conditions under which such a need could arise. Whatever the particular circumstances, assistance should be reserved for those rare instances where it is needed to enable a sound enterprise to continue to furnish goods or services to the public, and where failure to meet that need could have serious consequences for the nation's output, employment, and finances.

Second, since the assistance is designed to protect the public interest, it follows that it should not be used simply to protect large firms from failure, or to bail out bad management, or to shield creditors or shareholders from the consequences of unwise investments. Guarantees should be a last resort, issued only when there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the guaranteed loan and when there is no other way to avoid serious injury to the economy. Since any such guarantee would be subject to conditions assuring a preferential status for the government relative to other creditors or shareholders in the event of insolvency, and since guarantees would be available only in emergencies, the existence of the authority should not in any real sense erode the disciplines of the private enterprise system. Rather, it should be regarded as a kind of insurance policy to protect the general public against a highly specialized risk.

Third, assistance should be provided through Federal guarantees of private loans rather than through outright advances of public funds. Aside from its obvious budget savings, this approach would have the advantage of assuring that experienced private lending officers will administer the loans in accordance with Federal guidelines and supervision.

Fourth, to assure thorough and well-balanced consideration of the need for assistance, responsibility for passing on guarantees should be vested in top Federal officials concerned with overall economic and financial policy. We suggest that this function be vested in a board chaired by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the Secretary of Commerce and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board as members. No permanent staff would be required, since guarantees would be issued only under exceptional circumstances, and staff could be assigned as needed from the governmental units represented on the board. Thus no bureaucracy would be created with an interest in expanding the "program." There would be no "program"—only standby authority, ready for use in the event of need.

Fifth, Congress should be informed in advance of any proposed guarantee, so that it will have an opportunity to review the proposal to the fullest extent consistent with the need for prompt action. A possible model for such a procedure may be found in the Defense Production Act as amended last year. As you will recall, that Act now prohibits guarantees of V-loans in amounts over \$20 million without approval of Congress. It also precludes the use of guarantees of loans under that amount to prevent insolvency except under certain conditions, including a certification by the President, transmitted to the Congress at least ten days in advance. While a \$20 million limit would be impractical for purposes of emergency assistance, the certification procedures seems well suited for this purpose. Following that model, a guarantee would be authorized only if the President certifies that it is needed to avoid serious and adverse effects on the economy and a copy of that certification, with a detailed justification, is sent to

the Congress and the two Banking Committees at least ten days in advance.

These principles are embodied in a bill, S. 2016, submitted by the Board and introduced by your Chairman and Senator Tower. Guarantees outstanding under S. 2016 would be limited to a total of \$2 billion. In addition to the conditions I have already mentioned, guarantees could be issued only if the borrower furnished assurances that the loan is not otherwise available on reasonable terms and conditions, if the lender certified that he would not make the loan without the guarantee, and if the loan could not be guaranteed under the Defense Production Act. The bill also provides that fees shall be charged for guarantees and deposited in a fund from which payments required as a consequence of any guarantee are to be made. In the event that amounts in the fund proved insufficient to make such payments, the Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to obtain the needed funds through public debt transactions.

Since the Federal Reserve System acts as a lender of last resort to financial institutions, principally its member banks, we are sometimes asked whether we could or should perform the same role for nonfinancial enterprises. This question merits at least a brief comment.

The Federal Reserve Act now includes a provision (paragraph 3 of section 13) that empowers the Board of Governors, in "unusual and exigent circumstances" and by an affirmative vote of at least five members of the Board, to authorize the Federal Reserve Banks to make certain types of direct loans to individuals, partnerships or corporations.

The purpose of this provision of law, which was enacted in 1932, was to permit Federal Reserve Banks to make short-term loans to enterprises that are creditworthy but are unable to secure adequate credit accommodations because of unfavorable conditions within the financial system. The only loans made under this provision were granted between 1932 and 1936, totaling 123 in number and about \$1.5 million in amount.

Paper discounted by Federal Reserve Banks under that paragraph must be of the "kinds and maturities made eligible for discount for members banks under other provisions" of the Federal Reserve Act. This means, among other things, that the paper may not have a maturity of more than 90 days at the time of discount. The paragraph further provides that the paper shall be "indorsed or otherwise secured to the satisfaction of the Federal Reserve Bank," which the Board has construed to mean that a Reserve Bank should ascertain to its satisfaction that the indorsement or the security offered is adequate to protect the Reserve Bank against loss.

In light of these restrictions in the law and the background as to the intent of the law, the Board concluded last year that it would not be appropriate to invoke this authority to authorize extension of Federal Reserve credit to Penn Central. Speaking more broadly, since legislation is needed in any event to assure that adequate authority is available to cope with possible future emergencies, the Board believes that guarantee authority such as provided in S. 2016 would be preferable to direct provision of Federal Reserve credit. We make this recommendation not only because we believe assistance should take the form of a guarantee rather than direct lending, but also because we believe that the Congress, the President, and key Administration officials should participate in any decision to extend such assistance.

These are the considerations that lead the Board to recommend enactment of S. 2016. Whatever your decision may be as to the need for immediate action in the case of Lockheed, the Board hopes that you will give the most serious consideration to a longer-range solu-

tion such as S. 2016. Experience has convinced the Board that legislation of this type is needed as a protective umbrella for our sensitive economic society.

#### LOCKHEED FLIRTS WITH RFC'S GHOST: LOAN PLEA COULD SPAWN NEW AGENCY

(By Robert Samuelson)

"I had been brought up in the belief that the three most necessary things to a satisfactory life were family, religion, and money."—Jesse Jones, former chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation about to be resurrected?

By the end of last week, it appeared that Congress might just perform something approaching such a supernatural feat. Only 18 years earlier the Congress had said the last rites over the RFC—one of the aggressive, ambitious New Deal agencies, a sort of super-government bank, which, from 1932 to 1953, made more than \$40 billion worth of loans to corporations, banks, special wartime companies, and local governments.

A number of prominent Congressmen, including Rep. Wright Patman (D-Tex.), chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, have been extolling the virtues of the RFC for years, but their enthusiasm hardly accounts for the sudden wave of popularity. If there is a medicine that will revive the RFC, it is spelled Lockheed.

Lockheed Aircraft Corp. desperately needs what an RFC-like agency is adept at providing: government-guaranteed loans. Unless it receives \$250 million worth of those loans (and the company's banks insist they won't supply the money without federal backing), Lockheed will be unable to complete its TriStar jumbo jet, and without the TriStar, the firm will dive into bankruptcy.

A sympathetic Nixon administration proposed a \$250 million guarantee exclusively for Lockheed. Now, after two and a half weeks of hearings, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee is considering a substitute measure, which, if not an identical twin of the old RFC, at least looks like a blood relative. It may well follow the lines suggested by Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur F. Burns and provide authority for up to \$2 billion in loan guarantees to big corporations experiencing financial problems.

Who might ask for the guarantees? No one knows, but more than a few giant firms have flirted—or are flirting—with financial problems that could propel them to Washington for assistance: Chrysler, Pan Am World Airways, or possibly another major aerospace company, like Grumman.

For Lockheed, there are obvious advantages to the switch.

One experienced Congressional aide scornfully characterizes the original \$250 million guarantee proposal as a "private bill"—a term usually reserved for a Congressman's legislation to aid constituents on such personal matters as immigration and claims against the government. The broader bill would jettison this narrow "special interest" stigma. Already, Sen. Majority leader Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.), an opponent of the initial proposal, has indicated he could support a more general measure.

Moreover, substitution may divert attention away from some of the more slippery details of Lockheed's current plight. The broader legislation is almost certain to generate its own thick cloud of controversy. Some economists have denounced the idea as an ill-advised scheme that will send shaky companies scurrying to the government for salvation.

"It is the very threat of bankruptcy which often jolts firms, large and small, from inefficient practices in their utilization of labor and capital and in their methods of financing and marketing," economist Alan Greenspan told the Banking and Currency



Committee last week. "To have the possibility of falling back on a guarantor of last resort (the government) must inevitably remove this very valuable prod to efficiency and productivity."

The proposal may also be attacked as an open invitation to political abuse. Anyone who makes this criticism will be able to point to the old RFC. In its dying years, the RFC was a frequent subject of Congressional investigation of charges that powerful Democrats and Republicans improperly influenced the agency—sometimes over the objections of staff—to approve loans to politically-favored firms.

Even without the suggestion of corruption, many economists and businessmen will undoubtedly argue that firms that must seek guarantees probably deserve to expire. Consider the case of Lockheed.

Faithful observers of the Lockheed affair have witnessed a classic episode of attempted industrial assassination. The most vigorous opponents of the loan guarantee are probably to be found among rival aerospace firms. General Electric (which makes engines for the rival McDonnell Douglas DC-10) and North American Rockwell have both openly belittled the proposal. Two top vice presidents of McDonnell Douglas have publicly damned the Lockheed guarantee.

It is not hard to understand why. Squeezed simultaneously by declining government (space and military) spending and static airline orders, the industry has shrunk considerably since its boom year of 1968:

AEROSPACE STATISTICS  
(Dollars in billions)

Year	Total sales	Government sales	Employment
1968.....	\$29	\$16.6	1,418,000
1969.....	26.1	15.7	1,354,000
1970.....	24.9	14.4	1,069,000

With the future saturated in uncertainty, some economists contend, as Greenspan said, that if Lockheed is permanently propped up, another "major company in the industry must find itself in trouble." The Administration and Lockheed, by contrast, characterize the company's problems as primarily short-range, reflecting trauma of the bankruptcy of Rolls Royce (manufacturer of the TriStar's engines).

To skeptical economists, however, new government loans (or loan guarantees) simply constitute an undesirable subsidy to certain sectors of the economy, diverting funds from areas which deserve and need the funds more.

This strict standard of economic purity may not impress Congress. Aside from tariffs and special tax provisions—all of which provide hidden subsidies—the government already supplies open subsidies to many parts of the ostensibly private economy. For example:

Ship builders and operators have received direct subsidies since 1936 that now total nearly \$4 billion as an offset against lower foreign wages.

To provide airline service to smaller cities, the government has been making direct subsidies to airlines for years, with the payment projected at \$63 for FY 1971.

Farmers, of course, are the biggest recipients of direct subsidies, which they collect as both price support for their crops (with the government buying their output at a predetermined price level) and outright payment for complying with certain Agriculture Department regulations.

In FY 1971, the total outlay amounts to \$2.7 billion.

Some of the proponents of the loan guar-

antee proposal appear acutely aware of the objections that are likely to be raised.

Federal Reserve chairman Burns says the loan guarantee authority should be used only as a last resort to underpin firms so large that their collapse would do "serious injury" to the economy. The Penn Central's bankruptcy a year ago, he points out, so frightened many lenders that numerous companies experienced temporary problems in receiving needed loans. In the last 18 months, Burns says only two firms would possibly have qualified for assistance under his definition: Penn Central and Lockheed.

The Burns bill would establish a three-man commission consisting of the chairman of the Fed, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Commerce to pass upon applications for loan guarantees; the commission would have no permanent staff, which, Burns says, would have a vested interest in keeping itself busy—i.e. drumming up business.

Burns sees the loan guarantee authority receiving little, if any, use. "I think it's a most humiliating experience for a corporation to come to government," he told the Banking and Currency Committee.

But other proposals suggest a broader application of the guarantees. Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) envisions the guarantees going to medium-size firms with temporary problems, and Wright Patman (D-Tex.) champions a Development Bank, which, like the RFC, might extend direct loans to housing or local governments.

Such is the confusion that surrounds Lockheed that there is no assurance that any legislation will emerge from Congress. The circumstances are certainly less compelling than those that first gave birth to the RFC.

Originally created under Hoover, the agency did not really blossom until the New Deal when Roosevelt appointed Jesse H. Jones—an authoritarian, ambitious, independent-minded Texan, who once worked as a lumberman—as chairman. Jones expanded the RFC into a small empire, abandoning the narrow goals of Hoover's appointees to preferred stocks in banks, more loans to business, and establish a host of subsidiaries, many of which survive to this day: The Federal National Mortgage Association, The Commodity Credit Corporation, The Export-Import Bank.

But with the passing of the Depression, the RFC's standing slipped considerably. Congressional investigating subcommittees were climbing all over the agency. The chairmen of the Democratic and Republican Committees, both attorneys, were accused of improperly practicing before the RFC when they occupied important political posts. More serious, there were cliques of Washington insiders with close ties to the RFC's directors. One resourceful young man who started his government career in 1940 as a \$1,040 a year messenger, developed into a \$60,000 a year "expediter" of RFC loans by 1950.

After one hearing, Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.), chairman of the investigating subcommittee, was moved to comment: "I have never heard so much lying in my life." And so, in the summer of 1953, Congress quietly put the RFC to sleep.

#### OFFENSIVE AGAINST DRUG ABUSE

### HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined the distinguished gentle-

man from Florida (Mr. FREY) in cosponsoring a concurrent resolution supporting the President in his diplomatic offensive against the problem of drug abuse. In this critical area, it is essential that the Congress work hand in hand with the executive branch of Government in combating this ever increasing problem.

I have cosponsored a bill to cut off foreign aid to countries that do not cooperate in limiting poppy growth and heroin processing. This is another step that Congress can take in assisting the President in his diplomatic efforts.

During my hearings with the Select Committee on Crime, I traveled with the chairman to New York to discuss the international aspects of this problem with officials of the United Nations. The concurrent resolution that is being introduced today calls for diplomatic pressure to encourage other nations to contribute to the United Nations special fund for drug abuse control. At the present time, the United States is the only principal contributor to this fund and as drug abuse is an international problem, if we are to have any true answers, we must have international cooperation.

The disclosure of the drug abuse problem in Vietnam has only highlighted a problem that has been growing for several years. Time for action is long overdue and I hope the House will take swift action on the resolution introduced today and the President's comprehensive drug abuse program.

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE NEW YORK TRAFFIC COMMISSIONER HENRY A. BARNES

### HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call upon every Member of Congress, public elected officials of the U.S. and educators to participate in traffic safety education programs on Traffic Safety Day, September 16, 1971, to pay tribute to the late traffic commissioner, Henry A. Barnes on the third anniversary of his death. The late traffic commissioner Henry A. Barnes died of a heart attack while working on his job in the New York City Traffic Department on September 16, 1968.

I suggest that every elementary school in the Nation teach children traffic safety education on Traffic Safety Day, September 16, 1971. Alex "Daybreak" Novitsky, journalist and television producer from Brooklyn, New York, is writing and producing a 1-hour television program on Traffic Safety Day, September 16, 1971, paying tribute to the late traffic commissioner, Henry A. Barnes. Mr. Novitsky was the chief of public relations and director of traffic safety education for Commissioner Barnes and he has written and produced over 1,000 radio and television shows including the

first live remote television program in Brooklyn on WABC television. The Traffic Safety Day TV program will emanate from New York City and Joe Franklin will host the 1-hour television program. Traffic safety is a national problem and it is a worthy project in which all of our public officials should participate.

This project has the cooperation of the greater New York Safety Council, Institutes of Traffic Engineers, the U.S. Department of Transportation, ABC-TV, NBC-TV, CBS-TV News, Associated Press, and the United Press International News Service.

#### CHAPLAIN JIM YOUNG RETURNS FROM VIETNAM

#### HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Chaplain Jim Young is a former pastor of St. Paul's United Methodist Church in Joplin, Mo. He was born in Springfield, Mo., and attended schools there. This dedicated young man has just recently returned from a tour in Vietnam, where he was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action during a North Vietnamese attack on a firebase south of Hue.

Chaplain Young, in an interview with staff writer, Irene Holt, of the Joplin, Mo., Globe newspaper, had many interesting comments and observations about the attitudes of our young soldiers serving in the Vietnam conflict.

I commend this young man of God for the good work he has done, and I offer the following article from the Joplin Globe for the enlightenment of all:

EX-JOPLIN MINISTER RETURNS FROM WAR: LACK OF CONCERN FOR SERVICEMEN IN VIETNAM DEcriED

(By Irene Holt)

The lack of concern on the part of the people on what is happening to men in Vietnam is discouraging to Chaplain Jim Young, former Joplin minister and Silver Star recipient who returned to the area this week after a year in that war-torn country.

"Back here it's business as usual," he commented. "No one seems to get excited. These are men from our community, our nation—people don't seem to be aware that we have people over there."

Chaplain Young was awarded the Silver Star for his bravery under fire during an attack last month by North Vietnamese forces on Firebase Rife, 15 miles southeast of Hue.

With no weapons in his hands, Chaplain Young gave directions to three GIs, who killed four of the attackers. He also tossed back grenades and satchel charges, thrown by the enemy during the attack, some only seconds before they exploded.

"There were about 60 men on the hill," Chaplain Young said. "Fourteen men were wounded and one was killed."

The biggest problem of our men in Vietnam is "to stay alive," Chaplain Young said. They don't worry so much when the war will be over, he said. "Their biggest worry is to get through one day and knowing they are one day closer to home."

From the moment a GI arrives in Vietnam, Chaplain Young said he knows that in 364 days he will "go home."

Conversation among GIs generally revolves around "How short are you?" or "How many days?" Chaplain Young said. "Short" means how many days a man has left before he goes home.

The men in Vietnam experience all of the "human problems"—loneliness, fear, separation from home—the same they might have here but magnified by being under a combat situation, Chaplain Young noted.

"People tend to overlook just how important mail is to the men," he commented. "It's their only link with home. Several days without a letter can really put a man into a depression."

"Not hearing from their wife, girl friend, parents—it really affects their morale."

When asked his feelings on war, Chaplain Young remarked, "There is nothing moral about war—all war is immoral. Therefore, I am opposed to it."

"The reality is that we are at war in Vietnam and a man is called on to do what he can to survive. To try to judge a man in Vietnam from standards back here, God is the only one who has the right to pass judgment."

"Since men are placed in this situation, 'kill or be killed,' the human factor of survival is going to take place."

Are the GIs basically religious?

"If you are speaking of being religious as attendance to church—the outward forms, probably not," he said. "But as to basic Christianity—love God and love your neighbor—I think these young men are very much aware of this."

Speaking of chaplains, Mr. Young commented, "Probably the biggest misconception of a chaplain is seeing him as being different from the pastor of a local church. Basically we have a parish and parishioners just like back here—the only thing is that we are in uniform doing a military job."

Chaplain Young commented that in Vietnam he spent four or five nights a week in the field with the 101st Airborne Division—nine months with the infantry and the last three months with the engineers.

"My people were spread at one time in 11 fire bases—a round trip of around 300 miles," he said. By his own personal count, he clocked 200 hours by helicopter and, during the last three months, 4,000 miles by jeep.

Chaplain Young feels there is a misconception about what the Army does to the young man.

"I am convinced we are responsible for our own actions," he said. "If a man goes into the military as a strong person, he comes out strong. If he goes in weak, he comes out weak. It depends on the individual."

"The military is going to bring out strength in the person willing to be strong and the ones not willing to put out the effort will be affected adversely."

Chaplain Young does not think the narcotics problem is of the "critical nature so many are talking about now. There is a narcotics problem, just as there is a problem back here. But there is no differentiation made between marijuana and heroin."

"But there is a great deal of difference. A lot of men try it just for kicks and are not addicts. But they are a part of statistics—they have used narcotics."

Pointing out that the Army is a cross-section of society, Chaplain Young stated that the people who would use narcotics in a civilian society would naturally use it in a military society.

"It is more readily available," he said. "In any unit that I know anything about, narcotics were not used in the field. That's the quickest way to get killed."

Speaking of Vietnam and its people, Chaplain Young said the average person in Vietnam could live on what an American throws away, both food and clothing.

The country is primarily agricultural, with some light industry, he added. "But it has been torn by war for virtually 30 years."

He commented that the area near Hue is heavily wooded, and that the Vietnamese cut wood and there were a few sawmills and things of this sort. "The land is really very fertile. It will grow three crops of rice a year," he indicated. Temperatures in the area range from 50 to 122 degrees.

Chaplain Young finds his work "a very rewarding type of job."

"I think people only change when they are under crisis and the young men going into the military are definitely under crisis," he said. "Anytime a person goes into entirely different surroundings, it is a very hard time for a man. Outside of being in combat, the initial basic training is the hardest. Life is very regimented as opposed to a man 'doing his own thing.'"

Chaplain Young became an ordained minister in 1966 after completing four years of undergraduate work at St. Paul's School of Theology, Methodist, Kansas City, and four years of seminary work. He was born in Springfield and attended Springfield schools. He enlisted in the Navy in 1955, serving four years, and was a National Guard Chaplain in Joplin in 1967.

He was pastor of St. Paul's United Methodist Church in Joplin from April, 1966 to July, 1969. Before his tour of Vietnam, Mr. Young served at Ft. Hamilton, N.Y., and Ft. Bliss, Tex.

Chaplain Young also won the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, and the First and Second Army Commendation Medals during his tour of duty as a battalion chaplain in the war zone.

He has been assigned to Ft. Leonard Wood, where he will report for duty the latter part of July. His wife, Janey, and their four children, will move to Ft. Leonard Wood from Springfield.

He will be guest speaker at the 9 a.m. service at St. Paul's United Methodist Church, Sunday, July 11.

#### GRADE REPORTS FROM THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY

#### HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is a great honor for me to have received the grade reports from the Air Force Academy and find that we have four young men from Utah who made the dean's list. John Leslie Clay, class of 1971, and Kenneth Franklin McKean, class of 1974, have also made the superintendent's list and the commandant's list in addition to the dean's list. John is the son of Mr. and Mrs. John E. Clay of Logan, Utah, and Kenneth is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas McKean of Salt Lake City. Mark Anthony Leopardi and David Grant Burdick, both of the class of 1974, have made the dean's list. Mark is the son of Dr. and Mrs. E. A. Leopardi of Brigham City, Utah, and David is the son of Mrs. Barbara J. Burdick of Salt Lake City, Utah. We are very proud of these native sons of Utah.