EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENIORITY

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, much is being said and written these days about seniority of service on committees as a basis for selection of committee chairmen. This concern is coming from various sources. There are those who are captivated by the expression: "Merit should come ahead of age." Others, like such politically oriented organizations as Common Cause and Americans for Democratic Action, are apostles of change, with little thought given to what the change would amount to. Still others suffer from ideological disenchantment. Then, there are the disgruntled who are always against those in authority—regardless of age.

Out of all this comes little by way of suggestions for improvement and progress. These critics uniformly cite the ages of certain chairmen they do not like, conveniently omitting those they do like. In proving their point they remind me of the man who said he caught a 50-pound fish, and to prove it he took the dubious to the river and showed them the water where the fish was allegedly caught.

Anyone who is familiar with Congress, and has sense enough to get in out of the rain, knows there is no magic in age. We all know there are many who are relatively incompetent who are on the younger side. And we see a few in that category who are older.

It stands to reason that any person who is endowed with reasonable intelligence becomes more competent as a result of experience. And that is what seniority means. Not only does it signify experience, but a Congressman must, along with that, be subjected to rigorous tests at the polls every 2 years. If there were very much wrong with him, the folks at home would find it out and he would be thrown out of office. Our political screening process is very cleansing, as it should be.

It is, therefore, understandable why the seniority system has evolved in this country and has stood the test of time.

The one thing these critics do not like to discuss is an alternative which would offer any reasonable hope for improvement. To be sure, the present method of choosing committee chairmen is not perfect, even though a chairman is required to be the most experienced, eligible member of a particular committee. Otherwise, he or she would not be the chairman. The method itself puts a premium on experience. In that respect the system is foolproof.

There are those who would choose chairmen by majority vote of committee members every 2 years. That is the most common proposal. Yet, it is replete with weakness. To put committee chairmanships up for grabs would insure chaos. It invites logrolling and deals. It would breed dissent and interminable confusion. Ambitious Members would spend much of their time lining up votes for the next election of a chairman. All sorts of promises and commitments would be in order. Troublemakers would have a field day.

On the other hand, a man chosen by seniority is indebted to no one for his position. He is a free agent, obligated to no one except the electorate and the House of Representatives. That adds to his effectiveness and capacity for leadership. While, being human, he may make mistakes, it is obvious he will make fewer mistakes than would those chosen in other ways.

Mr. Speaker, what assurance can there possibly be that one chosen chairman by committee vote or in any other manner would be better qualified? There can be none. Indeed, it is more likely that a less competent person would be chosen. That fact is self-evident.

Moreover, committee staffs are normally chosen by the chairman. At least, they must play a dominant role in such choices. We all know that the quality of committee work is very directly related to the competence of the experts who comprise the staffs. To attract the most competent, and keep them, there is an imperative need for some assurance of continuity of service. Many of them make a career of those jobs. It follows that if there is a constant danger every 2 years that the chairman will be replaced, the more competent help would be looking around for more permanent-type positions. Their jobs would be in constant jeopardy. And the public would be the ones to suffer the most.

I have said there is no magic in age. There are many brilliant young men who come to Congress, but they need seasoning which comes only with experience. The various committees deal with special topics. Much of the legislation referred to them is complicated and needs the guidance of an expert. One who remains on a committee long enough and applies himself becomes something of an expert in that committee's specialty. That becomes a valuable asset. So regardless of one's natural competence, to be a fully qualified leader he must learn the hard way. There is no substitute for it.

Young men have performed miracles. They have walked on the moon. Treasures in art and literature have been theirs. When he drafted the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson was only 33. And Benjamin Franklin was past 80 when he performed so brilliantly at the Constitutional Convention.

Winston Churchill first became Prime Minister at the age of 66. Charles DeGaulle was 68 when he became President of France and continued to serve until he was 78.

On and on it goes, proving time and time again there is no magic in age. It all depends on the individual—regardless of his age.

Mr. Speaker, let us not be guided by emotionalism in dealing with this subject of seniority. Let us proceed with reason and caution. There is so much at stake.

A FULLY AUTOMATIC RAILWAY FREIGHT SYSTEM

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, there is widespread interest in improving the efficiency of our rail transportation system and some of the most provocative new ideas have been put forward by Professor Whitelaw of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Professor Whitelaw's article entitled "The Case for a Fully Automatic Railway Freight System," published in the Virginia Engineer in October 1970.

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

THE CASE FOR A FULLY AUTOMATIC RAILWAY FREIGHT SYSTEM

(By Robert L. Whitelaw)

(NOTE.—Robert L. Whitelaw is a professor of mechanical and nuclear engineering at Virginia Polytechnic Institute. A few months ago he prepared an article entitled "Free Rail: The Next Step in Transportation" which appeared in the Summer, 1969, issue of the then entitled "Virginia Engineer." "The Virginia Professional Engineer" is now pleased to present his next article about a subject upon which he is a recognized authority.

(In an abstract to the article, Professor Whitelaw notes that "the time has come to seriously consider planned conversion to a totally automatic rail-freight system. The first step is already here in the unitrain; next should come the unmanned unitrain, and finally the regular periodic shipment of any mixed or specialty freight in multiple or single cars, self-propelled and unmanned. The ultimate goal is to utilize our national railroad plant at maximum efficiency, which will only be attained when every loaded car is constantly in motion, and automatically routed from shiper to receiver.

(The economic incentives are enormous and the technology fully developed. Given the magnificent rail network already before us, the principal changes needed are three; electrification, individual vehicle propulsion and grade-crossing elimination.

(Though costly, these changes need not be accomplished all at once, and the benefits to be reaped far outweigh such costs. The current 5 to 15% car utilization factor and spasmodic freight car shortages would be things of the past. Almost all long-haul highway freight and much of current air freight would return to rail. The 1000-mile overnight dock-to-dock delivery would be commonplace, and even 30 hours coast-to-coast would be feasible.

(A self-propelled freight car, once loaded, would be dispatched. Its entire route, from switch to switch, would be selected by a simple onboard computer, completely programed by the destination assigned. Its journey would be non-stop at an average 50

to 70 mph, and very rarely need it travel empty. Ultimately, all propulsion would be electric with attendant social benefits of quietness, cleanliness and conservation of fuel resources.

(Gone would be the locomotive, the caboose and the railroad yard as known today. All labor would be in maintenance, service or technical supervision. The railroad would thus handle freight in like manner as our wires handle electricity and our pipelines oil and gas, with an efficiency and economy heretofore undreamed of.)

Automation is a word still viewed in some quarters with deep misgiving. One school of economic theory would equate it with long-term joblessness. Such views tend to obscure long-term benefits by magnifying short-term dislocations. For the lesson of history is that automation almost invariably improves both the productivity and the quality of human effort. One has only to view the changes in the technological scene in a single generation (not to speak of the two centuries since James Watt's first steam engine) to recognize that wherever the skill-saw, the thermostat, the electric eye, the conveyor belt, or whatever other device has been applied to eliminate onerous repetitive labor, more jobs have been created than have been destroyed, and the new jobs created are always more satisfying and more rewarding. Automation, in short, elevates human labor.

Now it is apparent that there is some labor price at which automation becomes justified. For each operation in the whole complex chain of converting raw materials into finished products in the consumer's hands there is such an "automation-justifying labor cost", and it has already been reached in a vast number of manufacturing operations, and in many retail and accounting operations. (Witness the rise of the self-serve grocery and discount store, computerized banking and the credit card!) And now that distribution cost, distribution from mine and forest to fabricator, from fabricator to assembler, from assembler to warehouse to retailer,—is becoming the principal cost in so many commodities, it is here proposed that automation in almost every one of these steps is now justified. It is proposed in fact that automation in commodity transportation and even in human transportation is the next great technological revolution before us. It is further proposed that, of all possible forms of commodity transportation available (excepting fluids and electricity), the railroad system lends itself most readily to such automation with the greatest economic benefit. And finally it is proposed that the principal deterrent to achieving these benefits is neither capital investment nor engineering know-how, but railroad traditions enshrined in government, management and labor,—traditions whose original purpose has long since vanished.

The specific proposition is that total automation of land transportation of most commodities, using our existing railroad system as a foundation on which to build, is already economically justified and technically feasible; and that the best form of this automation will be a nationwide fleet of individually self-propelled freight-cars, each dispatched the instant it is loaded and threading its way automatically through the rail network from shipper to receiver, at continuous speed and without benefit of crew of any kind.

Since speeds of 60 to 100 mph would be almost immediately attainable, and since every loaded car would be continuously moving and earning revenue, regardless of weather or human factors, the direct economic benefits to shippers are readily seen. But the corollary blessings of such a system to society at large might well exceed even these direct benefits. First among these would be the elevation in the dignity and productiveness of railroad labor. Next we would find that large industrial concentrations, aggravating both air and water pollution, would tend to disperse, no longer being subject to slow and costly long-distance transportation. Finally, since the new system would recover much of the business presently lost to highway and air, and would be all-electric, it would greatly reduce the triple-threat of current transportation; air pollution, congestion of air and road, and waste of precious liquid fuel.

These are but a few of the advantages to be examined. But first it is necessary to review the weaknesses and strengths of our present railroad system, to show that it cannot continue long in its present form, and yet is the necessary foundation on which to build the automatic system of the future.

THE PRESENT RAIL FREIGHT SYSTEM

To paint a detailed picture of the general economic sickness of most of our major railroads is not necessary here. The most casual observer cannot fail to note its growing symptoms. Revenue per ton-mile is declining along with car utilization, while labor costs, maintenance costs, damage costs and taxes continue to soar. So long as the "train" concept is adhered to, there are both technical and labor barriers to automation that are insurmountable. Based upon present concepts the best future projections see railway revenue freight falling behind highway freight within 20 years, and the worst projection sees it continuing to decline even from the present. And the revenue picture is even worse, since under the present operations the railway must constantly lose the most profitable cargoes to truck and airplane.

Taken as a whole, our railroad plant is probably the most magnificent freight transportation system the world has ever seen. Yet in fifty years its share of the business has declined from 90% to 45%, and in less than fifty more some see it cut in half again. The problem is partly technical but mostly human. Of the five different groups upon whom the economic health of the railroad depends—railroad management, railroad engineering, railroad labor, government regulators, and the multifarious taxing agencies—all at one time or another in history have preyed upon it as something either to be frozen and entrenched against the slightest vestige of change, or as something to be sucked clean of every nickel it might produce, and generally in total unconcern as to what the customers really want. In fact, if it had not been for technical improvements initiated for the most part by railroad equipment manufacturers, i.e., the diesel locomotive, the block signal system, air brakes, radio controls, automatic classification systems, and special-purpose freight cars, our national railroad plant would be on the verge of disaster, if not totally moribund. In this picture it is significant that the healthiest roads today are for the most part those which enjoy most revenue from bulk commodities such as coal, commodities which are totally dependent upon rail and are handled largely by automatic machinery.

Looking at the operating characteristics of our present rail-freight system it is easy to identify four of the major culprits in its bleak economic picture:

1. At any given time on our railroads only 10% of our freight cars are moving, only half of these (5%) are moving with revenue freight on board, and then only at an average speed of 35 mph. In short, the average freight car only travels about 40 miles a day with revenue on board.

2. While the length and average speed of mixed freight trains has undoubtedly increased, offsetting the increased crew costs, they are approaching an upper limit at which derailments from various causes (including vandalism) are both intolerable and unavoidable without prodigious expense and redesign of both tracks and vehicles. What is more, the longer the train and the higher the speed the more expensive is the average derailment in damage to rolling stock and roadbed, not to speak of danger to the public.

3. No matter how fast or long the trains, reclassification of one mixed train into another must still be done slowly one car at a time. Thus complete automation of present-type train reclassification is almost totally impossible, and while classification yards are ingeniously automated in many other ways they represent a prodigious investment in land and trackage that will always entail individual human action at every coupling, drawing hazardous occupation wages. What is more, damage to lading in classification shunting represents an annual bill of almost $100,000,000, not to speak of long-term hidden effects in equipment reliability!

4. So long as each railroad attempts to be "autonomous" in a given region, and gather the lion's share of any freight shipment on its own trackage, and through its own classification yards as at present the shippers continue to suffer from ineconomic routing and delays. Under this modus operandi, the national railway network is never looked upon as a network to be optimized for the shippers benefit, and many vital and long-needed links in the system are never built.

If we now view our railroad system as a potential transportation plant, a foundation upon which to build what is really needed, a caterpillar to be metamorphosed into a butterfly, then one could hardly wish for a finer asset. With 7% of the world's population, and 7% of its land area, the inhabited area of the United States and Canada has 35% of the world's railway mileage and an even larger share of its freight-carrying capacity. Here is a plant of over 250,000 miles of uniform gauge, well-ballasted main-line roadbed, almost 50,000 miles being double-tracked, another 100,000 miles in spurs and sidings, an operating network connecting all but the most insignificant centers of manufacture and commerce in the two countries. Large sections are in heavy-duty rail, much of it all-welded, and almost all main-lines equipped with block-signal controls, remote-control switches and switch-heaters. Grade-separation has progressed to the point where few main highways have main-line level crossings in the east, and almost all hard-surfaced highway crossings are protected with gates or flashers.

Viewing this system as the nucleus for the automatic system of the future, its merits are considerable. Almost all of it, with minor improvements, is capable of accepting the new type of high speed self-propelled freight-car which an automatic system would call for. The important transition steps of double-tracking, electrification and complete grade separation could be achieved gradually, even while the first elements of an automatic system were being introduced. The existing roadbed alone represents a taxpaying asset of over fifteen billion dollars which could not be duplicated today for five times that amount. With this to build on, plus the benefit of modern construction machinery, the modifications needed to bring the entire system up to the requirements of a nationwide automatic freight network, with no vital links missing, can be achieved with an investment in the neighborhood of ten billion dollars,—well within the vastly improved earning power that would result.

THE AUTOMATIC RAIL—FREIGHT SYSTEM

With the foregoing picture of things as they now stand, and of the built-in shackles of any system employing manned "trains", let us try to formulate the elements of an ideal system built on the same foundations. We begin with the four basic elements: a shipper, a receiver, two rails connecting them, and a vehicle. We then ask, (a) what is it the two customers essentially want, and (b) what is the best means of achieving this goal in the light of present and foreseeable technology.

Clearly, the shipper would like to load his commodity as expeditiously as possible on a vehicle suitable both to the commodity and to the average size of each shipment. He would like it dispatched the instant it is loaded; he would have it travel at a speed such that the sum of its costs (transportation plus inventory plus insurance) will be a minimum, and both he and the receiver would like it to arrive intact and undamaged and on time any time of the year, regardless of the weather. Finally, it is presumed that such service can be provided by rail at a total cost less than by any other means.

What then is the most promising means of achieving this goal? The best approach is first to explore history. Whence came the idea of a "train" of cars pulled by a locomotive? It was merely the form that chanced to appear best at the moment. First, the steam engine had to precede the electric motor, at least in western Europe, because there was no comparable means of converting fuel to mechanical energy in the quantities needed. (Hydraulic power, except in Scandinavia, was of significant potential). Second, the reciprocating steam engine clearly became technically feasible before the steam turbine. Thirdly, the earliest steam engine, put upon wheels, was so massive for a given power that it was obviously best to consolidate its power in a single vehicle towing a number of unpowered vehicles. (The weight being so great, and the "train" being so short, tractive adhesion at the rail was no problem, and undoubtedly never entered the analysis!) Finally, horses had already been in use in just this way, towing coal cars on tracks from a colliery. Thus was born the concept of a "train" towed by a steam locomotive, able to exert large traction from standstill just like a horse. It would be asking too much to expect a careful analysis of future developments and problems, of ultimate speeds and electronic automation, at a time the railroad was just aborning! Even to consider that each car might have a separate destination was novel!

But now let us turn the coin and ask how things stand today. Suppose our entire technology had developed to its present state without the invention of the railroad, and the first railway system was now to be built on a national scale. What form should it take?

Two parallel steel rails supported on wooden (or synthetic!) ties on a stone-ballasted well-drained roadbed would still appear close to optimum. The form, height and weight of the average rail used today would undoubtedly emerge. The magnitude of aerodynamic resistance, and the means of minimizing it by streamlining, the relative importance of grades and curves, and the relative unimportance of rolling resistance would quickly be determined; a low center of gravity and a wide gauge would clearly be important; and the inside-flanged wheel would undoubtedly be chosen, though not necessarily the four-wheel truck.

Sophisticated dynamic analysis would readily show the relationship of track-keeping ability to speed, vehicle weight and center gravity, and track width and curvature. A careful optimization of all these factors would then lead to conclusions as follows:

1. Track gauge should be between 6′ and 7′ (certainly wider than 4′–8½″).

2. Vehicles should be low-slung, as to center-of-gravity, with small wheels; and if coupled, the coupling should be close to axle-height.

3. A system of individual self-propelled vehicles could accept a right-of-way with steeper grades and sharper curves than a system of locomotive-drawn trains; and on any given track could attain a higher safe speed.

4. Even allowing for the higher investment in propulsive power per vehicle, the self-propelled vehicle system could be economic and safe up to average speeds in excess of 100 mph; and if unmanned (i.e., automated) would easily show greater earning capacity per dollar invested than a system of coupled trains.

Total automation would thus be the immediate goal if the railroad were introduced today; and its specific form would be unmanned self-propelled vehicles, operating singly or in permanently coupled strings, with fail-safe automatic control of speed, headway, braking and switching. All-electric power would likewise be obvious, supplied through a weather-protected third rail, and probably in the form of direct current using solid-state inverter technology. The monstrosity of overhead wires and vehicle catenaries inherited from 19th century electrification concepts would be rejected. Outlying spurs of the network, with insufficient traffic to justify electrification might still operate with small diesel-electric or gas turbine "locomotives". But considerations of air pollution, noise and fuel conservation would favor maximum, if not total, electrification.

With electrification, plus the concept of a self-propelled vehicle passing a given point many times an hour, it would follow that no grade crossings could be allowed, and that most links in the network must be double-tracked with single-track links being one-way. (It should be noted that European railroads adopted these criteria from the outset, even for a conventional train!)

The drawbacks, both technical and economic, of a locomotive-drawn train as a means of distributing mixed freight from various shippers to various receivers would be obvious such as: limited speed, derailment hazards, low grades, heavy roadbed, long headway between trains, and above all the impossibility of uncoupling, reclassifying and recoupling without human intervention.

One case only for the locomotive-drawn train might remain, namely in applications justifying a "unitrain": a train of cars carrying the same commodity (or set of commodities) day after day between a given origin and a given destination and never uncoupled. Even such a train could be unmanned and looked upon as merely a long flexible self-propelled car operating compatibly in a nationwide system of self-propelled cars of all types and sizes.

Thus we see that, if the railroad were to be introduced for the first time in today's world, the steam locomotive would be dismissed at the outset, and even the diesel would be of doubtful merit. Instead, the most economic freight system for the future would be a wide-track network, almost totally electrified and carrying a fleet of self-propelled cars at speeds up to 100 mph. Each would be available to any shipper on demand, and once loaded would thread its way automatically throughout the network so as to reach its designated receiver by the quickest route. Such cars would come in a variety of types, just as seen today, but because of the higher speed and the absence of couplings, there would be significant streamlining both fore and aft. Center-of-gravity would be noticeably lower with smaller wheels and less risk of derailment. In a few cases, cars might travel in permanently coupled groups of two, three, four or long "unitrains". In every case, acceleration, braking, maintenance of safe headway and decision-making at every switch, would be totally automatic.

The principal and obvious economic advantage in such a system would derive from three factors: (a) no human operators or guidance required, (b) all revenue cargo would be in continuous, fast and direct motion from shipper to receiver, and (c) empty cars would be dispatched automatically to the nearest revenue shipper.

A fleet of self-propelled cars equal in number to the present national fleet of 1,000,000 would handle over ten times the present annual mixed freight tonnage (i.e. excluding coal, ore, sand, etc.), and even bulk-handling of the latter commodities by unitrains in such a system would be significantly reduced in cost. Of equal importance, freight car shortages as we now know them would practically vanish, along with the vast, ugly, noisy and depressing yards of freight cars that now blot the nation.

Under the new system the attractive railroad tariff on almost all commodities, stemming from both automation and rapid dock-to-dock service, would recover almost all long-haul highway freight, and even a large fraction of present airfreight. And this recovery would be essentially permanent, since neither motor-freight nor airfreight can ever achieve total automation or shipping speeds significantly greater than what is now offered?

Before these advantages can be clearly established, at least three economic questions must be answered:

1. What is the increased capital investment in each vehicle by virtue of having to carry its own powerplant, and automatic control and route-finding system?

A preliminary answer here is that all such powerplants being alike, being electric and having extremely long and maintenance-free operating life, the cost-increment on a life-cycle basis is much lower than might appear. Again, with modern electronic technology, and uniformity throughout the fleet, the needed control system per vehicle is neither large nor costly.

2. Since each vehicle must overcome its own air resistance, unlike a train, and since air resistance increases as the square of speed, surely the fuel cost of each shipment will be significantly higher? Here it is easy to demonstrate that with streamlining, plus electric traction and regenerative braking fuel cost per ton-mile will actually be less.

3. Surely the prodigious investment needed in the entire railroad system to bring this about would be too great and take too long before net benefits could be realized? In answer to this question, even if the total cost were close to 100 billion dollars, freight costs will still be lower, than if we persist in retaining manned freight systems. Again, it can be shown that much of the investment proposed represents improvements the railroads must make in any case, even with present-type equipment and all their problems of labor, air pollution, derailment and sorting. It remains then to show that there is a feasible program of orderly transition to an automatic rail-freight system that neither loses revenue nor is too costly.

A PROGRAM OF TRANSITION TO AN AUTOMATIC RAIL-FREIGHT SYSTEM

The nucleus of the new system would be all existing main lines already double-tracked and with grade crossings all but eliminated. This would be the "primary network" and, surprising as it may seem, such a network already connects most of the principal cities in the east, plus at least one line west. In the long western stretches of track, lightly used grade crossings could be allowed for a number of years but with protective barriers operating in reverse: crossing gates would be normally down rather than up, only opening for road traffic when no rail traffic is close enough to be affected.

This primary network would first be electrified, including all spurs to principal shippers and receivers nearby, and all switches modified for automatic control. Development and construction of the necessary rolling-stock and electronic control and safety systems would be concurrent with development and installation of the high-voltage concealed power-rail, so that the beginnings of automatic rail-freight between the

nation's principal cities could appear in less than two years.

The next step would be electrification, double-tracking and grade separation on each of the remaining trunk and spur lines in a planned national network, each link being completed in the order of greatest benefit to the economy and to defense logistics. This planned network would entail (a) double-tracking of obviously vital links and spurs; (b) converting many single-track links to one-way traffic, where another presently-cometing single-track parallels if not many miles away, the two thus comprising an effective double-track link; (c) abandonment of many existing links of fading usefulness; and (d) new construction on some long-needed vital links never appreciated because of the hodge-podge and short-sighted planning that shaped much of our present railroad network.

The third step in the program, some of it concurrent with the second, would be an orderly program of curve reduction and/or increase in superelevation, as best for each situation, so as to permit uniform maximum speed almost everywhere. This step, in essence, would be the correction of a pathological error forced upon the railroad system by the choice of locomotive-drawn trains rather than self-propelled vehicles. To meet the demands of the long train and heavy locomotive we have spent billions to keep grades low and make roadbeds heavy but without much attention to curves. A self-propelled vehicle system, by contrast, readily accepts fairly steep grades, but would demand gentler curves, especially as speeds increase. This principle is demonstrated in our interstate highway system in which curves found on most railroad mainlines would be intolerable whereas grades impossible to heavy trains are quite acceptable. Thus for instance the optimum future rail crossing of a freeway might have the railroad arching over the road to the same degree as the road dips beneath the railroad!

The fourth and final step in the transition to an optimum fully-automatic rail-freight system might be a massive expenditure to correct one of the worst technical blunders in engineering history, namely, the choice of 4'–8½" as standard track gauge. To appreciate the magnitude of this error one has only to consider that a 500-ton locomotive, 15 feet high, is confined to the same wheel-spacing as a 1-ton 5 ft. high Corvair. Volumes could be written on the millions this historic error has cost in human discomfort in damage to lading, and in unnecessary derailments, not to speak of its cost in limiting both speed and stability. Yet, in charity, we must recognize that it was an error not easily foreseen, and self-entrenching as time passed and railroads grew.

Consideration of both the economic and technical factors involved would not indicate an optimum track gauge of about 6'–6". By this step together with curve-reduction and lowered center-of-gravity mentioned previously, the safe continuous top speed of unmanned self-propelled vehicles could be increased some 33%, i.e., from 75 to 100 mph.

Such an increase in gauge could be superimposed gradually upon an operating present-gauge system, with the system accepting a mix of both speed—and narrow-gauge vehicles, depending upon the customers connected, until the entire conversion is completed.

Against this final step the argument might be made that given the colossal present investment in 4'–8½" track, it would be wiser to accommodate higher safe speeds by making vehicles lower, slimmer and longer. This would also reduce the annual energy cost per cubic foot of cargo space at a given speed. Again, a case might be made for closer attention to wheel diameter, flange height and undercarriage suspension to achieve high-speed stability. Undoubtedly therefore the most sophisticated analyses and tests would be justified before taking such a drastic step as widening track gauge.

DETAIL DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

Some final comments are in order regarding the design of the typical vehicle in the proposed system, and of the control system necessary to ensure safe headway and correct switch actuation at all times.

While a number of basically different types of cars would be called for, just as at present, they would all be designed with a great deal of attention to streamlining, since at speeds approaching 100 mph over 95% of the propulsive energy will be spent in overcoming wind-resistance. In the light of the above, a standard truck with 50 to 100 hp per axle would appear to be acceptable for almost all cars in the system.

Open space enclosed vehicles (i.e., boxcars) would be most common; with internals designed for automatic loading of cartons by an extension of the factory conveyor system. Open flatcars for such freight as lumber, steel, machinery, etc., would undoubtedly employ a light rigid fairing both for aerodynamics and weather protection. Tank cars would be as clean as airplane fuselages, with faired undercarriages. Special vehicles requiring either heat or refrigeration enroute would have a special advantage in an all-electric system, not being dependent upon the reliability of an auxiliary onboard powerplant as at present.

Automatic maintenance of headway would require equipment on each vehicle capable of detecting when the vehicle ahead is approaching the "safe differential stopping distance" (SDSD), plus braking controls to maintain headway in excess of that distance at all times. This SDSD control system requires a knowledge of three factors at all times, speed, headway and rate-of-change of headway. Several electronic systems to accomplish this in a tracked vehicle are feasible.

Automatic guidance of each vehicle from origin to destination is not so difficult as might appear. Since each shipper would have a pre-established supply relationship with a limited number of receivers, his staff would have ample time to map out both the best and alternative routes in each case. Each route would be "mapped" by merely identifying the yes-or-no decision at every switch enroute, and the final terminal. This sequence would then be registered on tape or card carried in the vehicle's switch-control system. If in the course of its journey a particular track segment should be blocked by accident or unforeseen congestion, a railroad "troubleshooter" at an appropriate point upstream would electronically "read" the destination of each approaching vehicle, and transmit a "correction" (i.e., a set of detour switches to follow) which would return it to its prescribed route another way.

Both the planning of the best routes, and the trouble-shooting described, are good examples of the upgrading of railroad labor to more creative functions that would result from automation.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMATION

The principal merits of such a fully-automatic railroad freight system may then be summarized as follows:

1. Nowhere in the system is manpower needed to drive, connect or disconnect vehicles.

2. All revenue-producing vehicles would start moving as soon as loaded, and would continue at uniform speed by the best route to the receiver's dock.

3. Uniform speeds approaching 100 mph can be foreseen, and the best route in every case would be based upon regarding the entire national network as a single system, regardless of who "owned" what piece of track; i.e., the customer's benefit, rather than that of any particular railroad, would be paramount.

4. A released empty freight car would be automatically routed to the nearest "demand" pool, or claimed by another shipper while enroute to such a pool. The inventory of cars of each type in a "demand" pool would vary with both region and season, but in any case would be a much smaller fraction of the whole than the idle car inventory in the nation today.

5. Being all-electric, and totally separated from highway traffic, the system would add to its economic virtues the social virtues of quietness, cleanness, better conservation of natural resources, and protection of the public.

6. Every mile of mainline track would be in constant use by vehicles many times an hour bringing to the railroad investment a utilization, efficiency and productivity hitherto unmatched in any form of vehicle transportation.

7. The combined industry of the entire nation, linked by such a system, could now be looked upon as a single factory; each factory as merely an operation of the whole; and the automatic rail-freight system as the conveyor-belt connecting each operation to the next. In short, it would become to the nation what the circulation system is to the body, the life-blood supply to every joint and sinew, the epitome of what an effective transportation system ought to be.

MRS. WYNONA LIPMAN ASSUMES BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS DIRECTORSHIP

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a dear friend and devoted public servant, Mrs. Wynona Lipman recently assumed the duties as director of the Essex County Board of Chosen Freeholders. She brings to this task outstanding ability and commitment. The following editorial from the Montclair Times and her own words aptly describe her determination. And, I want to congratulate her and extend my warm wishes for success in her challenging new post. The editorial follows:

THE FREEHOLDER-DIRECTOR

Over the years Montclair has contributed heavily to governmental service from its vast store of outstanding citizens. Since this has been a predominantly Republican community and still shows numerical Republican leanings, most of the contributions have come from the GOP.

Montclair's most recent addition to the ranks of local citizens in governmental service, however, comes from the Democratic Party, Mrs. Wynona Lipman. Mrs. Lipman, on Jan. 2, was named director of the Essex County Board of Chosen Freeholders.

Accepting the directorship Mrs. Lipman spoke of "better government and more effective public service." Of them she remarked: "This goal cannot be achieved by wishing, but only by doing."

Regarding governmental costs, Mrs. Lipman declared:

"Let us separate the niceties from the necessities, the essential from the convenient, the immediate from the occasional, and come up with a budget that is realistic, sound, and most of all effective from the hard-hit taxpayer's point of view."

Of her financial philosophy, Mrs. Lipman asserted: "The day of the loose and easy

dollar is rapidly becoming a part of ancient history. The public wants results and results it is going to get."

These are brave words and they are strong words, but the new freeholder-director seems headed in the right direction.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the proposals put forward by President Nixon in his state of the Union message have drawn much thoughtful study and commentary in the Nation's press.

The newspapers in my own State of Delaware have offered constructive comment on the proposals and I ask that three representative editorials be printed in the RECORD.

The first of the three, "Cabinet Shuffle: Good Step," appeared in the Wilmington Evening Journal on January 25. The second, "Nixon: Meaningful Address" by Jack Gibbons, appeared in the Delaware State News on January 27. The third, "Nixon Tests Himself," appeared in the Evening Journal on January 26.

While I do not necessarily agree with all the points raised in the editorials, I think they are representative of the thoughtful responses called forth by the President's proposals.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CABINET SHUFFLE: GOOD STEP

There is no reason, excepting perhaps tradition, why the federal government should not be an efficient organization with a minimum of overlapping functions and ambiguous responsibilities. President Nixon's proposal to reorganize seven Cabinet-level departments into four new ones is an attempt to buck that tradition. The planned consolidation will not be easy, but the attempt is well worth the try.

President Nixon rated the reorganization plan high enough in his priorities to make its announcement the climax of his State of the Union message Friday night. (General commentary on the message will follow tomorrow.)

One has only to look at a few examples of how the system works under the present setup to realize its inadequacies. The food stamp program, naturally an adjunct of welfare, is administered not by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare but by the Department of Agriculture, to point out one mismatch.

The Nixon proposal would do away with the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, Commerce, the Interior, Transportation, Housing and Urban Development and Health, Education and Welfare, combining their functions into four new departments—natural resources, human resources, economic development and community development. The Departments of State, the Treasury, Defense and Justice would be unaffected.

Various interest groups and congressional committeemen, long accustomed to things as they are and quite comfortable with them, will put up stiff opposition to the Nixon proposal. The old "you scratch my back I'll scratch yours" game is a tough one to play when someone moves one of the backs.

But hopefully, the reorganization plan will prove too important to be stalled by a few squawks from the inconvenience. As one government official put it:

"The present Cabinet just grew, haphazardly, over two centuries. This plan is not just moving boxes around. It is an effort to overcome very real overlaps, competition and ambiguity of responsibility."

The more cynically minded might be tempted to view the plan as creating four monsters out of seven giants. Bigness is not, after all, any guarantee of improved efficiency or responsiveness. The planned reorganization stems, however, from recommendations made by the Ash Commission, chaired by Roy L. Ash, head of Litton industries Inc., and study groups from the Office of Management and Budget.

Finally, the risk that such a reorganization might make matters worse is minimized substantially when one considers that things generally have nowhere to go but up.

NIXON: MEANINGFUL ADDRESS

If President Nixon continues to speak as well, as humbly and as meaningfully as he did in his address to the joint session of Congress Friday night he will be much harder to defeat in 1972 than now seems likely.

To begin with, the president adopted the tone that he has asked the rest of us to use ever since his inaugural two years ago. He wanted us to stop yelling so we could hear each other. He didn't yell Friday night. He didn't implore or insult. In fact, Ted Agnew, sitting behind him, looked uncomfortable. Here was Ted's president doing what Ted had refused to do.

Next, the president was humble. This becomes a president, especially in these times when everyone around him competes for his favor and attention, and flattery is the accepted tactic.

Then, the president's message was filled with meaning and substance. There will be no discrimination, Nixon said, and he reached the highest emotional pitch of his delivery with this assertion. Any funds going from federal government to state will be used in the American way, not in the Mississippi way.

One observer made 17 positive notes as he listened to the 33-minute talk. This is a high mark. Mr. Nixon spoke of a strong economy without war. He asked $100 million for cancer. He will expand the park system. He will provide more physicians by increasing aid to medical schools. He still wants family assistance.

Did the president omit anything?

Yes, the observer, reflecting for several minutes after the talk, thought of three omissions. One, the president did not speak much about education and the right of every citizen to higher education regardless of economic circumstances. That was too bad. But in a way the president evened up this loss by leaving out tiresome references to law and order and the drug scene. Enough has been said about this rubbish.

NIXON TESTS HIMSELF

Twin thrusts of the program President Nixon is laying before Congress, beginning with last week's report on the State of the Union and continuing with various subject oriented messages, are decentralization and reorganization.

The first objective, adoption of a plan to share federal revenue with the states, and cities, adds flesh to his "New Federalism" (a notably uninspired example of sloganeering which is now seldom mentioned). The second would take those functions remaining to the federal government and execute them through a radically different structure.

The total is a new way of doing things in Washington, and a new way of relating the various levels of government in the United States, which Mr. Nixon chose to call "revolutionary." The word is a bit strong.

The "six great goals" to which Mr. Nixon aspires for the nation are philosophically acceptable to the great majority: Welfare reform, full peace-time prosperity, restore the environment, strengthen state and local government, reform federal government and improving health care.

It is Mr. Nixon's means to those ends which will run into, if not actual resistance, then the kind of keep-things-as-they-are inertia which has frustrated so many reform-minded presidents and their inspired advisers.

Welfare reform, as implemented by the Family Assistance Plan the President presented to the last Congress, has already met that fate once. It was scuttled by members of Congress (and those they represent) who would not like any welfare plan because they basically do not like the idea of public welfare, and they refuse to recognize that one way of administering welfare could be relatively better than another.

The means of achieving the strengthening of state and local government (through revenue sharing) and reforming the federal establishment (through the "big package" plan of reorganizing 12 Cabinet-level departments into eight function-oriented departments) are subject to similar drags.

Revenue sharing needs a lot of selling at the national level, and Mr. Nixon has promised to lay his plan before Congress in greater detail. Even in its broader outlines, which include taking $10 billion from present federal categorical programs and adding to it $6 million in "new money" for a grand total of $16 million to be transferred to the states and localities, will meet the objection that it is not much more than a shuffling of the spending authority. Congress is not inclined to look with favor on a program that make it the tax collector for funds to be spent by state and federal government; no legislative body likes to take the blame for taxes which others will spend.

But how else is the President to respond to the really desperate, even panicky calls of governors and mayors who see themselves and their governments going down for the third time in a fiscal sea?

Federal reorganization on a truly broad scale which would achieve, in addition to standing Departments of State, Defense, Justice and the Treasury, new Departments of Human Resources, Community Development, Natural Resources and Economic Development, is a crying need to relate today's problems with today's government, and to establish in government cleaner lines of authority and responsibility.

But Congress itself is used to doing things the old way; all the other institutions built up around the existing system—agencies, lobbies, committees, state structures—are used to the old way.

What faces Mr. Nixon is a monumental task of leadership and salesmanship, with little promise of help from a Congress which, in both parties, is rather stodgy and establishmentarian. The test which the President has set for himself is both personal and political future, will ride on the success he on the country, and quite probably his own political future, will ride on the success he achieves toward the goals he has set, and the means to achieve them.

THE BUDGET GAP—NIXON RECEIVES AN "A" FOR CREDIBILITY

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, fiscal forecasting is a hazardous art. I

hesitate to call it a science. And budget drafting is doubly so. It is interesting, therefore, and significant that Edwin L. Dale, Jr., of the New York Times, has given the Nixon administration high marks for the forecasting done in the fiscal 1972 budget. Mr. Dale finds the Nixon budget for 1972 far more credible than its recent predecessors, particularly since it does not hinge too heavily on what Congress might or might not do. I commend a reading of Mr. Dale's article of January 31 to my colleagues.

THE BUDGET GAP—NIXON RECEIVES AN "A" FOR CREDIBILITY

(By Edwin L. Dale Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—If the financial and business community—and economists—have a sense of skepticism about President Nixon's new budget, and particularly the estimate of the deficit, the feeling is entirely understandable.

The reason is what has happened in recent years. Presidential estimates in the January budget have usually been wildly wrong, almost always with the result of a much bigger deficit than estimated in the original budget document. The question now is: How does the new budget stack up for "credibility?"

Before answering, it is worth a look at the rather depressing recent record.

In January, 1966, President Johnson estimated an almost exact balance for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967; result—a deficit of $8.7-billion. The chief reason in that case was a major underestimation of the cost of the war in Vietnam.

The next January, Mr. Johnson estimated a deficit of $4.3-billion for fiscal year 1968; result—a deficit of $25.2-billion. Here, a major reason was the failure of Congress to enact the 10 percent income tax surcharge until 11 months after it was proposed.

The opposite happened in the next fiscal year. In January, 1968, President Johnson estimated a deficit of $7.9-billion for fiscal 1969. Largely because receipts, spurred by an economy that refused to slow down, greatly exceeded estimates, the final result showed a surplus of $3.2-billion.

Fiscal year 1970, a budget started by Mr. Johnson but amended somewhat by President Nixon, had the merit of the smallest error—only $6.2-billion. A predicted surplus of $3.4-billion turned into a deficit of $2.8-billion. In this case the most important villains were a big burst above estimates in the "uncontrollable expenditures," such as interest on the debt, and the first impact of the 1970 recession in slowing receipts.

The worst record of all is the current fiscal year, though it is not yet over. President Nixon in January a year ago projected a surplus of $1.3-billion. The new budget document has revised that to a mammoth estimated deficit of $18.6-billion, the second largest since World War II. The culprits: Congressional action and inaction increasing spending and reducing revenues, some increase in the "uncontrollables" (particularly welfare), and the big impact of the recession on receipts.

What about the new budget?

In several important respects it has advantages over its predecessors on the side of credibility. The most important is that it is not asking Congress for a single significant tax increase, nor does it depend on Congressional approval of a postal rate increase.

In addition, there is a somewhat more realistic approach to the package of old and relatively ineffective programs that every President, properly, tries to get Congress to reduce or abolish. This budget does not include nearly as many items of this type that nearly everyone recognized at the beginning that Congress would not approve. To this degree, the expenditure figure is more realistic, though it still counts on some "savings" requiring Congressional approval.

Also, and of considerable importance, the Government has gradually improved its methods of estimating the "uncontrollables" and in this budget tried to be honest and realistic in estimating them. Officials say there was no pressure this time to shave the estimates to make the over-all budget total lower.

Finally, there is some indication that Congress is beginning to awaken to its own, almost unconscious, role in raising spending and that it might be more cautious this year, though that it is not certain.

On the opposite side, by far the most important reason for doubting the budget estimates is the extremely optimistic forecast for the economy—a Gross National Product in this calendar year of $1,065,000,000. Only by estimating the G.N.P. high was the revenue figure brought up to $217.6-billion and the deficit held down to $11.6-billion.

Thus it should be no surprise if the deficit again turns out higher than last week's estimate, though the error should not be nearly as large as in the current fiscal year. Under the "full employment budget" concept now used by the President, a larger deficit caused solely by the economy's failure to perform quite as well as forecast would be acceptable anyway, and the money markets in those circumstances should be in an easier position to finance it.

In general, then, insofar as decisions and judgments made at this stage are important, this budget appears to deserve fairly high marks for credibility. And the main reason, is that, in various ways, it relies much less than in the past on having Congress do things it does not want to do.

THE TURNED ON CRISIS

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to announced that yesterday public television stations throughout our Nation began broadcasting a comprehensive drug abuse education series produced by Station WQED of Pittsburgh, Pa. This unique series, entitled "The Turned On Crisis," was funded by a grant from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, of Washington, D.C., and received high acclaim when it was pretested in Pittsburgh last October.

"The Turned On Crisis" examines the many problems surrounding drug addiction and explores the alternatives parents and teenagers can seek to combat this national crisis. The series will be presented in three parts. In February, 8 hours of prime time programs, aimed at families in their homes, will be aired twice weekly. This will be followed in March by six half-hours aimed at educators, including school board members, administrators, and supervisors. Next fall, six 20-minute programs will be beamed to junior high school students in their classrooms.

One of the most innovative aspects of this series is its provision for community participation through the formation of "mini community meetings." These local groups are being provided with materials to advertise the series in their areas. In addition, they are encouraged to develop followup action programs to deal with the drug problem in their own community.

This series, involving both television programs and especially prepared printed materials, is designed to effectively reach young people without oversensationalizing or preaching. It attempts to have an impact on the most important audience—young people.

A wide range of guests appear in the series: nationally known figures such as Dr. Jesse Steinfeld, the U.S. Surgeon General; David Susskind, television producer and host; Fred Rogers of "Misterogers' Neighborhood;" Dr. Carl Rogers, noted psychologist with the center for the Study of the Person; Dr. Lewis Yablonsky, author and sociology professor; Dr. Helen Nowlis, psychology professor and author; and Dr. Sidney Cohen, adviser to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Television personalities, sports celebrities, entertainers, ex-addicts, youth, and adults from communities throughout the United States also participate, lending their talents, insights, and personal experiences to the series. Among them will be: Arnold Palmer, "Brother John," Big Brother and the Holding Company, O. J. Simpson, the "Bugaloos," Frank Gorshin and Martin Allen.

When "The Turned On Crisis" was pretested in Pittsburgh last October, many communities across western Pennsylvania developed their own action programs. I am very much encouraged by the fact that of the 29 "mini community meetings" set up as a part of the program, 22 have decided to form permanent organizations to fight drug abuse. The results and effects of this pretest series is discussed in an article written by Robert Adams in Qed Renaessance, Station WQED's community magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Station WQED has done a highly commendable job in producing "The Turned On Crisis." I am hopeful that the series will enjoy a high viewership and am enthusiastically awaiting report of its reception.

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

A COMMUNITY COMMUNICATES ON DRUG ABUSE

(By Robert Adams)

THE TURNED ON CRISIS PROMOTES UNDERSTANDING THROUGH INVOLVEMENT

With so many demands on an individual's time, what provided the impetus that motivated some 2,000 people to attend meetings each week for four weeks in their communities in 9 different counties surrounding the Pittsburg area?

The first phrase that probably stimulated their participation was "drug crisis." No word in the country today brings fear to people's minds faster than the word drugs. That phrase was immediately followed by the word television. Certainly that is another word which can motivate people into action.

But "The Turned On Crisis" was formulated by WQED/WQED's staff with more than a television series on drugs in mind. Rather, the series of month-long programs was only a part of a project which hopefully would encourage and urge viewers to act in their re-

spective communities to challenge the drug crisis.

A VIEW OF THE PROGRAMS

Let's first examine the kind of television programs that could produce the community response that was sought.

The series featured week-by-week topic development of four main areas of concentration: Information, Prevention, Rehabilitation, and Legislation. Starting last October, the series was presented on WQED Sunday through Friday starting at 8:00 PM. Most of the programs were 60 minutes, but several of them, notably the "Town Meeting" programs and the feature-length motion pictures, ran 2½ hours.

Each week a program's initial showing was presented on Sunday and repeated on Tuesday, with another first showing on Monday and a repeat on Wednesday. Thursday was "Town Meeting" Night. On Friday, award-winning dramatic film productions dealing with the drug problem were aired. Among these presentations were "Man With The Golden Arm," "Hatful of Rain," and the Emmy Award-winning "The People Next Door."

Thus, six nights a week the station was presenting programming in prime-time which would provide information, examine various forms of prevention and rehabilitation, and finally, ask judges and legislators to comment on what they had seen and suggest legislation which would aid in combating the drug problem.

Drama, encounter sessions, panels, community discussion groups, documentaries, feature films and dramatic television programs were all utilized in the series. Well-known personalities in the entertainment world, educators, psychologists, police officers, social workers, lawyers, judges—all were asked to participate and their enthusiasm was evident throughout the series. Tear-filled eyes . . . angry voices . . . heated arguments, these were intermingled throughout the series with intelligent and sobering statements, pertinent information, and a spirit of cooperation.

An "Electronic Bibliography" on WQED provided 60 films and videotapes related to topics on drugs. They included programs from a week-long Drug Abuse Seminar conducted at Seven Springs, Pennsylvania; a series on alcoholism; programs offering socio-cultural points of view on drugs. This material was gathered from educational and research centers and from public television stations throughout the country. These films were presented Monday through Friday from 6:00 PM to 11:00 PM on WQED.

INFORMING THE PUBLIC

Next, the public had to be made aware of the project and what the station hoped to accomplish. A marathon promotional campaign was set in motion as the October deadline approached.

News releases, on-the-air promotional films, radio spot announcements, special stationery, billboards, bus cards, taxi cards, 30 daily newspaper ads, and special mailings to schools and other interested groups were flooded throughout the Pittsburgh area. All were integrated through the use of a unique logo and logotype which instantly identified "The Turned On Crisis." The logo suggested that "turning on with drugs is turning on yourself."

In addition to press kits which contained the promotional materials, utilization kits included a drug fact-book, meeting guides, audiovisual and print bibliographies on drugs, posters, flyers, logo buttons, drug glossary, discussion leaders handbook, and other informational materials which supported the project.

INVOLVING THE COMMUNITY

A key ingredient in making the series meaningful was a decision made early in the planning stages to involve the citizens in the project throughout the many communities served by WQED. This required action by the station in initiating or activating a group of people or an organization which could undertake the leadership in a series of town meetings, later called "Mini-Town Meetings." The "Mini-Town Meetings" which provide a forum at which interested citizens could view the televised programs and voice their opinions of what could be done with the drug problem in their community. Such an organization was found in the nearly 400 member Human Resources Committee of professional and civic volunteers in the Community project. Their members provided the leadership and committee chairmen needed at the "Mini-Town Meetings."

The meetings were held Sunday, Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday each week for four weeks in 29 areas. They watched the programs and then commented on what they had seen and how it related to their own community. On Thursday of each week, representatives from the "Mini-Town Meetings" participated in a televised "Town Meeting." These "Town Meetings" were broadcast "live" and openended from the studios of WQED as part of "The Turned On Crisis."

The station, however, sought more than a series of "conversations" at the "Mini-Town Meetings" and the "Town Meetings." The station sought commitment and action by the community areas. The programs and discussions had to be so stimulating that they could only lead to action.

THE COMMUNITY RESPONDS

Throughout the entire month of October the programs were aired and supported with the many forms of publicity and promotion. The "Mini-Town Meetings" were, in most instances, well attended and the participants were beginning to see, as they watched the programs, and discussed the problems with their neighbors, the need for action in their communities.

These actions took several forms. In Moon Township, their group is renting a building situated on 10 acres of land with an option to buy. The young people in the area will be able to work the land during summer months to supplement their financial needs.

This center will be a totally self-help program, and partially self-sustaining. They have secured the professional services of a lawyer, a judge, and assistance at Staunton Clinic in Sewickley, which offers psychiatric and emotional services to those in need. They are also working with local officials, schools, businesses and churches.

The group also has volunteer workers who "man" a 24-hour "hotline." They are prepared to listen when an individual needs a "rap session." They also sponsor activities which include arts and crafts, a coffee house, amateur theatricals, and a limited non-professional counseling service. In addition, they have what they term a "first-aid" room which provides cold-turkey treatment and a doctor on call. Of course, their future plans are much more extensive, but their present facilities are a direct outgrowth of "The Turned On Crisis."

The group in Monroeville has formed an adult drug council. They are also planning a "hotline" for youngsters to call when they are in need of information, but they also see the need for more personal involvement in the form of counseling.

Butler County is an example of one of the groups that is getting assistance from an existing organization. Peer group counseling is available every Tuesday night at Butler's Mental Health Center. This group has been assured by the County Commissioners that it will appoint a county coordinating committee on drugs. They are planning a Drop-In Center where "rap sessions," counseling, and alternative activities to drug use will be offered to youngsters.

A SAMPLING OF RESPONSES

A good sampling of the responses was seen at the final "Town Meeting" which was broadcast on WQED. Representatives from all the "Mini-Town Meetings" were interviewed on the program. Their answers ranged from on woman who offered her 10 room house for a rehabilitation center, to another woman who complained that she still is trying to find someone in her community interested in meeting with her to discuss the drug problem.

Several representatives echoed the response of Mrs. Joan Ripple from Greensburg, who said that at her "Mini-Town Meetings" "the youngsters, who turned out in large numbers, found that they did not have enough adults there to talk to." Mrs. Marty Friday and Mrs. J. C. Price of Penn Hills were two more people who shared Mrs. Ripple's view.

Catherine Marburger from Evans City in South Butler County was also typical of several representatives when she said her community had 50 to 60 people who would continue to meet and set up definite procedures to alleviate the problem.

Several people were frank to admit they still didn't know what they were going to do in their communities. Lack of funds, lack of a center for addicts, lack of hospital beds, and the need for training teachers and parents—all were cited on the program as barriers to action. But all were in agreement that the efforts of the station in making them more aware of the problem would eventually result in action in their areas.

As Mrs. Lois Albrecht of South Center Mental Health Center said, "We thank WQED for this project. It's a good beginning."

"But a beginning is not enough," stated Lloyd Kaiser, President and General Manager of the station at the conclusion of the program. "We want to hear about your actions as a result of this project. We also want your reaction to the series. Whether it's criticism or praise; our weaknesses and our strengths. We would like to know through your letters, what you think about the 'Mini-Town Meetings' and the 'Town Meetings' and the other programs. We plan to follow up with a report of some of the actions taken by groups as a result of this series."

A TALLY OF THE RESPONSES

Statistics are often poor indicators of the effectiveness of a project. But they do give some evidence of the success or failure of a project such as "The Turned On Crisis."

Out of a total of 29 community areas that participated in the "Mini-Town Meetings," 22 of them have definite plans to continue meeting and seeking solutions to the drug problem in Western Pennsylvania.

Examining these 22 area groups we find that:

Eight areas, Westmoreland County, Penn Hills, East Liberty, Braddock, Green County, Southern Butler County, Monroeville, and North East, have formed new *ad hoc* committees. They will be working with PTA groups or forming their own active groups to combat drug abuse in their areas.

Nine areas, Butler County, South Side, North Hills, Churchill, South Hills, Homewood, Brookline, Mercer County, and Wilkinsburg, are working on the expansion and strengthening of already existing community action councils.

Three areas, Moon Township, North Side, and Lawrence County, are working specifically for Youth Recreation Centers as an alternative to drug use.

One area, Fox Chapel, plans to continue weekly mini-meetings indefinitely. These will be informal "rap sessions" between youths and adults and will be held in the area high schools.

One area was instrumental in getting their county commissioners to appoint a ten-member council on drugs.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES

Although perhaps not as impressive as the statistical summary, what happened to several individuals as a result of this project may have more meaning. To be effective in a drug situation you have to work on almost a one-to-one relationship. This is where real progress is seen.

A woman who was one of the leaders from Moon Township befriended a drug addict during the community meetings. They established a very friendly relationship and both of them, from opposite ends of the economic and social strata, are more understanding of the other's point of view.

A man in an affluent suburban area of Pittsburgh, after seeing the drug sensitivity encounter program, identified so strongly with the young man who broke down on the program that he was encouraged to go to his own son and establish a better relationship.

Following the first "Town Meeting" program, several blacks commented that this was the first time that they have been able to talk to white people about a subject without any references to racial problems.

A march on St. Francis Hospital by residents from the Homewood Brushton area resulted in obtaining 12 beds in the hospital for drug addicts.

These examples are typical of the truly meaningful results of "The Turned On Crisis." They are not as impressive as 22 out of 29 community areas taking action, but they are the incidents, multiplied many-fold, which will have lasting results.

PROGRAMS TO BE SEEN NATIONALLY

Eight of the programs which were seen on WQED in October will be shown on the Public Broadcasting Service network in February. They will be supported by extensive promotional materials which will be supplied to all the stations which broadcast the series of programs. The objective of the series nationally is the same as the objective in this area. The drug crisis cannot be solved through a project even as intensive as "The Turned On Crisis." It is more realistic to call the project *one* of the challenges to the drug crisis which spur others into action toward long-range solutions.

AN EXAMPLE FOR KANSAS AND THE NATION

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the city of McPherson, Kans., provides an encouraging example for other cities in our State and throughout the country. During this past decade, McPherson registered steady and substantial population and economic growth without the resultant problems which plague many cities of its size.

At a time when our rural areas are fighting to retain their identities and to keep their young people at home, McPherson is showing the way. Blessed with adequate and inexpensive power and water resources, new industrial efforts have flourished. Jobs have been created for the ample and skilled labor supply which is available due to increasingly efficient farming methods.

I might add that McPherson has made this progress with a minimum of assistance from the Federal Government. While many cities hold out their hands for Federal money whenever a problem arises, McPherson has gone ahead, attacking local problems with local initiative, unencumbered by Federal controls.

Mr. Speaker, I close my remarks with an editorial from the McPherson Sentinel, which is justifiably proud of these acomplishments:

MCPHERSON SHOWS KANSAS HOW TO GROW BETTER

Kansas leaders interested in encouraging growth of Kansas in proportion to our neighboring states are discouraged by the poor growth of Kansas in the past 10 years. Despite tremendous efforts to attract new industry to provide jobs for our young people at home, Kansas population only grew a little over 3 per cent in the past 10 years. In comparison, our neighbor states grew about twice as fast.

There is one place in Kansas which is keeping up with the growth in our neighbor states—McPherson. In the past 10 years we gained over 8 per cent in population which compares well with our neighbor states.

Why the difference? We have an aggressive industrial expansion program similar to many other cities in Kansas, but we also have something more. We have an aggressive and progressive retail community which has steadily expanded services in these 10 years. We have a city of homes, well kept and happy We have a city which so far has escaped deprivations of organized crime, excessive vandalism and rioting.

Not only can we offer new jobs in our industries and stores, but we also can offer a city in which people want to raise their children.

We are mighty proud of this record and pledge to go on showing the rest of Kansas how to grow in a sensible and healthy way.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ACT

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today I joined my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN) and others, in cosponsoring the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1971.

This general subject matter is one on which I have introduced legislation in the past. It is a timely bill considering the growing concerning over the cooperation of Federal, State, and local governments in reaching our national goals. The tax dollar can only go so far and the needs for governmental assistance are so great, that no one will dispute the fact that the executive branch, Congress and the State and local governments must all clasp hands to reach the most efficient use of the tax dollar in government assistance programs.

Last session, I introduced a bill with several cosponsors calling for a study commission to look at, among other things, the effects of Federal grant activities on the interrelationship of government at all levels, and to consider the possibility of channeling Federal programs which benefit the same functional area, through a single State agency for each State. This is an approach that I still think should be looked into.

The bill I am cosponsoring today is designed to improve the financial management of Federal assistance programs and to implement consolidation of such programs. Among other things, the bill also provides for strengthening congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid.

Our long range goal should be to provide the simplest, soundest method of government—not just at the Federal level, but across the board. This bill, introduced by Mr. FOUNTAIN, is in keeping with this goal.

A NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, in my home district in Brooklyn, I am privileged to number among my constituents a large percentage of senior citizens. I am, therefore, deeply concerned with the nutritional crisis which currently faces many older people in America.

It is a sad, but well-known fact that most of the elderly people in this country exist on diets which are woefully inadequate. Often, they are referred to as "tea and toast" diets, a description which is all too accurate. Mrs. Sandra Howell, project director for the Gerontological Society, explained the inevitable result of such malnourishment:

When poor nutrition exists and persists in the older adult, it serves to intensify the severity of other conditions which accompany the processes of aging. By not specifically dealing with the problems of adequate diet in the elderly, we encourage the spiral of chronic disease, physical and psychic disability and ultimate institutionalizations.

The reasons for this disgracefu situation are many. However, to state the problem in the most straightforward terms possible, elderly people do not eat well because they cannot afford to.

Today's senior citizens have been doubly victimized by the circumstances of history and economics. Their peak earning years came during the depression or before the advent of minimum wage laws; and as a result, they were not able to accumulate the large savings necessary to provide for their later years. Those who by hard work and good fortune were able to maintain small savings have had these reserves quickly depleted by today's soaring cost of living. Therefore, most older Americans are now obliged to exist on social security benefits from the Federal Government.

To say I was shocked to learn of the paltriness of these benefits is an understatement. The average social security benefit for a retired worker is $99 a month, $87 per month for a widow, and $166 a month for a retired couple. Yet, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, a moderate budget for a retired couple is $370 a month—more than two times the amount the Government provides.

The situation is even worse concern-

ing State welfare programs. In New York, one of the States with so-called "liberal" welfare statutes, the elderly poor are allotted a grand total of 66 cents a day for food. I shudder to think of what people are forced to live on in less liberal States.

The impossibility of achieving proper nourishment on such a meager sum as 66 cents should be evident. Several wealthy people of impeccable reputation have tried such a diet for just 1 week and have told us of the misery and hunger it has caused. Our wealthy friends, however, could always look forward to meat and vegetables only a few days later; and such knowledge was enough to keep them going for 1 painful week. Imagine, though, how it feels for an elderly man or woman to know that from the day he retires until the day he dies, there will be no hope of escaping such near starvation.

There are several other reasons, aside from simple poverty, which prevent senior citizens from eating well. The process of aging is not easy for anyone. Suddenly, dearly loved husbands or wives are gone. Friends become ill. One by one they, too, pass away. Children are far away, raising families of their own. Life has become very, very lonely.

Consider the effort required for poor older people to plan and cook adequate meals. One food after another is prohibited by diet restrictions. Aching legs must trek from store to store in search of the best bargains. Groceries must be carried home and up flights of stairs, while hearts are pounding and breath is short. Dull, meager meals must be prepared and cooked. Finally, our senior citizens must sit down to eat—alone.

Can we honestly expect older Americans to go through this same tedious routine day after day, with no hope of relief from the loneliness and boredom? I think not.

Last session of Congress, I cosponsored a bill amending the Older Americans Act of 1965 which called for grants to States for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of low-cost meal programs, nutrition training programs, and opportunities for social contacts for our senior citizens. Hearings were held on this bill, but then no further action was taken.

I am again putting my name on this bill in the hope that action will be taken in this session of Congress. The bill goes to the heart of the problem. Unlike so many proposals, it does not merely advocate the pouring of massive sums of money into something which does nothing more than treat some of the symptoms of the problem, without dealing with the causes.

Under the provisions of the bill, low cost, nutritionally sound meals could be delivered to those elderly people who are not able to leave their homes. For those who are able to get about more easily, the same meals could be served in local community centers. Such an arrangement would not only provide superior nutrition for the elderly, but would immeasurably widen their social horizons. New friendships would be made, new interests developed. A program of this sort would be a major step toward relieving not only the nutritional problem of our senior citizens, but the loneliness and boredom which are major causes of that problem.

Unless we move now to solve the nutritional crisis facing the elderly, it is very possible that in the near future we will be debating not the number of older Americans, but the starvation of older Americans.

America's senior citizens have served their country well for many long years. They now need our help in facing a problem of grave proportions. It is my fervent hope that we will not fail them.

GOVERNMENT PRICE AND WAGE FIXING

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, as inflation continues throughout the national economy, with no end in sight and no countermeasures apparently working, an increasing number of people who ought to know better are beginning to call for governmental price and wage fixing, usually known by the milder sounding term "price and wage controls." By people who ought to know better, I mean those with no personal or ideological interest in bigger, more socialistic government.

This trend is reflected to some extent in my mail. Constituents write saying, in effect, that if other anti-inflationary policies do not succeed soon, we may have to resort to "price and wage controls" as the lesser of evils. The implication is that such controls, though a drastic change in policy, are a sure-fire means of guaranteeing the availability of cheaper goods to consumers.

But in fact they are nothing of the sort. In peacetime governmental price and wage fixing never works in a free country; and even in time of all-out war, when patriotic fervor does what fear of penalties cannot do in bringing about compliance, Government-fixed prices are always accompanied by severe shortages of the price-controlled goods. Chronic shortages are the hallmark of every controlled economy.

In his recent book "Man Versus the Welfare State," the noted economist Henry Hazlitt explains why this is true:

> Attempts to hold down or roll back prices, when they do not merely lead to black markets and quality deterioration, must reduce and disrupt production and distort the balance and structure of production. . . .
>
> When the price of one item, say some necessity such as bread or milk, is held below the price that supply and demand would set in a free market, it reduces the comparative profit margin in making that product and soon creates a shortage of that product. This is exactly the opposite result from the one the government price-fixers had in mind. If, in the effort to cure this, the government tries to hold down the prices of the labor, raw materials, and other factors that go into producing the price-controlled product, the price control must be extended in ever-widening circles, until the government finds itself trying to fix the price of everything.
>
> As there are probably at least 10 million separate prices in the American economy, and as this implies something on the order of 50 trillion cross-relationships among prices, the government sets itself a fantastically impossible task. But this does not mean it cannot do immense harm to the economy when it nevertheless undertakes this task.

Therefore, we are not simply making a choice between big government and inflation when we consider adopting governmental price and wage fixing. In that case we are also choosing scarcity over abundance.

Governmental price and wage fixing can never cure inflation, because it is aimed only at the symptoms of the disease, not at the cause. There are three good ways to get at the cause: first, eliminate the huge annual Federal deficit, every dollar of which is 100-percent inflationary; second, move toward restoring the gold backing of all our money, made meaningful by once again allowing private citizens to own monetary gold; third, curb the excessive powers and special legal privileges now given to labor unions, which enable them to demand and obtain inflationary wage increases.

These three courses of action against inflation, and legislation to implement them, have a high priority in my legislative program for the new session of Congress just beginning.

A BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, when Milton S. Kronheim, Sr., of Washington, D.C., celebrated a recent birthday, his friend and columnist, Art Buchwald, wrote a parody on the classic, "Casey at the Bat," by Ernest Lawrence Thayer.

Mr. Kronheim is one of those exceptional Americans who has practiced brotherhood all his life. Those who are privileged to know him not only respect him; they love him. He is a real inspiration to his many friends—a man of great ability, leadership, and compassion—a living legend.

Despite his 82 years, he is in remarkable physical condition and was—and is—quite an athlete. I was, therefore, rather disappointed in the last line of Art's verse. Instead of depicting Milton Kronheim as the "villain" of the game, he should have made him a hero, because Milton Kronheim has been a hero for many, many years by helping people—thousands of them. But I still enjoyed the parody, and I am sure Milton Kronheim did, too.

Art Buchwald's parody, "Kronheim at the Bat," follows:

KRONHEIM AT THE BAT

It looked extremely rocky for the D.C. nine that day
The score stood two to four, but an inning left to play.
So, when Goldberg died at second and Wagman did the same
Judge Bazelon got up to go, leaving there the rest
With that hope which springs eternal within the human breast.
For they thought, "If only Kronheim could get a whack at that
They'd put even money now with Kronheim at the bat."
But Levine preceded Kronheim and so did Rosenbloom
The former was a duffer, the latter used a broom.
So on that stricken multitude, a deathlike silence sat
There seemed but little chance of Kronheim getting at the bat.
But Levine let drive a single to the wonderment of all
And Rosenbloom got luck and tore the cover off the ball.
And when the dust had lifted and they saw what had occurred
There was Rosenbloom at second and Levine a-hugging third.
Then from the gladdened multitude went up a joyous yell
It rumbled in the White House, it shook the Capitol.
It struck upon the monuments and rebounded up at State
For Kronheim, mighty Kronheim, was coming to the plate.
There was ease in Kronheim's manner as he stepped into his place
There was pride in Kronheim's bearing and a smile on Kronheim's face.
When responding to the cheers, he lightly doffed his hat.
No stranger in Washington could doubt Kronheim was at bat.
Ten thousand eyes were on him as he rubbed his hands with dirt.
Five thousand tongues applauded when he wiped them on his shirt.
Then when the writhing pitcher ground the ball into his hip
Defiance glanced in Kronheim's eye, a sneer curled Kronheim's lip.
And now the leather-covered sphere came hurtling through the air,
And Kronheim stood a-watching it in haughty grandeur there.
Close by the sturdy batsman the ball unheeded sped.
"That ain't my style," said Kronheim.
"Strike one," the umpire said.
From the benches filled with relatives, went up a mighty yell
His grandchildren were screaming, but what I can not tell.
"Kill him, kill the umpire," shouted son, Junior, from the stand
And it's likely they'd have killed him had not Kronheim raised his hand.
With a smile of Jewish charity, great Kronheim's visage shone
He stilled the rising tumult, he made the game go on.
He signaled to the pitcher and once more the spheroid flew.
But Kronheim just ignored it and the umpire said, "Strike two."
"Fraud," cried the maddened relatives and the echo answered "Fraud!"
But one scornful look from Kronheim and the audience was awed.
They saw his face grow stern and cold, they saw his muscles strain.
And they knew that Kronheim wouldn't let the ball go by again.
The sneer is gone from Kronheim's lips, his teeth are clenched in hate.
He pounds with cruel vengeance, his bat upon the plate.
And now the pitcher holds the ball, and now he lets it go.
And now the air is shattered by the force of Kronheim's blow.
Oh, somewhere in this favored land, the sun is shining bright
The band is playing somewhere and somewhere hearts are light.
And somewhere men are laughing and somewhere children chat.
But there is no joy in D.C.; Kronheim hit the umpire with his bat.
Happy Birthday

MEMPHIS BUSINESS LEADER CITES VALUE OF U.S. SAVINGS BOND PROGRAM

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include some pertinent thoughts of one of America's outstanding business leaders on the U.S. savings bond program.

Mr. Kemmons Wilson is founder and chairman of the board of Holiday Inns, Inc. Not only is Mr. Wilson a highly successful business leader, he is also a practical practitioner of all that is best in the American system of private enterprise.

His thoughts on the value of U.S. savings bonds to the individual as well as to the Nation are well worth reading and I commend them to your attention:

SAVING WAYS TO HOLIDAYS

(By Kemmons Wilson)

Holidays are happy events on the calendars of most families everywhere. They are "time-outs" from the hurry-and-scurry of work-a-day worlds. They are renewals of the good things of living, learning, growing, understanding.

Vacations together—family style—recreate the minds, bodies, spirits of parents and youngsters alike. It is all so much a part of the promise of the American way—life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I know the promise so well—and its fulfillment.

Hard work is a consequence of a dream, an idea, the desire to achieve. Another key to the puzzle of progress—both personal and corporate—is saving. Setting something aside, in reserve, is the wisdom of prudence. It is the thrift of our tradition, taught around the family table. It is a requisite of sound management, re-echoed around the board rooms of industry.

There are numerous ways to be thrifty, to save, to create reserve. But, for the individual—particularly the employed person and his family—there is no safer, surer program than the Payroll Savings Plan of the U.S. Treasury.

I believe in the program. My family believes in it with me. We know that it works. I talk to guests in our Holiday Inns, wherever I go. I want to know how they feel about our system and its services. Many of them volunteer the information that they are buying Bonds; that they are saving them for holiday trips and planned vacations.

Homecoming games, graduations, group meetings and reunions (many are becoming family affairs), golf outings and the whole spectrum of sports, young marrieds discovering new vistas, those seeking the haunts of history, retired couples satisfying their wanderlust, students on leave from classrooms—all finding new corners of a great country, some for the first time; all revitalizing their thinking about places, people, customs.

All these are our guests. These too, are the savers, the Bond buyers, the wise, who exercise the priceless foresight of building their own reserves for the happy days of future pleasures.

It is the big, wonderful, wide-open world of experience, knowledge and personal satisfaction. And what broadens the outlook better than travel?

Travel is now a favorite national pastime. We are not only discovering but rediscovering our country in amazing numbers. We have the money to match the desire to witness first-hand the new, the different, the beautiful, the exciting brought to our eyes and ears by the magic of communications. We've annihilated space with transportation.

In our lifetime, travel, vacations, holidays have jumped from luxury, affluent status to within the reach of most everyone of moderate means. They are more affordable, as well as more enjoyable, thanks also to the last word in lodging and fine food at reasonable prices.

So, the Bond-buyer/Holiday Inn guest, performs his preference for both of us, because he can count on what he gets in return. Of course, that's simply the prime action of good customer relations.

He knows there's no risk involved in buying U.S. Savings Bonds. The interest rate is guaranteed and not subject to market fluctuations. If lost, stolen, damaged or destroyed, his bonds are replaced at no cost.

His savings can now earn 5½ percent, for as little as $18.75 invested in an E Bond that now matures in 5 years, 10 months. He knows also that, in case of emergency, he can redeem his Bonds with ease and certainty. If he retains his Bonds long enough, when he redeems them, he is assured of getting interest, along with the purchase price. That's unlike most other forms of savings.

Patriotically, he realizes that his Bond holdings help to protect the value of the dollar; that they help the government to sustain and add to the quality of our accustomed life. As he travels with his family past historic sites; through national and state parks; into art galleries, libraries, museums—he enjoys the pride of ownership for having contributed a share of their maintenance.

Yes, I've been a volunteer for Savings Bonds some time now. That's why our "Great Signs", at Holiday Inn locations around the country, feature messages to guests and neighbors that promote the benefits of Bonds. Holiday Inns and Savings Bonds are companions in their provision and promotion of public-service values, plus best possible returns on customer purchases.

Guaranteed reservations at guaranteed prices, plus the pleasantries of peace of mind provided by the attentive attitudes of host personnel—this is the atmosphere, these the attributes of the Holiday Inn daily adventure with the refinements of good living.

Ask almost anyone along the road to name the best assets of good living away from home. He will most likely vote for ease of comfort and convenience, temptation for his taste buds and economy of accommodation. We think we meet the measure of most who visit with us and we cherish our role of host.

Mrs. Wilson shares my belief that the Savings Bonds Program takes the person by the hand and teaches him how to develop financial security. We are very proud of her selection as "Mother of the Year". And she is a bellwether of gift-giving with Savings Bonds. We have found no more impressive nor last-

ing means of expressing our affection to our family; also for our country.

She believes that Bonds—and what they stand for—are excellent examples in teaching the importance of thrift to youngsters. The practice of saving encourages young people to assume responsibility for themselves; to gain poise and confidence. They also serve well in building educational funds for future use by the family.

She would tell you that I long ago had to learn how to make my own way. And she tells me that I'm a better husband and father for having done so. I do know that I discovered the enduring lesson that our lives are richer when we strive to help others, rather than merely to please ourselves. However, I've found that the Savings Bonds of Uncle Sam accomplish both—service to our country and security for ourselves.

NINETEEN SEVENTY SPEAKS

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Leo Lipp of Seattle, Wash., has sent to me a poem he has written expressing his feelings at the close of 1970 and the beginning of a new year:

NINETEEN SEVENTY SPEAKS

(By Leo Lipp)

I am old and weary and somewhat dejected
From a year of strain and great turmoil.
My time is up; no, it is not unexpected
Yet some will say in vain was my toil.
Have I failed during the year to perform my mission
As my predecessors have done in the days of the past?
If so, had I heard complaint or received petition
I would have changed my course surprisingly fast.
I fell heir to a throne, by name Nineteen Seventy.
I was ruler for a year over a world filled with madness
And the heavens looked suffused with crimson for me
From the blood which stained the earth, the tears and sadness.
The ornaments on my crown, the bones of unknown soldiers;
The jewels, their wistful eyes pleading for mercy and rest.
My sword not of gold, but of steel, sharp as a razor;
My word was law. Justice? Might! Useless telling, you know best.
My throne from which I ruled was of silver and gold;
I held the fate of everyone's life in my mighty hand.
I pronounced judgment to some, kill and be killed, and to others I told,
Make more ammunition, the fight must go on from air, sea and land.
I see some wiping their tears away, their hearts filled with sorrow,
Yet, those who coin millions would say, "I hope this is not over tomorrow."
And here I am, an old and weary man, Nineteen Seventy not a year more.
How can I fulfill each one's desire—bring peace to grieving hearts—
And wealth to those who worship it and adore?
I see it cannot be done; come forward Nineteen Seventy-One, I will retire.

AN EXPANDING ECONOMY, MORE JOBS AND PRICE STABILITY

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, there are increasing signs substantiating President Nixon's statements that America can look forward to an expanding economy, more jobs, and price stability. Factors pointing to this include the following:

Interest rates are dropping. The prime rate has dropped 2¼ points from 8½ percent to 6¼ percent.

In the last 2 months, the Federal Reserve Board has approved the lowering of the discount rate from 6 to 5¼ percent.

We are seeing declines in consumer lending rates.

Housing starts have surged from an annual rate of 1.2 million in the first quarter of 1970 to 1.7 million in November and are headed upward.

In the last 2 months FHA mortgage rates have dropped from 8½ to 7½ percent. Conventional mortgage rates also continue to drop.

The President's policies have helped cut the rise in wholesale prices from 4.8 percent in 1969 to 2.3 percent in 1970.

Inflation has been turned around. Forces set in motion by the Johnson administration sent the consumer price index from 4.7 percent in 1968 to 6.1 percent in 1969. But in the last 6 months of 1970, the increase dropped to 4.5 percent.

In 1969 food prices rose at an annual rate of 8.2 percent; in the last half of 1970, food prices were rising less than 1 percent a year.

Personal savings rates of 7.5 percent point to expansionary days ahead as the money is released for consumer purchases.

Industrial production advanced 1.4 percent in December, the greatest rise in 3 years.

Excluding automobiles, retail sales as estimated in December of 1970 were 8 percent up from December of 1969 and 8 percent—10 percent annual rate—up from November.

The third quarter of 1970 saw an increase in the annual rate of productivity in the private nonfarm economy from 3.9 in the 2d quarter to 4.8 in the 3d quarter.

State-insured unemployment claims are going down.

State and local spending is heavy.

The President's decision to liberalize depreciation schedules will stimulate expansion of plant and equipment in 1971.

There are heavy inflows of savings into the mortgage markets.

There has been strong performance in the bond markets and the stock market has risen dramatically from its low of 1970.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that those who seek to talk us into a depression for political purposes have failed again.

REFORM DOOR OPENED BY NIXON PROPOSALS

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's state of the Union message on domestic matters contains some of the most far-reaching proposals ever put before the Nation and the Congress. In the view of the editors of the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., in a statement appearing in the January 24 issue, it was a "powerful message well in tune with the times." The basic question remains, however, whether the 92d Congress will move ahead on the President's six major goals. The State Journal expresses the hope that for the good of the country it will. I commend the editorial, entitled "Reform Door Opened by Nixon Proposals," to the attention of my colleagues:

REFORM DOOR OPENED BY NIXON PROPOSALS

President Nixon's State of the Union appeal for a transfer of more power to state and local governments and his proposals for grappling with key domestic issues facing the nation made for a powerful message well in tune with the times.

Initial reaction in Congress, as expected, was along partisan lines with Democrats generally reported cool and Republicans enthusiastic. This is traditional and a picture won't start to develop until the more specific details are forthcoming.

The President, however, has zeroed in admirable on many of the most critical domestic problems facing the nation. Not the least of these is the growing public disillusionment with the massive federal bureaucracy and with the general unresponsiveness of government at all levels, stressed by Mr. Nixon in his talk.

To meet this he called for a huge federal revenue sharing program to send more money back to hard pressed states and cities. At the same time he proposed a major restructuring of the federal executive branch of government.

He also called for what amounts to deficit spending to meet the serious unemployment problem, a vast new program to improve health care and medical research and to assure that no person is denied medical treatment simply because he cannot afford it. He appealed again for action on his welfare reform proposals which were left on the congressional shelf last year, and said he would offer new programs to combat environmental pollution, provide more recreation centers for urban populations and to provide for a return to a prosperous peacetime economy which the nation has not seen in more than a decade.

He called upon Congress to give early consideration to a number of other reform legislative proposals which were bypassed last year.

As some analysts have already noted, the President's State of the Union outline is a massive challenge to the 92nd Congress to meet the critical domestic problems of the nation head-on. Some have suggested that this was politically motivated simply to put the Democratically controlled Congress on the hot seat for the 1972 election.

The latter, however, is a conclusion which would have been made by the chronic critics regardless of what the President proposed in his message. Had the President made a brief speech, suggesting nothing in particular about how to meet the nation's problems, the critics would then harp that he was avoiding his responsibilities.

The job of the President, any president, is to tell the Congress what he thinks ought to be done to meet the nation's needs. Congress can accept it, reject it, amend it or come up with alternative proposals.

Nixon, we believe, clearly made it known that he wants a break in the bureaucratic ice jam which has held up the many programs and reforms he outlined. In so doing he was responding to the national pulse.

It is significant that many of the issues Nixon discussed are the same ones which a number of Democratic leaders have been stressing in their campaign activities for a long time.

Thus it appears that the President and Congress are not terribly far apart on goals. The combat will be over the methods and priorities given to the programs.

Probably the biggest battle will be over the proposed revenue sharing with states and cities and the reorganization of the executive branch of the federal government.

Both carry a built-in demand that Congress and the massive federal agencies must surrender some of their traditional powers in the interest of more efficiency and bringing government closer to the people.

Traditionally, all such efforts have met with strong resistance in the past in Washington. But events of the last few years have made it clear that most Americans want action to reverse the steady growth of top-heavy federal bureaucracy.

It is too much to expect that either the President or the Democrat controlled Congress will put aside political infighting. But we believe the way is open for both to seek compromise and bring about the solutions which are so urgently needed.

President Nixon has provided an excellent beginning to get what he calls the "peaceful revolution" underway at last.

A NEW ERA FOR THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the last 2 weeks we have been witness to a dramatic change in the purpose and direction of one of America's two great political parties. Without question, January 1971 will surely stand in history as the beginning of a new era for the Republican Party.

In the recent past, it has been Democratic administrations that innovated while Republican administrations provided sound managerial skills, corrected excesses, and restored balance to Government. This may be a gross oversimplification, but, still, it has largely been true.

The great and historic change we have now seen is the emergence of a Republican administration that combines both functions. President Nixon has proposed domestic reforms sweeping in concept and purpose, and imaginative and innovative beyond anything proposed in the last 30 years, perhaps in this century. And yet throughout these proposals runs the same strain of commonsense and sound management that has long been the strong point of Republican administrations.

President Nixon has forcefully demonstrated that his administration is alert to the needs of our society; that he is willing to propose change where change is needed, and that he has not given up on the principles of sound government for which our party stands. It is a historic achievement, one of which every American can be proud.

COURAGE AND COMPASSION MARK WEST CONSHOHOCKEN TRAGEDY

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, a devastating series of gasfed fires and explosions wracked the borough of West Conshohocken, Pa., in my Congressional District on the night of January 27, 1971. The toll is appalling: four dead, 35 injured and 24 homes destroyed.

While there are many questions that surround the circumstances of this tragedy, there are other things which stand out quite clearly. These are the courage and compassion of the many people whose lives became intertwined when the rending blasts tore apart masonry walls, spewed fire over the street and left families homeless.

In my county of Montgomery, we are served by volunteer firemen and that night proved once again that they stand with the best of professional firemen anywhere in competence, valor, and dedication to duty. Joseph Powers, 19, a volunteer with West Conshohocken's George Clay Fire Company, was playing a hose on a burning house after initial blasts in homes when the street erupted in explosion. The concussion caused the house's front wall to collapse. He was crushed to death.

His twin brother, James, was further away and was fighting the fire. He was injured along with other volunteer firemen.

Two children, missing the night of the fire, later were found dead. They were Michael Pruitt, 14, and his sister, Michelle, 8. Their grandfather Albert Rupp, 66, had been blown out of the house by one of the explosions and died later in the hospital.

In West Conshohocken, a community of a little more than 2,000 people with less than a square mile of area, the flags fly at half staff. Neighbors, service organizations, officials of government at all levels and individuals are working to ease the burden of the grieving and the displaced.

The courage and compassion that marked the early hours of the West Conshohocken tragedy are evidenced in the continuing efforts of countless groups and individuals. As the Congressman and formerly the State senator for West Conshohocken, my personal inspection of the site further convinced me of the widespread impact of this disaster.

Words are inadequate to comfort a mother who has lost two children and her father. Expressions of sympathy cannot console a mother who has lost a twin son. Even all our efforts to provide shelter, clothing, and food for the homeless somehow cannot make up for the terrible suffering caused these people.

The scars of the West Conshohocken tragedy will remain. But remaining also will be the indomitable spirit of the volunteer firemen of George Clay Fire Company, as exemplified by Joseph Powers' sacrifice, and of their hundreds of counterparts from volunteer companies in the county. The cooperation and courage of police, government officials and individuals certainly display the highest degree of concerned citizenship. I cannot single out any individual or group, nor would they want this, except to be known that they were tested and did not fail in their obligations to their fellow men.

To deplore and commiserate is not enough, however. I intend to do my utmost to cooperate with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission and others involved in investigating the reasons for these series of blasts and fires. Within Federal jurisdiction, I will propose recommendations, if the probes reveal these are necessary, for tightening Federal laws on natural gas pipelines.

Preliminary information provided to me indicated the cause may have been a crack in a weld of a 50-year-old, 16-inch steel, high-pressure pipeline. I wondered, as I viewed the devastation in West Conshohocken, just how many other pipelines might be just as old or older, might be just as susceptible to leaks or stresses, and might be just as vulnerable to circumstances which led to the incredible series of events that comprised the West Conshohocken disaster.

The very least we owe to those who died, to the sorrowing survivors, to the homeless, and to those brave citizens who were there that night is to review all regulations, making sure they are strong enough, tightening them up and enacting new ones if necessary, making certain we have stiff inspection procedures and remedies for deficiencies. Instituting procedures for immediately cutting off gas to ruptured lines, and taking every possible step to prevent a recurrence of this type of disaster.

DR. JOYCE BROTHERS LAUDED

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, recently Dr. Joyce Brothers received a telephone call on her television program from a New York housewife who wanted to commit suicide. Dr. Brothers stayed on the telephone with the woman until the crisis had passed.

One of my Baltimore constituents, Mr. Walton Windsor, has requested that national recognition be given to Dr. Brothers for her act of human kindness. All too often these days the helpless are cast aside or ignored. The example of Dr. Brothers is one I should like to share with my colleagues in the House.

THE AMERICAN SPIRIT

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the six great goals for domestic reform which President Nixon presented in his state of the Union message are so far-reaching in concept that they have already generated great controversy in the Congress and in the Nation.

Free and open discussion about the substance of the President's proposals is entirely in the best interests of the country. However, some partisan critics have chosen to question the motives of the President in putting forth such a program.

The answer to such questions lies in a very remarkable document which I have just reread. It is a speech delivered by candidate Richard Nixon during the presidential campaign of 1968. Prepared and delivered almost 2½ years ago, it is a most unusual foreshadowing of the ideas which the President presented to the Congress in his state of the Union message.

For those of our colleagues who would like a true insight into the depth of commitment behind the President's six great goals, I am inserting this speech on "The American Spirit" in the RECORD. It was delivered by Richard Nixon on October 2, 1968, in Williamsburg, Va.

The speech follows:

THE AMERICAN SPIRIT

(Speech by President Richard Nixon)

Williamsburg is a revered place in America.

Here was the capital of Colonial Virginia; here was a revolutionary war headquarters of George Washington and here, during the Civil War, was the scene of a bloody battle between Blue and Grey forces.

In modern times, Williamsburg has been restored to its historic setting; today, men of the twentieth century can walk through a village of the eighteenth century, absorbing the mood that surrounded the men who built this nation.

It is fitting, then, to pause in the election campaign of 1968 at a place, steeped in our heritage; this is a proper moment to examine our past for some keys to our future. Perhaps we can draw some strength and gain some insight from what has gone before.

We recall the days of our Revolution, we think of the phrase "the spirit of '76." That is not just a slogan; there was a real "spirit of '76." The spirit was the driving force within most Americans of that revolutionary era.

I believe that a nation, like a person has a spirit.

I believe that a national spirit comes to the fore in times of national crisis.

I believe that each time a national spirit makes itself felt, it speaks to its own time with a different message directed to the problems of that time.

That is why a searching look at the American spirit is needed today. The American spirit, as I vision it, is not visitation of some ghost of the past; rather it is the affirmation of a deep national yearning that all of us feel today.

Whenever America falls short, that spirit appears—not to comfort us, but to make demands on us. Not to salve our conscience, but to spur our conscience.

Our history shows that as a people we have responded to these new demands each time they were made.

Almost two centuries ago, at the time of our Revolution, the American spirit demanded political liberty. And so a nation was born.

A century and a half ago, the American spirit demanded a choice in national leadership, calling for a framework that encouraged the cut and thrust of controversy. And the two-party system was born.

A century ago, at the time of our Civil War, the American spirit demanded an end to slavery and an end to sectionalism. And so the nation was born again, this time into a deeper unity.

At the turn of this century, the American spirit demanded a fair share for all in the fruits of our economic system; trust-busting was born and the labor movement gained momentum.

A generation ago, with tyranny on the march, the American spirit stirred again; a new internationalism was born, and America shouldered her world responsibilities.

With hindsight, we can now see how the American spirit reappeared time after time in our history; looking back, it is easy to detect its differing demands and the great changes it achieved.

But the Americans living through those times did not have the benefit of hindsight. The men who gathered at places like Williamsburg two centuries ago were not then a distinguished group of statesmen known as Founding Fathers—they were a band of practical idealists risking the gallows by talking of revolution.

The great eras of changes are clear enough for us in retrospect. But to the men living through those times, America was upset and uncertain; strong cross-currents of opinion roiled the waters and hatreds flared.

That is the kind of era we are going through right now. The textbooks of the next century—if textbooks are still in use—may sum up the new demands of the American spirit in a sentence or two. But now it is up to us to work it out for ourselves.

Here in 1968, what is missing from American life that has called up this spirit of change? What void in each one of us needs to be filled?

Of course, we think first of the obvious answers. We need peace in the world; we need the good life for all; we need justice for all, in the framework of law. But let's go a step beyond.

We are told of a man who was seen digging around the walls of his house; when he was asked why, he gave this strange and intriguing answer: "I am letting the dark out of my cellar." That is what we must do now; as we dig for the demands of change, we must let the dark out of our cellars.

I believe that an underlying reason for the feeling of emptiness in so many hearts today stems from the loss of personal freedom.

I believe that the American spirit is reappearing now to demand the return of that personal freedom.

As in our past, these demands are thundered in stormy times. Some of us are all too noisy; some of us are all too silent; but each of us knows that this is the time to stand up for his own individual identity.

We won our fight for political freedom two centuries ago; we won a battle for human freedom a century ago; today, we are in a fight for our personal freedom.

Personal freedom, to me, is at the root of human dignity.

Personal freedom is room to turn around in life. It is the right to grow in your own way, to learn what is not yet being taught; it is both the right to privacy and the right to participate.

Personal freedom is not a license to disrupt, but it is a liberty to dissent; not a duty to destroy, but an obligation to challenge.

Personal freedom will not ensure that every man will get all he desires; it will ensure that every man will get all he deserves.

Those Americans who once had personal freedom and lost it, now want it back; those who never had it at all, want it now.

In striving for a worthy goal—security—we have lost a worthy asset—individuality, the hallmark of personal freedom. In trying to provide for the material needs of all, we have stolen from the personal freedom of each.

Where did we lose our way? Where did we begin to trade away our personal freedom?

Some would say we lost our way when we began our ever-expanding welfare programs. Others would say we lost our way when we took on the responsibility of helping to defend the free world.

I don't agree. These were steps that changed the course of history; these were steps in the right direction.

We were right to want to help the poor, the sick, the unemployed, the elderly. We were right to want to help advance the cause of democracy around the world.

But in making these advances, we lost something. We became so busy doing so much for the "people" that we forgot about the person. We became so obsessed with the collective needs that we overlooked the individual need.

At first we didn't feel the loss. Our American system had so much momentum; there was so much to be done and so much to do it with. We could not detect the slow erosion of our personal freedom, the gradual diminishing of human dignity.

But now, a generation later, we feel it. And we miss what we lost. We miss it in the feeling so many Americans have of being hemmed in; of being a cog in a huge machine; of being no longer in control of our own lives; of not having our own important say in the direction of our communities and our nation.

Well, what are we going to do about it? We cannot turn back the clock; we must not undo all the good we have done, as we try now to regain the freedom we have lost.

Nor can we throw up our hands and say that one man does not count anymore—that we've traded personal freedom away for the security of a big, paternal government.

We do have another choice. We must find a way to make government work for all of us without dominating any one of us. We have to establish new respect for the qualities of initiative, personal sacrifice, and readiness to seize opportunity, that made the individual American the wonder of the world.

And we have to reawaken this respect the hard way: without tearing down the structure we have built to help those who cannot help themselves.

That is why a political promise of "more of the same" is wrong, and why a promise of "less of the same" is just as wrong. We need neither more nor less of the "same"—we need an approach that is entirely different.

Welfare is too important to be left to the Welfare Staters. We are going to change our welfare system to make it fit the American system, to provide each person with a means of escape from welfare into dignity. This is not an impossible dream. America needs it: with leadership that understands the American spirit, America is going to get it.

And that's not all. Each of us wants to get back that sense of participation in government, that hand in our own destinies.

We are going to reverse the flow of power to the Federal Government in Washington, and channel more power back to the states and localities. Tax sharing; bloc grants; decentralization; local option; community participation; this is the direction I believe America is about to choose.

What's more, the pendulum is going to swing back to an emphasis on individual opportunity. But something new will be added; genuinely equal opportunity, starting from childhood. The industrious person will get ahead and the lazy man will fall behind, no matter what their background or heritage or skin color.

How can I be so certain about all this?

Because I believe that is what the American spirit now demands. Because the American people are not "the masses"—they are 200 million individual persons who are discovering what they have lost, and are determined to get it back.

Our present leaders are out of touch with this new mood and cannot comprehend this new need. They see the future as bearing down on us. They are fearful of the future, fearful of the change it will bring, and they brace themselves for the shock that they know will come.

In the eyes of the fearful, tomorrow is a threat that must be faced; in the eyes of the hopeful, tomorrow is a vision that must be realized.

An American poet put it this way: "dive for dreams, or a slogan may topple you." We must turn away from the old slogan that trigger responses that are no longer responsive; we must dive for the dreams we can make come true.

The way to the future is not along the path of least resistance. We will only earn back our personal freedom along a path of great resistance.

The American spirit is presenting its demands today, as it did in different terms to generations before us. Once again, those demands require sacrifice and ingenuity:

The American spirit demands an explosion of education into the mind of every child in every corner of this land;

It demands a career—not just a job, but a career—open to every man and woman who has the capacity to get ahead;

It demands an end to the slamming of doors, with the answering echo of gunfire that we have heard in the past;

It demands a plunge into community service by each of us, rather than delegating compassion to government;

The American spirit of today demands that the helpless be cared for, and the hopeless be cared about;

It demands that there be greater rewards for initiative and hard work and self-reliance;

It demands that privacy be respected, that the individual be respected, that the law be respected.

Most of all, the American spirit today demands the self-determination of the human being. This means a shift from Federal rule to home rule, a shift from faceless manipulation to personal participation.

There is a mystery to America that its detractors have never been able to grasp.

Just when our idealism appears to be swamped in a sea of material wealth; just when our native morality seems to be flooded by a wave of crime and disorder; just when our international power and prestige appear frustrated by the ineptness of our leadership—something remarkable happens.

The American spirit wells up and we snap out of it. We let the dark out of our cellar. We choose new leaders with new ideas and we tell them we're ready to make any sacrifice required to set our nation right.

We don't ask new leadership to put us back to sleep. We don't ask new leadership to fix everything without bothering us. Instead, we demand to know what we need to do—what each individual one of us must do.

At watershed moments like these, the unconquerable American spirit comes alive. We stand at a pivot point; the nation is poised to turn and move in the direction the spirit of America demands.

That is why I have been saying that the choice in this election year is perhaps the most important in our lives. If we fail to seize this moment, if we let slip this chance to recapture our personal freedom—the moment may never come again in our lifetime.

Therefore, let us not lightly dismiss the agony of the American spirit today as only "growing pains."

Let us recognize it as hunger pangs, for now is a time that our body politic hungers for new directions, new answers to new needs.

At moments like these throughout our history, it has been America's genius and good fortune to satisfy this appetite for orderly change. This generation of Americans shall not be the first in 200 years to deny the demands of the American spirit.

Rather, I believe this generation will choose to rise to the challenge: we shall promote the general welfare, yes—but we shall preserve our personal freedom as well.

We shall hold fast to the quality that made America great, as we reach out for new qualities that will make America greater.

Woodrow Wilson described the challenge of such a moment. The year was 1913. The nation was badly torn; a third party movement had split the majority vote. There was war in the Balkans that threatened to spread to the rest of the world.

In his first Inaugural Address, this is what Wilson told his countrymen: "Men's hearts wait upon us; men's lives hang in the balance; men's hopes call upon us to say what we will do. Who shall live up to the great trust? Who dares fail to try?"

In this campaign, my fellow Americans, we can feel the American spirit stirring.

It calls upon us to make a mighty effort to rekindle our hope, our courage and our passion for personal freedom. We dare not fail to try.

The American spirit today demands an awareness of the need for change.

It requires the exploration of new horizons of justice.

It insists on the rediscovery of the worth of the individual.

It will accept nothing less than a reach for greatness.

The next President of the United States could possibly serve until 1976, the 200th anniversary of the birth of our nation.

The next President will lead this nation in its reach for greatness only if he summons a new "spirit of '76"—a spirit conceived in old glories, born to speak to its own time, destined to shape a glorious future.

A TRIBUTE BY NEWSPAPER EDITOR JIM FAIN TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most Members of the House are aware of the fact that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOCH) currently is hospitalized following a second operation stemming from a fall he experienced last year.

BILL McCULLOCH'S confinement prompted the editor of the Dayton Daily News, a newspaper which circulates in BILL'S district as well as my own, to reflect on what kind of a man the Fourth Ohio District has in Congress. In his column, Jim Fain frankly states what we all know to be a fact about him:

Bill McCulloch is my idea of what a servant of democracy ought to be. He is high-minded, fair, dedicated, self-effacing. He puts the welfare of the country ahead of political advantage.

BILL'S career in Congress has proven his dedication to the Nation. His approach to government is a model for all of us to emulate.

I know that my colleagues join me in wishing BILL McCULLOCH a speedy recovery so that we may have the benefit of his guidance and inspiration in the 92d Congress.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to insert the text of the column written by Mr. Fain:

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News, Jan. 13, 1971]

REP. McCULLOCH—A MEDAL FOR A POLITICAL HERO

WASHINGTON.—People work off more distemper on politicians than on baseball umpires—or even newspaper editors.

There's nothing fair or logical about this. A politician is a man of considerable talent and endurance. The citizen has no right to use him as a punching bag; he ought to be grateful instead. But the custom is embedded, as American as mom's pizza pie.

All of which is brought to mind by the fact that one of Ohio's truly great public servants is seriously ill in John Hopkins hospital in Baltimore and is entitled to the prayers and best wishes of the people he has served so well.

He is Rep. William M. McCulloch, Republican of Piqua, who has represented the Fourth Ohio District in Congress since 1947 and who was a member of the Ohio House of Representatives for six terms before that.

Bill McCulloch is my idea of what a servant of democracy ought to be. He is high-minded, fair, dedicated, self-effacing. He puts the welfare of the country ahead of political advantage.

The best example came several years ago in the in-fighting over a tough, realistic civil rights law. Mr. McCulloch is the ranking Republican on the House Judiciary committee, the main cockpit in which that battle was fought.

Not many congressmen wanted to maneuver one way or the other on so controversial a measure in the full spotlight of floor action. The place to cripple the bill was by the amendment process in committee. Bill McCulloch and Rep. Emanuel Celler, the ranking Democrat and committee chairman, refused to let that happen.

They stood shoulder-to-shoulder, constructed a meaningful bill, then defended it against all comers, in committee and on the House floor.

Not to take anything away from Celler, who has been an outstanding congressman, but Bill McCulloch's role was by far the more courageous. Celler represents a Brooklyn district with a sizable black population. At that time, McCulloch's district was comprised entirely of rural and semi-rural Ohio counties north of Montgomery.

McCulloch had no black constituency to speak of. He had nothing to gain politically. On the contrary, he had a good bit to lose. Prejudice is not unknown among whites in his district. But he is a man of principle and be believed in what he was doing.

That kind of philosophy and courage has illumined Bill McCulloch's entire quarter century in Congress. He has the respect of just about everybody who counts in Washington. He is highly regarded, on the Hill, in the executive branch, in the judiciary and among the hard-bitten Capitol press corps.

Last year the 69-year-old congressman suffered a fall at his home, which caused some blood clotting. He has been plagued

with complications ever since and currently is hospitalized, as he has been for some time, at Johns Hopkins.

Here's wishing him a speedy recovery and here is one loud witness that the citizens of Ohio owe this old-school gentleman a great deal. Politics is a rough, demanding, cruel business. The men who endure its hardships and go on to offer a brand of enlightened service that has characterized Congressman McCulloch are the heroes who make democracy workable.

NEEDED BILLS TO MEET PRESSING PROBLEMS

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as the 92d Congress convenes, our Nation faces problems of gigantic proportions that must be met and overcome. We, in Congress, as the elected representatives of the people, are assigned the responsibility of providing the necessary leadership required to effectively combat these maladies afflicting our country. New ideas must be brought forth and then implemented if we are to succeed in our struggle against poverty, malnutrition, pollution, and crime. Our resources must be marshaled and utilized more effectively. Reforms of existing programs must be instituted to eliminate waste and misdirected activities. But above all, we, the Members of the 92d Congress must acknowledge the task before us and pledge our untiring efforts to meet the mandates imposed upon us by the American people.

Today I am introducing five bills that I sponsored during the 91st Congress that unfortunately were not acted upon. These bills touch on four major areas of concern: health, crime, pollution, and the economy. They are good bills, bills worthy of your support and your vote.

The first bill that I am sponsoring is the Federal Drug Abuse and Drug Dependence Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1971. Last session over 75 of my colleagues joined me in sponsoring this badly needed legislative proposal. The Senate under the able leadership of HAROLD HUGHES of Iowa passed it in the closing days of the last session. Hopefully both bodies of the Congress will take such action during the 92d and the proposed Federal Drug Abuse and Drug Dependence Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act will become law. I personally intend to solicit cosponsorship of this measure within the next few weeks.

The second and third measures that I am putting forward today deal with the economic plight we are in. I intend to establish through these legislative proposals a framework to provide for economic conversion of our industries. The transition from a war oriented to a peacetime economy, which hopefully is taking place, must be planned and coordinated. The economic conversion bill I reintroduce today will help accomplish this. With unemployment up to 6 percent, with the GNP down for the first time in 12 years, with cutbacks in spending in every area of the economy, clear and accurate measures must be established to meet these grave dangers to the well-being of the American people.

In a more specific area, one in which I have a very personal concern, I am also introducing legislation. This area, the decline of the aerospace industry, cannot be allowed to continue. I have often stated that I consider the members of the aerospace team to be a national resource that must be protected. The loss of these skilled individuals would represent a loss that I do not think this country can tolerate. Consequently, I am reintroducing my own resolution calling for a redirection of the members of this fine group into meeting our domestic problems, particularly environmental pollution. The professionals at NASA as well as those at our aerospace firms can make invaluable contributions in this regard. I intend to see that their skills are not lost to us.

The next bill that I am sponsoring today also deals with the environment. It is of particular interest to the people of my district who live near Los Angeles international airport but affects citizens throughout the land. The bill will provide for a comprehensive program to control an environmental polluter, noise. This matter is not limited to jet aircraft noise which is a serious problem of itself but goes to the whole area. Doctors have evidence that excessive noise is both physically and psychologically harmful to humans. In my own Congressional district we have had to close two schools due to this problem. The din created by huge trucks on highways and streets, the rat-a-tat of the pneumatic drill and the pile driver, the blasting of a stereo that comes through the paper thin walls of modern apartment houses are all taking their unseen toll on us. I am therefore calling for the Surgeon General to investigate this matter through an office specially set up under his jurisdiction. The proposal also provides enough funding to make their work effective.

Finally, in the area of law enforcement and crime, I am resubmitting a bill to assist in combating crime by reducing the incidence of recidivism. This I feel can be accomplished only by instituting a sweeping reform of our correctional institutions, from the local jail house to the Federal penitentiary. Today our prisons do not rehabilitate as they should. Rather they harden inmates and act as schools for crime, insuring the first offender the chance to become a second offender.

Punishment alone is illogical and unproductive. Our penal institutions should be places where men and women who have committed wrongs, atone for their crimes and are also provided the opportunity to return to society in the hope of living an honest and worthwhile life. My bill will help in this direction.

While undoubtedly many other needed and worthwhile bills will be introduced today, several of which I am joining my colleagues in cosponsoring, I wanted to call your attention to these specific measures that I have submitted to the Congress today. The need to meet the myriad of problems that the United States faces today is urgent. These needs must be met by the 92d Congress for time is running out on us all. We must act affirmatively and constructively before it is too late.

THE DRAFT AND POVERTY IN THE ARMED FORCES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unfortunate consequences of the draft has been its effect on military pay. Since conscription forces the young men of our Nation to join the Armed Forces regardless of the pay rate, there has been little incentive for policymakers to establish a reasonable compensation policy for junior enlisted men. The President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Force noted in its report last spring that pay for career personnel was increased by 111 percent between 1948 and 1969, but by only 60 percent for first termers during that period. As a result, many young servicemen are having a most difficult time trying to make ends meet. We must enact the recommendations of the President's Commission if we are to remove the financial penalty which is now associated with military service.

The problem of poverty in the Armed Forces should be the concern of every Member of Congress. I commend this item from Stars and Stripes to your attention:

MANY GIs CALLED POVERTY-STRICKEN

(By John Pilger)

NUERNBERG, GERMANY (S&S)—A tremendous number of low-ranking USAREUR enlisted men are living in a state of poverty, an Army doctor said here.

Dr. (Capt.) Fletcher Hamilton, chief of the neuro-psychiatric clinic at the 130th General Hospital, claimed that, because of low pay and lack of resources, a significant number of soldiers are suffering breakdowns.

Hamilton has started a movement to generate congressional pressure, with the aim of bettering the lot of low-ranking enlisted men.

"Our program," said Hamilton, "is primarily for the men in grades E1 to E5. We don't deny that other soldiers can have problems, too, but these are the guys who get hit the hardest, and they really need help fast."

According to Hamilton, there is a definite "debt cycle" that many enlisted men unwittingly get into.

"Take an average Pfc. who is married" Hamilton said. "He comes to USAREUR without his wife, since she won't be command-sponsored.

"With his low pay, he usually has to take out a loan to get her flown over. Then there is the matter of an apartment."

An informal study of E5 and lower-ranked soldiers assigned here to the hospital shows, he said, that the average rent is $112 per month.

"Then there are the purchases needed to stock a house. In the end the man is left

with maybe $40 a month to feed himself, his wife, and maybe even a child."

While there is no rule that states that a soldier can or cannot bring his wife to Germany, Hamilton said that having his family with him is very important to his well-being.

Since many soldiers in these grades are newly married, it could be disastrous to separate the family, Hamilton said, pointing out that the first 18 months of a marriage are the most important and hardest, since that is the period of adjustment.

The doctor said many soldiers—including a high percentage of new husbands—find themselves sent to Vietnam for a year, and then are given direct assignments to Germany for two or three years.

"If he does not fly his wife over, it means a separation of three or more years," said Hamilton, adding that "this could ruin a marriage before it even starts."

But what can be done for those GIs who do bring their wives to Germany?

The ideal, Hamilton says, would be command sponsorship of the wives. But, on a more immediate basis, there are several changes which could be made, according to Hamilton.

In the United States, the Agriculture Department issues food stamps, which, Hamilton said, are approved for use in commissaries.

Hamilton's group is calling for issuing these stamps, which would greatly expand a soldier's purchasing power in a commissary, to GIs in USAREUR.

Hamilton also points out that a significant pay hike should be approved for the lower grades.

"It should be a sliding one, however," he said, "giving the most money to the enlisted men who really need it . . . not to us officers who already make enough to get along quite well."

What he considers a "significant hike" is at least 60 percent, if not more.

Hamilton also sees the need for a federally run poverty program in Europe to aid soldiers.

Another major point is that there should be a renegotiation of the Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA).

Portions of SOFA could and should be changed to allow dependent wives to take many of the jobs now available solely to local nationals, he maintains.

"The German economy is in great shape," the doctor said. "Germans don't really need the jobs which we are offering to them. Our own military families need them so they can survive."

While at first it might seem that a neuropsychiatric clinic is a rather strange place to begin a movement toward these reforms, Hamilton explained that it is "really quite natural."

"In our job, in our daily work, we see the soldiers and their wives who have problems. We are in a better position, perhaps, to fully understand the cause-and effect relationship which exists.

"We see that a lot of the breakdowns are directly attributable to the fact the GI is here without his family, or if here, the marriage is in serious trouble because the soldier has to live in a constant state of poverty and indebtedness.

He said, "We have cases in the hospital right now which demonstrate this. The wife of a Spec. 4 who is about to deliver her child is in poor physical condition because they don't have enough money each month to purchase adequate food.

"Her husband is forced to go out on summer nights and raid farmers' vegetable patches to get enough food to survive."

Hamilton also said this is but one of many similar cases.

"The problems of the GI in USAREUR are double or even triple those of a soldier stationed in CONUS.

"In many respects they are even more severe than those of men stationed in Vietnam. Although it isn't classified as such, this definitely is a hardship tour."

The movement sparked by Hamilton and generated from the clinic here is slowly expanding.

Thursday Hamilton is scheduled to present his views and hopes to a meeting of neuropsychiatric personnel at a two-day meeting being held at the Landstuhl Medical Center.

Hamilton's goal is simple: to generate a letter-writing campaign to congressmen and Pentagon officials, which will have enough pressure behind it to bring about some of the urgent reforms he claims are needed.

THE NEGLECTED DEBATE

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post, there appeared an excellent article written by David Broder pointing out that election periods have never yielded any adequate definitive treatment of the Indochina war issue. Last Sunday's Gallup poll reported that 73 percent of American voters now feel that we should have a fixed date of total withdrawal from Vietnam by the end of this year. Hopefully, all elected officials and both major parties will work—much harder and much more openly—to clarify this issue and define for the American people exactly what the specific policy alternatives are. A copy of the article follows:

THE NEGLECTED DEBATE

(By David S. Broder)

A question the historians of this era will have to confront is how the Indochina war issue, which has dominated so much of the national debate, escaped definitive treatment in any of the national elections of the period.

In 1964, Lyndon Johnson ran and won on a pledge to avoid American troop commitments to Vietnam, and less than a year later sent the first large-scale combat forces to that country.

In 1966, when the costs of that policy were already becoming apparent, the leadership of the Republican opposition nonetheless endorsed its essential assumptions and strategies. The voters handed Mr. Johnson and the Democrats a massive repudiation on other issues, but his response was further escalation of the level of troops and warfare.

In 1968, the failure of that policy drove him from office, but the general election campaign between Hubert Humphrey and Richard Nioxn produced bipartisan expressions of support for the new American policy of remaining in Vietnam until negotiations guaranteed the survival of a non-Communist government in Saigon. Richard Nixon was elected on the promise of a plan to end the war, but not until long afterward did he reveal that his plan was to reverse the Johnson strategy and begin withdrawing American troops before a political settlement was reached.

Before the 1970 election, the Cambodian invasion had made it clear that the new strategy might involve increasing American intervention in other countries of Southeast Asia. There was heated debate in Congress, but little of the controversy carried over into the 1970 campaign.

Instead, for the fourth time in as many elections, the voters were assured that there was no real disagreement between the parties over Indochina strategy—and were invited to consider other issues. And now, as before, we can see a new strategy emerging in the post-election period, a strategy of expanded military action aimed at protecting non-communist governments, not just in Vietnam, but in all of Indochina. We find again that the controversy that was not vented in the campaign is boiling in Congress and the country.

It is a dreary cycle, and hardly an advertisement for the efficacy of the two-party system. But it may be, however, that the pattern of political deceit, in which both parties have participated, is coming to an end.

Public opinion and opposition party strategy appear to be coinciding at last in a proposition that may be explicit enough to provide an electoral mandate for a substantive decision on our policy in Indochina—something there has never been since 1964.

Last Sunday's Gallup Poll reported that 73 per cent of the American voters now support congressional action to withdraw all U.S. troops from Vietnam by the end of this year.

That is one-third more than favored the same proposition last September, and it now commands heavy majorities among Democrats, Republicans and Independents.

It is a clear, explicit proposition—even if all its consequences probably have not been thought through by its adherents in the public. And it happens to be a proposition supported by almost all the men in contention for next year's Democratic presidential nomination.

Sen. George McGovern initiated the proposal, and it has been endorsed by his colleagues and potential competitors, Edmund Muskie, Birch Bayh, Harold Hughes and Edward Kennedy. Only Sen. Henry M. Jackson among the Democratic hopefuls is clearly on the other side, with Hubert H. Humphrey reserving judgment on the matter for the time being.

The leading Democratic proponents have acknowledged that the price for fixing a final date for American withdrawal may well be the overthrow of the present governments in Saigon, Pnom Penh and Vientiane. But they argue that those governments are not essential to America's interests and that a fixed timetable for withdrawal offers the only way to end America's combat role in all of Indochina, to secure the release of our prisoners and to close out the ghastly history of that misguided intervention.

It is a proposal Mr. Nixon would surely reject today, and his opposition is sufficient to block its passage in Congress. It may be that Vietnamization may moot the issue by 1972, or it may be that before the campaign begins, Mr. Nixon himself may be willing to set a final date for withdrawing all American forces.

If not, the proposition may well become the center-piece of presidential campaign debate. It could at long last provide the vehicle for a public resolution of this top-long-postponed Indochina policy question.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, DECEMBER 1970

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the December 1970, civilian personnel report of the

Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, DECEMBER 1970

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in the month of December was 2,875,228 as compared with 2,880,346 in the preceding month of November. This was a net decrease of 5,118.

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

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in the month of December totaled 2,838,317. This was a net decrease of 5,094 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of November. Employment by months in fiscal 1971, which began July 1, 1970, follows:

Month	Executive branch	Increase	Decrease
1970:			
July	2,942,517		−1,595
August	2,901,856		−40,661
September	2,851,875		−49,981
October	2,838,664		−13,211
November	2,843,411	+4,747	
December	2,838,317		−5,094

Total employment in civilian agencies of the Executive branch for the month of December was 1,682,363, an increase of 1,010 as compared with the November total of 1,681,353. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in December was 1,155,954, a decrease of 6,104 as compared with 1,162,058 in November.

The civilian agency of the Executive Branch reporting the largest increase during December was Post Office with 3,959. Agriculture Department reported the largest decrease with 4,176. These changes were largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense the largest decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Army with 4,709 and the Navy with 930.

Total Executive Branch employment inside the United States in December was 2,628,610, a decrease of 1,324 as compared with November. Total employment outside the United States in December was 209,707, a decrease of 3,770 as compared with November.

The total of 2,838,317 civilian employees of the Executive Branch reported for the month of December 1970 includes 2,523,542 full time employees in permanent positions. This represents a decrease of 3,634 in such employment from the preceding month of November. (See Table 2 of accompanying report.)

The Executive Branch employment total of 2,838,317 includes some foreign nationals employed abroad, but in addition there were 101,395 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during December who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in November was 101,916.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

Employment in the Legislative Branch in the month of December totaled 29,813, a decrease of 146 as compared with the preceding month of November. Employment in the Judicial Branch in the month of December totaled 7,098, an increase of 122 as compared with November.

DISADVANTAGED PERSONS

The total of 2,875,228 reported by the Committee for November includes 20,000 disadvantaged persons employed under federal opportunity programs, an increase of 1,371 over the preceding month of November. (See Table 4 of the accompanying report.)

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I include a tabulation, excerpted from the Joint Committee report, on personnel employed full-time in permanent positions by executive branch agencies during December 1970, showing comparisons with June 1969 and the budget estimates for June 1971:

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

Major agencies	June 1969 [1]	December 1970 [1]	Estimated June 30, 1971 [2]
Agriculture	83,425	82,527	85,600
Commerce	25,364	27,689	28,400
Defense:			
Civil functions	31,214	29,733	30,900
Military functions	1,225,877	1,090,441	1,079,500
Health, Education, and Welfare	102,941	103,798	105,300
Housing and Urban Development	14,307	14,859	16,000
Interior	58,156	55,647	58,000
Justice	35,106	39,186	43,600
Labor	9,723	10,452	11,600
Post Office	562,381	567,631	585,200
State	24,658	23,226	23,600
Agency for International Development	15,753	13,893	14,000
Transportation	60,386	66,217	69,600
Treasury	79,982	87,182	93,500
Atomic Energy Commission	7,047	6,948	7,000
Civil Service Commission	4,970	5,219	5,500
Environmental Protection Agency		[3] 4,552	6,700
General Services Administration	36,176	36,440	39,900
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	31,733	29,677	29,900
Office of Economic Opportunity	2,856	2,352	2,500
Panama Canal	14,731	11,450	14,800
Selective Service System	6,584	6,702	6,500
Small Business Administration	4,099	3,941	4,100
Tennessee Valley Authority	11,987	13,194	13,300
U.S. Information Agency	10,500	9,845	9,900
Veterans' Administration	147,606	149,795	154,400
All other agencies	26,200	30,691	29,700
Contingencies			5,000
Subtotal	2,633,762	2,523,287	2,574,000
Public service careers program		255	
Total	2,633,762	2,523,542	2,574,000

[1] Excerpted from the December 1970 personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

[2] Source: As projected in 1972 budget document; figures rounded to nearest hundred.

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

THE AGE STRUCTURE OF POLITICAL POWER

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the December 1970 issue of the American Statistician contains an article which bears factual witness to the proposition that political leaders are severely estranged by age from the average age of citizens.

The article "The Age Structure of Political Power" is by Ernest Rubin, who is associated with the Department of Commerce, American University, and the American Statistical Association.

Mr. Rubin concludes his article with a most perceptive question and statement:

Can innovative, suggestive, creative concepts originate and develop, be exploited and executed when the fountainheads of political power are concentrated in the upper quartiles of the age distribution? Politics may be a game like chess, neither an art nor a science, but the age factor influences how you play it. Unlike chess, however, the consequences of politics are real.

The article follows:

THE AGE STRUCTURE OF POLITICAL POWER

(By Ernest Rubin)

On June 22, 1970 a law was enacted in the United States setting 18 years as the minimum age for voting.[1] The traditional age requirement in this country had been 21 years. In a sense the new law reflects the mood of the time with its special concern over the present generation gap. A related phase of this perennial controversy of youth versus age is found in the criticism of political leaders and institutions, including the seniority selection system of choosing chairmen for Congressional Committees. It is of interest to explore statistically the age distribution of formal political power in the United States at the national level. The following discussion should be considered as an exploration in political demography.

Formal political power at the national level embraces elected or appointed officials. There exists three political divisions under the Constitution and laws of the United States. These are the executive and legislative branches which require the election of the President and of the Congress, and the Federal judiciary, which depends upon nomination by the President and confirmation by the Senate.

Since 1789 there have been 37 Presidents of the United States. Article II Section I paragraph 4 of the U.S. Constitution states in part that ". . . neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of thirty-five years . . . "The age range of the presidents at time of inauguration is 42 through 68 years; for vice presidents the range is slightly broader, 40 to 72 years. Table 1 provides the age distributions of presidents and vice presidents. The average age of presidents at time of inauguration is about 55.0 years and that of vice presidents 55.5 years.

An examination of the ages of president over the 180 year period, 1789–1969, indicates a modest through discernible downward trend, that is, relatively speaking presidents are getting a little younger. In the period prior to the Civil War, 1789 to 1860, there were 15 presidents, 5 of whom were over 60 years of age at inauguration. The average age of these presidents is over 57 years. The age range for the pre-Civil War presidential group is 48 to 68 years. For the period 1861–1969 there were 22 presidents, two of whom were over 60 years old. The age range for this group is 42 to 62 years and its average age is about 53 years. The data on the ages of presidents and vice presidents for the entire period 1789–1969 suggest that the contest for the highest elective post in the United States is not a young man's game. Since the duration of the presidency lasts as a general rule between four and eight years, most presidents reach their 60's during their term of office.

TABLE 1.—AGE DISTRIBUTION OF PRESIDENTS AND VICE PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES AT TIME OF TAKING OFFICE, 1789 TO 1969

Age group	Presidents	Vice Presidents
40 to 44 years	2	4
45 to 49 years	5	5
50 to 54 years	11	13
55 to 59 years	12	5
60 to 64 years	5	3
65 to 69 years	2	7
70 to 74 years	—	1
Total	37	38
Average age	55.0	55.5
Standard deviation	6.0	8.2

Note: On the discrepancy between the number of Presidents and Vice Presidents, Grover Cleveland, who served 2 alternate terms is counted as the 22d and 24th President. He had 2 different Vice Presidents. Franklin D. Roosevelt, who is counted as the 32d President, was elected for 4 terms and had 3 different Vice Presidents.

Source: The 1970 World Almanac and Books of Facts (Newspaper Enterprise Association Inc., N Y., 1970).

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 2.—THE AGES OF SELECTED U.S. PRESIDENTS AND THEIR CABINETS, 1789–1969

President	(Year)	Age of President	Average age of Cabinet	Age range		Number in Cabinet (excluding President and Vice President)
				Low	High	
Washington	(1789)	57	39.6	36.0	46	5
Jackson	(1829)	62	47.5	39.0	50	6
Lincoln	(1861)	52	58.4	48.0	63	7
Cleveland	(1885)	48	54.9	51.0	60	8
Wilson	(1913)	57	50.6	47.0	55	10
Franklin Roosevelt	(1933)	51	58.7	45.0	71	10
Kennedy	(1961)	43	48.1	36.0	63	11
Nixon	(1969)	56	55.1	47.0	64	12
Average (in years)		53.3	51.9	43.8	59	

Source: Webster's Biographical Dictionary (1st ed. G. & C. Merriam, Massachusetts) and the 1970 World Almanac and Book of Facts (Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc., N.Y. 1970).

A considerable distribution of political power derives from the President through his Cabinet. It is, therefore, of some interest to examine the age structure of presidential cabinets. Table 2 provides age data for the cabinets of eight presidents (a non-random selection). The age range for these cabinet members is 36 to 71 years, while the average age range for the eight cabinets is 44 to 59 years.

For the data in Table 2 a rank correlation coefficient of −.5 was computed between the age of the president and the average age of his cabinet. For this non-random sample an inverse relation exists between the age of presidents and the average age of their cabinets. Of the eight selected presidents (Table 2) the four youngest presidents (Kennedy, Cleveland, Roosevelt and Lincoln) had cabinets with a substantially higher average age while the three oldest presidents (Washington, Jackson and Wilson) had cabinets of significantly lower average age. In one case, Nixon, the average age of the cabinet is almost equal to that of the president. In the aggregate, however, the average presidential age of 53.3 years is slightly over the average age of cabinets of 51.9 years. In general, presidents primarily select cabinet members within a half dozen years of their own age; almost all cabinet members are of the same generation as the president.

The U.S. Constitution sets the minimum age qualifications of candidates for Congress, to wit, 30 years for Senators and 25 years for Representatives.[3] In this examination of the legislative branch I will be concerned only with the age structure of the Senate.

The number of Senators and their average age at time of taking office for the period 1789–1966 is given in Table 3. Before the Civil War there were 571 Senators with an average age of 45.4 years. The average has risen substantially since 1860 with a slight downturn for the period 1931–66. For the entire group of 1,619 Senators covering the period 1789–1966 the average age is 49.3 years.

The age distribution of the U.S. Senate on January 1, 1968 is shown in Table 4. It will be observed that the average age of the Senate at that time was 58.7 years, with a standard deviation of 10.25 years. Senators are elected for a period of six years[4] and many are reelected several times. The age range for the Senate of 1968 was 35 years to 94 years, a span of more than two generations, or a two generation gap within the Senate itself.

The rules of the Senate further accentuate differences between the social and economic mores of its members and those of the general population. This result occurs because of the seniority method of selecting committee chairmen. On August 24, 1970 Senator Robert Packwood attacked in detail the seniority system in effect in both of the legislative branches of Congress, concentrating his fire on the Senate.[5] The thrust of his argument was that under the rules of the Senate, in effect since 1846, solely length of continuous service is the determining factor for the chairmanship post of these committees; ability or other relevant criteria carry no weight. Because committee chairmen exercise significant control regarding the course of proposed legislation their positions in the Senate and in the House are of critical political importance.

Table 5 shows the age distribution of the chairmen of committees in the U.S. Senate in 1870 and 1970. The median age of committee chairmen in 1870 was about 52 years; a century later, the median age was almost 67 years. On the average, committee chairmen are 9 years older than their legislative colleagues. In 1970 the median age of the Senate was about 58 years. The median age of the U.S. population in 1960 was 29.5 years and in 1970 will probably be about 28.5 years.[6]

The age factor in the Senate, which begins with a required minimum of 30 years has generally increased over time, i.e., since 1789. The average age of the Senate in 1970 was about 59 years, while that of its powerful deans, the committee chairman was almost 69 years. A similar situation obtains for the House, with the averages throughout between five to ten years less than for the correspondent characteristics described for the Senate. In a general way it may be said that the gap between the Congress and the general population exceeds one generation.

The third great component of political power in the United States reposes in the judiciary. I will consider data relating to the judges of the U.S. Supreme Court, which is the highest judicial tribunal in this country. Curiously enough, the U.S. Constitution does not prescribe a minimum age requirement for the position of a Supreme Court judge.

TABLE 3.—THE AVERAGE AGE OF U.S. SENATORS: 1789–1966

Time period	Number of Senators	Average age on 1st taking office
1789–1860	571	45.4
1861–1900	392	49.9
1901–30	319	52.8
1931–66	337	52.0
Total	1,619	49.3

Source: The 1970 World Almanac and Book of Facts (Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc., New York, 1970) p. 431.

TABLE 4

[Age distribution of the U.S. Senate as of Jan. 1, 1968]

Age group:	*Number of Senators*
35–44 years	10
45–54 years	20
55–64 years	35
65–74 years	29
75–84 years	5
85–94 years	1
Total	100

Average age, 58.7 years.
Standard deviation, 10.25 years.
Source: *Congressional Directory 1968* (U.S. G.P.O., Washington, D.C. 1968).

The average age of Supreme Court judges at the time of their appointment, for the period 1789–1969, is almost 53 years. In Table 6 the 180-year period is divided into four historical intervals. This average increased by about 9 years to 56.7 years during the period 1789–1926. This average declined in the last period 1927–69 by about three years.

A Supreme Court judge is not an elected position and he is not subject to a specifically defined term. Rather this post virtually embraces life-time tenure as there is also no mandatory retirement age. Vacancies on the Court primarily occur because of mortality or resignations. Hence the matter of service duration on the Court is of even more importance than that of the members of the legislative branch.

For the period 1789–1956 there were 85 Supreme Court justices with an average service of 16 years. Table 7 provides data on duration of service in three historical periods. Between 1789 and 1905 the average years of service was somewhat over 17 years; for the period 1906–56 this average was 13.3 years. More than one-third of this body served over 20 years.

TABLE 5.—AGE DISTRIBUTION OF COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN IN THE U.S. SENATE: 1870 AND 1970

Age group	1870	Percent	1970	Percent
40 to 49	9	34.6	1	6.2
50 to 59	13	50.0	3	18.8
60 to 69	3	11.5	6	37.5
70 and over	1	3.9	6	37.5
Total	24	100.0	16	100.0

Source: Congressional Record, vol. 116, No. 147, p. S14007, based on information from the Congressional Directories of 1870 and 1970, and Biographical Directory of the American Congress.

TABLE 6.—AVERAGE AGE OF U.S. SUPREME COURT JUDGES AT TIME OF APPOINTMENT, BY SELECTED HISTORICAL TIME PERIODS, 1789 TO 1969

Period	Number of judges appointed	Average ages (in years)
1789 to 1834	22	47.6
1835 to 1880	22	52.7
1881 to 1926	29	56.7
1927 to 1969	24	53.4
Total	97	52.9

Source: The 1970 World Almanac and Book of Facts (Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc. N.Y., 1970).

TABLE 7.—DURATION OF SERVICE OF U.S. SUPREME COURT JUDGES APPOINTED IN SELECTED PERIODS, 1789–1956

Duration of service	Judges appointed in—			
	Period I 1789–1845	Period II 1846–1905	Period III 1905–56	1789–1956
0 to 4 years	6	1	3	10
5 to 9 years	4	8	8	20
10 to 14 years	2	5	4	11
15 to 19 years	5	3	6	14
20 to 24 years	3	7	3	13
25 to 29 years	3	4	2	9
30 to 34 years	6	2		8
Total	29	30	26	85
Average (in years)	17.3	17	13.3	16

Source: The 1970 World Almanac and Book of Facts (Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc., N.Y., 1970).

Footnotes at end of article.

Age of the Supreme Court became an issue in the first two terms (1935–37) of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The Court rendered a series of decisions that invalidated Congressional social and economic legislation of the New Deal.[7] This Court was described as "nine old men" and Roosevelt, in attempting to reform the Court suffered a serious Congressional defeat.[8] The average age of this Court in 1936 was 71 years with a standard deviation of about 6 years.

The foregoing discussion suggests that the age distribution of political power at the federal level is substantially weighted above 55 years of age. To summarize the principal statistics, the average age upon assumption to office for Presidents was 55 years, for Vice-Presidents, 55.5 years, for Presidential cabinets 52 years, for Senators 49 years and for Supreme Court judges 53 years.

A large proportion of the members of the three branches of government are lawyers. There appears to be a propensity toward conservatism and the maintenance of the status quo in the legal profession.[9] Further analysis of interest may be along the lines of identifying and correlating age data with such variables as political affiliation, educational background, religion, income level, wealth status, occupation or job experience. A certain degree of relationship, possibly measurable, exists between the branches of government and within a particular branch. Some presidents and vice-presidents have come to their positions via the legislative route and some presidents have gone to other branches of federal government, e.g., J. Q. Adams, Andrew Johnson and Howard Taft. Many Senators were first elected to the House and frequently Federal political careers were preceded by experience in State offices.

There are, of course, other questions that statistical analysis may throw some light on. Can innovative, suggestive, creative concepts originate and develop, be exploited and executed when the fountainheads of political power are concentrated in the upper quartiles of the age distribution? Politics may be a game like chess, neither an art nor a science, but the age factor influences how you play it. Unlike chess, however, the consequences of politics are real.

FOOTNOTES

[1] H.R. 4249, Law #01–285, signed by Presiday Nixon, June 22, 1970.

[2] Albert Szent-Gyorgi writes "... Our political leaders all come from a bygone age. Our system of representation is antiquated . . ." in an article "15 Minutes to Zero," *New York Times*, September 25, 1970, p. 41. Speech by Senator Robert Packwood, August 24, 1970, Congressional Record, Vol. 116, No. 147, p. S 14006.

[3] *Constitution of the United States*, Article 1, Section 2 and Section 3.

[4] Ibid, Section 3, 1.

[5] cf. note 2. A 1970 study on Congressional reform, prepared by the Committee for Economic Development, recommended that the rigid seniority system for selecting committee chairmen should be abolish. *Washington Post*, September 24, 1970, p. A 26.

[6] In 1790 the median age of the U.S. population was 16 years. Before the Civil War, data returns for the 1860 census indicated that the median age had risen to 19.4 years. At the turn of the century the median age of the national population was 22.9 years. The rise in median age reached its peak in 1950 at 30.2 years declining in 1960 to 29.5 years. *Historical Statistics of U.S.*, Colonial Times to 1957 (U.S.G.P.O., 1958), p. 11, and *Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 2969* (U.S.G.P.O., 1970), p. 26.

[7] Between January 1935 and May 1936 the U.S. Supreme Court rendered seven decisions that invalidated major economic and social legislation of the New Deal reform. See, Harold W. Falkner, *American Political and Social History* (F.S. Crofts, N.Y., 1943, Third Edition) pp. 704–706.

[8] President Roosevelt on February 5, 1937 asked Congress to pass a new law empowering the President to appoint a new federal judge when any judge did not retire within six months after his seventieth birthday. The maximum permissible size for the U.S. Supreme Court would have been 15. Ibid., p. 713.

[9] Along similar lines John Maynard Keynes observed ". . . in the field of economic and political philosophy there are not many who are influenced by new theories after they are twenty-five or thirty years of age, so that the ideas which civil servants and politicians, and even agitators apply to current events are not likely to be the newest . . ." *The General Theory of Employment Interest and Money* (Harcourt, Brace Co., N.Y., 1936), pp. 383–384.

DR. MARIE Y. MARTIN—TOP ADVISER ON COMMUNITY COLLEGES

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Dr. Marie Y. Martin on her selection as "special assistant" within the U.S. Office of Education, as the Nation's top adviser on community colleges. California has long been recognized as the national leader in this important area of education, and I congratulate the Office of Education for this wise choice.

Dr. Marie Martin has had a long and distinguished career in community college leadership. This appointment is a well-merited recognition of her work. I wish to share with my colleagues the following article from the Los Angeles Times on January 21, 1971 concerning Mrs. Martin's appointment and some of the political background that unfortunately has been occurring in the Los Angeles Community College District, a large portion of which is included within the congressional district I represent:

EX-PRESIDENT OF PIERCE COLLEGE GETS HEW POST—DR. MARIE MARTIN, NEW COMMUNITY COLLEGE HEAD, WAS CENTER OF TURMOIL

(By Robert B. Young)

The former president of Los Angeles Pierce College, Dr. Marie Y. Martin, has been selected as the nation's top community college executive, The Times has learned.

The new U.S. commissioner of education, Sidney P. Marland Jr., authorized the addition of Mrs. Martin to his team in Washington, D.C., after a quick and quiet round of interviews late in November. As a GS–15 ranking "special assistant" within the U.S. Office of Education, Mrs. Martin's job will be to encourage two-year college development throughout the United States.

The appointment of the popular San Fernando Valley educator comes one semester after she was given an abrupt "administrative transfer" to a solo staff job downtown—a move that touched off a controversy that still festers within the eight-campus Los Angeles Community Colleges district.

Mrs. Martin's removal from the Woodland Hills campus she led for four years was widely seen as a punishing and highly political slap administered by Supt. Donald W. Click but given muscle by board conservatives led by former Trustee Robert C. Cline.

LOTS OF SPECULATION

Speculation about Mrs. Martin's next move had been widespread among her colleagues and former students, despite repeated arguments by the board's majority that the transfer last fall was routine.

Mrs. Martin, a widow, will begin work as soon as she is settled in Washington. Her new job—unprecedented within the federal education establishment—puts her directly under USOE's assistant commissioner of higher education, a job yet to be filled by President Nixon's new team.

As a special assisstant, Mrs. Martin will draw a salary of at least $30,000. As a college president, she had earned $29,550 in the Los Angeles district.

Peter Muirhead, Marland's deputy, "said he was looking for a strong voice for the junior colleges" within the Health, Education and Welfare Department, Mrs. Martin said during a recent interview here.

"I want to open up a direct voice for the junior colleges to Washington," said the sprightly, no-nonsense nominee, whose Los Angeles area career has shown her zest for both the practical and intellectual sides of two-year college training.

CONTRASTING VIEWS

From a national perspective, Mrs. Martin's selection is an indirect tribute to California's advanced stage of community college growth, a leadership role acknowledged in a 1970 study by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Locally, however, Marland's choice of the strong-willed San Fernando Valley educator will, by many close observers of the district, be read as vindication.

Mrs. Martin, when she was moved off campus, had one year to go at Pierce before a schedued retirement. She is 62.

When asked why the move was made at that time—the Tuesday before Pierce reopened last Sept. 14—Cline said the sudden switch was meant to maximize the district's personnel effectiveness, since Mrs. Martin would be given two important jobs to do at district headquarters. These jobs were to develop a 10-year academic plan for the system, and to pave the way for a changeover to a program budget format.

Although she long refused to talk about it, and accepted her reassignment in seeming good grace, Mrs. Martin said early this month that her 11th-hour removal, and bestowal of a new title—"president-at-large"—was "an affront."

Mrs. Martin tackled her assignments with customary thoroughness (leaving home for work at 6:30 each morning), and completed them before Christmas. Because the whisking away of a college president shook the district last fall, and because she now feels free to present her view of the issues it raised, Mrs. Martin helped a reporter reconstruct the incident—which had its roots in the late 1950s.

Since the trustees who formally concurred in Mrs. Martin's removal are Republicans (Cline was elected in November to the Assembly from the 64th District), it is germane to say something first about Mrs. Martin's own brand of Republicanism.

ADMIRER OF NIXON

"I'm a very great admirer of Nixon," she had told a reporter months before she was considered for the Nixon Administration job. "You could say I'm a Nixon Republican. I was reared by an Irish father who thought the best government was no government, and my feeling is that if you can do it yourself, you should do it."

Firmly, she added: "I've always been a conservative, in politics and in everything else. But as an educator, I'm dedicated to certain things. We can't go backwards. We must go ahead."

Significantly, she doesn't think of her board opponents as "conservatives," which they are often dubbed, but as "extremists" within her own party.

"Bob Cline has exercised political leadership, and politics has no business on any school board," she said.

In January, 1966, after serving as a Los Angeles City College dean and as president of now defunct Metropolitan College, Mrs. Martin was named to lead the 17,000-student Pierce campus—a park-like oasis that got its start in 1947 as an agricultural school.

Until the district got its own board of trustees in July 1969, things went well for the erect, blue-eyed and sandy-haired administrator. With help from the telephone company, she equipped a nature "Braille trail" for blind children on 70 acres of former pastureland, which she turned into a "resource management" preserve.

PIERCE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Pierce acquired a sophisticated computer center as well as an arts building, equipped metalworking shops with the latest in numerical control machinery, automated the library and biology lab, and reduced English dropouts by two-thirds.

But to many members of the advisory councils she brought in to help frame course goals, Mrs. Martin's real knack was in keeping the lid on explosive student tensions, by "maintaining outstanding rapport with students, faculty, local police and (community) groups."

A council member, Mrs. Mary Alice O'Connor, a Republican, is also president of Burbank's school board She told a reporter: "Marie's an extremely fine administrator—forthright, tough, but feminine. She's tiny but she's mighty."

Pierce's former president said her trouble began on the Tuesday of the new trustees' second meeting, in the summer of 1969

At the meeting, "Cline called me in and said, then, that he would have Thomas A. Devine back in the classroom by Sept. 15, 1969," Mrs. Martin said.

(Thomas A. Devine, a sociology teacher, had been removed from his teaching duties at Pierce in 1963.)

In this way, Mrs. Martin inherited a situation which would later lead to an ill-concealed feud between two strong-willed leaders: Trustee Cline and President Martin. Instead of acquiescing, she determined to back up her faculty predecessors at Pierce. Despite pressure from supporters of Cline, she denied Devine automatic reentry to classroom teaching.

"We knew Devine worked in their campaign," she said, referring to the Community College Board elections of 1969. "Cline made a political commitment, and this was a political payoff, in my opinion."

While conservative trustees have never admitted any link between Mrs. Martin's removal by Supt. Click and the reinstatement of a long-idle Pierce sociology teacher, many members of the eight-college community have said Devine was the reason why she was summoned to the main office.

Devine, who maintains a post office box in Reseda, had been removed from his teaching duties by a ruling of an assistant superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified School District, which governed the colleges until 1969.

The ruling was an outgrowth of complaints lodged by students and faculty members during a five-year period, to the effect that Devine was devoting more time to his personal anti-Communist activities than a conscientious teaching schedule should allow, and that he was using his class time to "indoctrinate, rather than teach," in the words of an associate speech professor, Howard J. Russell.

Russell, who heads Pierce's academic senate and faculty association, said, "The first overt move to alert (then-president) John Shepard that things weren't right with Devine's classes" was made by a group of teachers in November, 1958.

According to Russell, several hearings with the school board's personnel committee ensued, and, in 1963, "things peaked" when Asst. Supt. Walter Coultas removed Devine from teaching.

LATER POSTS

He was given a nonteaching assignment as Pierce's audio-visual director. Early in 1970, he was named director of the district's narcotics education program.

According to Mrs. Martin, Cline called her the day after he had vowed to have Devine back in class that fall. He had changed his mind, she said. As Cline told The Times last week, "I told (Devine) and his attorney to initiate a grievance hearing, and then a report would come to the board."

(Trustee Frederic A. Wyatt, in a telephone interview, disputed Cline's credit-taking, saying: "It was I who forced it to go through the grievance procedure—not Cline." On such matters has the board bogged down, in its first 18 months.)

CLOSED-DOOR HEARING

The hearing began behind closed doors Jan. 8, 1970, and consumed 35 days of testimony before a specially called panel of two college presidents (chosen by Mrs. Martin), two teachers (chosen by Devine), and Maurice Harwick, a private attorney who served as hearing officer.

Harwick's fee alone cost the district about $17,000. The testimony wasn't finished until the end of July, and the panel took until Sept. 2 to deliver its "facts and findings."

The panel's report backed Mrs. Martin to the hilt. Unanimously it recommended that Devine not be returned to Pierce on "any assignment for a minimum of five years" and that he be enjoined from any teaching job in the district for three years, pending his completion of at least 12 semester units of sociology.

TELLS SEQUENCE

Here, according to Mrs. Martin and her chief faculty colleague, Russell, is the sequence of events after the grievance panel gave the board its report on Sept. 2:

—On Sept. 4, Supt. Click visited Mrs. Martin at Pierce and "told me I'd be removed."

—At the board's next regular meeting, Sept. 8, Supt. Click announced a series of personnel switches, including Mrs. Martin's summons into the W. Olympic Blvd. headquarters. This was done less than a full week before the opening of classes.

—Two months later, on Nov. 4, the board, by a 4–1 vote, reinstated Devine to his first classroom teaching job in seven years—at Los Angeles City College—thus overriding the hearing panel's recommendation.

FORTY-EIGHT MILLION DOLLAR CLAIM

Devine at the time said, "It is certainly good to have my name cleared." Downtown, Mrs. Martin steadfastly refused to comment.

On Dec. 18, the district received from Devine's attorney, Bryson M. Kratz of Glendale, a $48 million-plus "claim" for loss stemming from his client's seven-year banishment from the classroom, as well as for "repeated libel published by (the) Los Angeles community colleges and their predecessors."

Asked about the claim, Cline told a reporter early this month: "I don't know, I haven't read anything."

At the same time, Cline said he had "known of" Devine for "eight or nine years," while denying that he (Cline) had influenced the superintendent's decision to remove Mrs. Martin from Pierce.

"I purposely did not get involved in the case," he said.

The reason for Mrs. Martin's transfer—"she wasn't removed, she was transferred," Cline said—was, in his opinion, that "Dr. Martin had the only combination of talent to do the job" that Supt. Click had cut out for her in the home office.

Cline added that, to him, the "real issue here is discrimination against a certificated employee," meaning Devine.

Pierce's administration, Cline added, "were spying on him and keeping a secret file—really a Gestapo-like harassment."

Rollin M. Russell is a Tarzana businessman who, as a Republican, served on Gov. Reagan's education reform commission in 1970 and who is vice president of the Southern California Industry Education Council. At the Sept. 29 board meeting, he was one of seven representatives of Valley organizations who pleaded with the board to reconsider Mrs. Martin's removal from Pierce. By a 3–3 vote on a motion of Trustee Wyatt, the board ignored the plea.

FURTHER REMARKS

"I would like to think that this board was responsive to the community," Russell said, "(but) I am not very sanguine on the matter."

Recalling the episode last week, Russell said: "Marie was railroaded. She is in one sense one of the most conservative Republicans you'll ever find. For Bob (Cline), for political reasons, to undermine Marie for his own personal gain—and I truly believe this—is absolutely inexcusable."

Dr. James C. Nofziger, an animal nutritionist whose brother, Lyn, serves President Nixon as a deputy assistant in Washington, is another Republican fan of Mrs. Martin's. ("She's a top-notch person," he said.)

To Nofziger, as to Russell, the long-festering dispute between Devine and the district provided a pretext for a showdown. "The Devine case itself was an unimportant consideration," he said. "It could have been any situation."

What Mrs. Martin's supporters agree on is that the newly elected board picked the wrong target. To Nofziger, the whole thing was absurd because, as he said, "there were no real 'liberal' problems at all at Pierce. Literally, it was the far right that gave her a problem."

NEW FUTURES

The old crowd is breaking up now. Assemblyman Cline is in Sacramento, and Mrs. Martin is wondering how a Turlock girl will adjust to Washington's mores. Devine will begin teaching part time at City College in September.

But the saga of Marie Martin still holds deep fascination within a district that had never known anything like the attention lavished upon it by its first board of trustees.

Mrs. Martin, in the meantime, said, "There's a whole lot of work to be done. I'll be devoting my whole energy to this new job."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

GOVERNOR WEST'S TIMELY IMPACT

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there is a new wind blowing in my native State of South Carolina. It is of local origin, naturally, as all things of a positive character in politics must be; and if left free of outside interference of all kinds, it may well reap a whirlwind of progressive changes for all the people of South Carolina.

I, therefore, proudly take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the inaugural address of South Carolina's new Governor, John C. West, as well as a perceptive review of it from the editorial page of the Greenville, S.C., News of January 20, and an enlightening review of Governor West's State of the State address from the editorial page of the Spartanburg Herald-Journal of January 31:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

(By Gov. John C. West)

Nineteen Hundred-seventy was the year that the citizens of South Carolina marked the 300th anniversary of the founding of this state, and we now move with confidence and optimism into the Fourth Century of our stewardship of this land. Our Tricentennial years was a time of reawakening to our history and heritage; it was a time of new awareness of the essential character and strength of the people of this state.

It was also a time to gain new understanding of our particular moment in history, and to view the past and the future with a new degree of sensitivity and perspective.

It was a time to realize that no state has produced more greatness in the character of its individual leaders; no state has given more freely of itself in the building of this great nation. But it was also a time to understand that ours is a history of people—of people who have known struggle and survival, disappointment and endurance, frustration and despair. We have emerged as a state in the twentieth century still limited in material attainment. But out of the trials and tests of the past, we have built a wealth of human and spiritual resources with which we can now look to our Fourth Century—a new Century of Progress for People.

As never before, we can look forward with confidence to a new era of achievement, to new milestones of accomplishment for our people, to a reawakened spirit of unity which should project our state to new heights of greatness, unparelleled in this state, or in any state at any time in history.

I make these statements not in the sense of the politician reaching for the easy superlative on a most memorable day. Instead, I speak with the assurance of one who senses an elevation of the spirits and renewed confidence of the people in themselves. I speak as one who has observed and experienced the resurgence of our state in recent years, and has detected the new energy and new determination present within the fiber of our people.

In the last decade, South Carolina has made more progress in every meaningful way than at any comparable period in her 300-year history. In fact, I challenge historians of today or tomorrow to match the progress that South Carolinians have made in the last ten years with that made by any state—including our own—in any hundred-year period of the past.

If there has been a single factor which has influenced this phenomenal growth and progress more than any other, it has been the quality of leadership our state has had in the Office of Governor.

I should like to say especially to our retiring Governor, Robert E. McNair, that yours has been a period of unusual service and unprecedented accomplishment. You have served more consecutive years as Chief Executive than any Governor in the history of our state, but your place in the history books will be for reasons other than length of term. Yours will be recorded as a period in which this state experienced its greatest human advancement. By reason of your distinguished service, you will unquestionably be accorded a well-deserved place as one of the greatest governors who has ever served the State of South Carolina.

I would be remiss if I did not mention also the one who has not only been your helpmate, but one whose years as First Lady have brought new dimension to that position, and a new and lasting sense of pride for the people of South Carolina. Through such accomplishments as the restoration and furnishing of the Governor's Mansion, you have not only won national acclaim, but with your charm, grace and dignity, Mrs. McNair . . . Josephine . . . a lasting place has been won for you and your family in the hearts of all South Carolinians.

Thanks to the caliber of leadership South Carolina has experienced, the decade of the sixties was one of unparalleled progress for our people. But more importantly, it was a period in which the foundation was laid for the seventies—a foundation giving us the capacity to reach for and attain any goals to which we as a people may aspire.

Therefore, it is appropriate on this occasion marking the beginning of the New Century in South Carolina that we set for ourselves certain goals, goals whose urgency and priority at this moment in our history cannot be questioned.

If to some these goals seem too lofty, impossible of achievement, or unrealistic, I submit that nothing is impossible if we unite together with energy, determination, and dedication toward a common cause.

We can, and we shall, in the next four years eliminate hunger and malnutrition, and their attendant suffering from our state.

We can, and we shall, in the next four years, initiate new and innovative programs which will in our time provide adequate housing for all our citizens.

We can, and we shall, this year initiate far-reaching programs to provide more doctors, nurses and health personnel as well as better systems for delivery of health care to each citizen. Our goal shall be that each citizen may live with proper protection from disease and proper treatment of illness for his full life expectancy.

We can, and we shall, in the next four years, eliminate from our government, any vestige of discrimination because of race, creed, sex, religion or any other barrier to fairness for all citizens.

We pledge to minority groups no special status other than full-fledged responsibility in a government that is totally color-blind.

We can, and we shall, accelerate programs of industrial and agricultural development until every citizen who is underemployed has the opportunity for full and rewarding employment, and every young person, has a job opportunity that is productive, meaningful and challenging.

We can, and we shall, strengthen our law enforcement system by providing better training, better pay and better equipment for our officers; by strengthening our laws and court procedures dealing with criminals; and by working for the removal of the root causes of crime.

We can, and we shall seek and channel the energy, dedication and social consciousness of our young people into solving the problems of our times.

We do not need—and we cannot afford—an alienation of the generations, and I pledge that this will be an administration which actively seeks the involvement of the young and old alike.

We can, and we shall, in the next four years, take whatever action is necessary to assure the preservation of our living environment, and to provide the type of resource management which will make it possible for all interests in our society to live in harmony with each other. There need not be—and there shall not be—economic or elecological sacrifice in the progress of South Carolina in the next four years.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, we can, and we shall, provide a better educational opportunity for all citizens of whatever age or status, from a comprehensive preschool program for the very young to a continuing educational program for adults ranging from basic literacy to sophisticated, advanced research-oriented graduate programs.

These goals, admittedly ambitious, are no more impossible of achievement than those articulated by the brave young President, John F. Kennedy, who stated so eloquently in 1961 that we could perform the seemingly impossible task of placing a man safely on the moon and returning within the decade of the sixties—a dream of man for untold centuries.

It has been just as much a dream that man one day could conquer the plague of human hunger and privation, and could live in peace and dignity with his fellow man. The fact that these conditions have been a part of man's recorded lot since Biblical times should make us no less determined to attack them with all our energy and capabilities in this decade.

The setting of these goals is in itself an important first step toward their ultimate accomplishment, and—in all candor—this first step is perhaps the easiest. Certainly it is the simplest. But if these words can launch our state into positive action, if they can unleash the energies of our people and their government toward solutions, then they will have proved to be a valuable first step.

More important than action and good intentions at this point must be the establishment of guiding principles to direct and channel our efforts in this undertaking. Basically, I see three principles to be of immediate and primary importance.

First, the goals, as stated, must be accorded priority status. In today's complex society with constantly increasing demands and expectations of people, there is a tendency to overlook fundamental problems, and to scattergun society's thrust on less essential, but more glamourous functions. In a state with limited financial resources, we must concentrate with laser beam accuracy on the basic human problems, using the constant criterion of Progress for People toward stated goals.

Second, the achievement of these goals can become a reality only if the people of this state unite and work together, putting aside differences of race, politics, generation, or other. Two thousand years ago, the greatest philosopher and teacher who ever lived said, "And if a Kingdom be divided against itself, that Kingdom cannot stand, and if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand." The politics of race and divisiveness have been soundly repudiated in South Carolina.

We are all one—God's people, and our differences—whether they be age, sex, religion

or race—should be considered as blessings and strengths. As we work toward the elimination of discrimination, as we build toward a better life for all, as all the people of our state join together in this most noble of undertakings, perhaps we shall begin to realize the truths as expressed in the words of the hymn:

God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform.

Ye fearful saints, fresh courage take;
The clouds you so much dread
Are big with mercy and shall break
In blessing on your head.

Third, in directing our efforts toward achievements which have eluded man throughout his time on this earth, we must have the active involvement of all citizens. Government is but the instrument of the will of the people—having no power in and of itself; deriving not just its power, but its will and its effectiveness from its citizens. It is not our purpose to change that relationship; it is our goal to strengthen it. What we outline today in terms of human progress are not simply governmental projects. If we are to eliminate hunger, provide better housing, improve the delivery of health care for all, we must have the deep involvement and commitment of the private sector working in close cooperation with the public sector and providing necessary support from our whole free enterprise system.

If we are to bring the generations together, if we are to eliminate discrimination, it requires more than a law or mandate from government. Basic to all our hopes and aspirations is the willingness of our people to accept change, and to gain a new respect for the opinions and the rights of all people.

Providing a better education for all, especially within our present limited tax sources, requires new and innovative concepts, the most important aspect of which will be the voluntary involvement of citizens in the educational program.

As we address ourselves to Progress for People, it is implicit that I am also talking about Progress by People. It is most important that each citizen recognize his responsibility and his opportunity to participate in Progress for People, and to make the years ahead rewarding and fulfilling, and

I pledge to each of you, my fellow South Carolinians, on this the most important day of my life, every ounce of strength, every talent which I possess, to move with you toward these goals for a better life for all South Carolinians and a new and brighter era in the history of our state.

[From the Greenville News, Jan. 20, 1970]

GOVERNOR WEST'S PEOPLE PROGRAM

Astute observers of the South Carolina scene have for generations noted a paradoxical divided unity in the Palmetto State. It permits all sorts of disagreements without destroying underlying, controlling common loyalty, respect and genuine affection throughout all segments of the population.

The atmosphere of community has confounded many newcomers in recent decades. They found it hard to understand why many obvious inequities did not produce constant upheaval.

But the deep-running sense of common heritage in 300 years of history is there. It has worked constantly to keep South Carolinians together through thick and thin, despite many stresses. Often the pace of progress has been painfully slow and many legitimate needs and desires have been sacrificed. Sometimes change has come rapidly, as when the biracial Redcoat movement coalesced to rid South Carolina of radical rule.

Yesterday South Carolina inaugurated the state's 76th governor, the first to take the oath of office in the fourth century of South Carolina's existence, and he sensed a strong desire among South Carolinians to step up the pace of economic and social progress.

The new governor, John Carl West, took note in his inaugural address of the community spirit of South Carolinians and left no doubt but that he was relying heavily upon it to achieve some rather ambitious goals.

Governor West's pledge that state government would be "totally color blind" and that "any vestige of discrimination" would be eliminated caught the immediate headlines. But the central theme of the inaugural was well beyond the racial question, as important as the "color blind" pledge was. It went to the heart of South Carolina's commonality.

Governor West noted a "new determination" and a "renewed confidence of the people in themselves", to tackle difficult problems.

Realistically Governor West noted that "we have emerged as a state in the 20th century still limited in material attainment. But out of our trials and tests of the past, we have built a wealth of human and spiritual resources with which we can now look to our fourth century—a new century of progress for people."

The governor said he spoke "with the assurance of one who senses an elevation of the spirits and renewed confidence of the people in themselves." He said he "has detected the new energy and new determination present within the fiber of our people."

Then the governor outlined a program of better housing, poverty elimination, better health care, continued economic expansion, stronger law enforcement, an end to discrimination, involvement of more people in government, environmental improvement and increased educational opportunities for all citizens.

This is the most ambitious "people program" proposed in this state for many generations. It will not be easy to carry out. As Governor West said, achievement can come "only if the people of this state unite and work together—putting aside differences of race, politics, generation and others."

In that context the headline-capturing racial pledge is only a means to the end of achieving better and more rewarding living conditions for all South Carolinians, the white majority as well as the black minority.

In our view the new governor has accurately expressed the desire of most South Carolinians to have done with racial issues and get on with the really important business of the state and its people. We think this desire has been evident for some time and was confirmed beyond any doubt in 1970.

Governor West will give details of his "people program" in forthcoming state-of-the-state and later messages to the General Assembly. These are awaited with much interest.

Although there may be many disagreements about details of the prospective legislative and executive program, most South Carolinians agree with the ideals and aims expressed by their new governor. He has their best wishes and broad support as he takes up the duties of office.

[From the Spartanburg Herald-Journal, Jan. 31, 1971]

WEST'S MESSAGE HAD RIGHT TONE

Gov. John C. West's first "State of the State" message was no flamboyant exercise in magnificent oratory.

There was no grandiose panacea for any of the challenges facing the state. Nor was there any gloomy warning about the obviously difficult fiscal situation with which the Legislature will have to deal.

The Governor offered a succinct and solid program of work which can be approached realistically with good prospects for accomplishment. Its tone of quiet confidence, while recognizing significant problems and needs, was most fitting for the present state of the state.

As usual in South Carolina, education both at grade-school and college levels, required major attention. Gov. West made some provocative suggestions.

The 12-month public school year was not new. As the Governor said, the quarter system with the objective of increased utilization of facilities and personnel deserves more serious appraisal than it has received heretofore. His emphasis on the idea should achieve at least that.

Another idea was somewhat startling: that a full year of college-level courses for which students could earn college credit be offered within the high school framework.

Actually, something akin to that already is present in the better high schools. Students who are academically capable and who have sufficient ambition can proceed farther in some courses than necessary for high school graduation. Once in college, they are able to prove by examination that they are qualified to be placed in higher than freshman classes. That gives them the opportunity to earn credits in other courses earlier than they otherwise could.

Gov. West's comments suggest the desirability, however, of closer and more formal coordination between high schools and colleges to make the procedure more productive for students.

The recommendation of a $250 pay raise for teachers was about what was expected. Also as expected, an immedicate reaction was that "the teachers" were dissatisfied. How dissatisfied is a matter of conjecture.

School teachers, like most human beings, wish to earn more money. They make a strong case of justification. However, to overdo the pressure at a time when the state's wherewithal is in extreme doubt cannot be ultimately beneficial to their cause.

The dissatisfaction has been expressed primarily by Dr. Carlos Gobbons, executive secretary of the S. C. Education Association. It seems to be his professional responsibility to be dissatisfied.

In other fields, Gov. West limited his major recommendations.

He gave very good advice to the State Senate, suggesting "immediate attention to the reapportionment situation," saying he hopes it can be accomplished "without the necessity of a court order." There are some in the Senate who believe they can get away with ignoring the 1970 census as a basis for representation. They are wrong and the Governor is right.

Gov. West also gave good advice when he urged the Legislature to complete action on revision of the State Constitution.

The Chief Executive launched his administration with a laudable spirit of conservative leadership and the kind of cautious optimism these times need.

TO PRESERVE TAX EXEMPT STATUS OF STUDENT NEWSPAPERS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, student newspapers have offered an important educational experience to thousands of American high school and college students over the years. I dare say that more than a few of my colleagues here served at one time or another, as I did, on a student publication and found it a rewarding experience. Not only did we learn to

write, to edit, to meet deadlines and to compose a printed page—most importantly we learned the fragile importance of editorial independence and the responsibilities it entails.

Freedom of the press has been a cornerstone of our open, democratic society. Yet this most fundamental principle of editorial independence is presently in danger in the case of student operated newspapers. School newspapers have been warned by the Internal Revenue Service that they may endanger the tax-exempt status of their sponsoring schools if they take it upon themselves to publicly endorse a candidate for political office. Understandably, many schools have responded to this prospect by enforcing political restrictions on student newspapers.

Today I have introduced a bill to eliminate the jeopardy to the tax status of sponsoring schools because of editorial policies or activities of student newspapers. This bill amends sections 170(c)(2)(D) and 510(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that for purposes of determining the tax status of the educational institution, the activities of a student operated newspaper shall not be attributed to the school. The portion of the entire budget represented by support of a student paper is so small, and the activities of the editorial board so fractional and remote a part of the entire functions of the school, that it makes no sense to disqualify the entire institution on this basis. The bill I have introduced would make it clear that if the editorial board of a school newspaper decided to print an endorsement of one side or another in a political contest, this would not be considered "political activity" on the part of the sponsoring school such as to jeopardize its tax status.

The spectre of an adverse interpretation of section 501(c)(3) has resulted in a substantial curtailment of the editorial freedom exercised by school newspapers. This is not the kind of atmosphere which teaches our children a healthy respect for the sanctity of the first amendment's guarantee of freedom of the press. I hope my colleagues will support the legislation I have today introduced to remedy this regrettable uncertainty in the tax law.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 29, 1971

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1971, marked the 53d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. On January 22, 1918, the short-lived Ukrainian Republic proclaimed its independence. Shortly thereafter, the Bolsheviks annexed the Ukraine to the Soviet Union, destroying the sovereignty of the Ukraine, but not the spirit of its people.

The Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation both in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe. It is, moreover, the second largest Soviet Socialist Republic in the Soviet Union, containing about 47,000,000 Ukrainians and makes up about one-fifth of the Soviet Union's total population.

Nonetheless, it is hard for us to properly envisage the tragic cultural subordination Ukrainians suffer under. They are a people who have always been noted for their writers and intellectuals, as well as their ethnic individualism. The more we learn about life behind the Iron Curtain, the more we are shocked by the harsh intolerance of Soviet Russia to individual and ethnic differences.

It is therefore most important that we continue to honor the individualism of the Ukraine, and to mark its past independence. Moreover, we must constantly remind ourselves that while differences are admired within a free nation, elsewhere they may not even be tolerated.

The Ukrainian national spirit is a most uplifting one, and serves to inspire those of us who find freedom less costly. I hope the great people of the Ukraine can soon enjoy the liberation they seek.

H.R. 1000 AND THE PRESIDENT'S NEBRASKA PROPOSAL

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Henry Owen, distinguished manpower expert, writing in the Washington Post on February 1, 1971, makes an important point with regard to the President's proposal to combine the Peace Corps and VISTA into an umbrella volunteer agency for youth. Mr. Owen states that voluntary programs like the Peace Corps and Vista "have tended to attract people from more affluent and well-educated families, rather than from the more numerous blue collar and lower middle class."

Mr. Owen concludes that it is desirable to expand the opportuinties for voluntary service. He suggests that we should "expand opportunities for part-time voluntary service; and make full-time volunteer service an alternative to the draft." Mr. Owens cites the National Service Act, which I reintroduced on January 21, 1971 as H.R. 1000, as a means to accomplish this second objective.

Mr. Owen's article follows:

WIDER VOLUNTARY PROGRAMS NEEDED—SERVICE CORPS IDEA IS WORTH ATTENTION

(By Henry Owen)

The Presidents' proposal at Nebraska University to create a new volunteer service corps deserves more attention and discussion than it has received. It could lead to innovations which would eventually affect millions of Americans.

In a recent essay on the presidency, Thomas Cronin, former White House Fellow and now a research associate at Brookings, suggests that presidential powers are more limited than is generally realized, and that federal action is only a partial remedy for many of our present problems. "Gone is the view," he concludes from his own and similar studies, "that the American presidency is the pre-eminent source of wisdom or benevolence; absent is the assumption that a strong presidency and central government can pass laws and allocate funds for the effective resolution of 'major people' problems . . ." This changing view, as he points out, helps to explain the current enthusiasm for private (as well as state and local) action.

The problem has been to translate this enthusiasm for voluntarism into concrete new steps to strengthen it. The President's proposal to combine several ongoing volunteer programs into one agency could be an important move in this direction. The question is whether it goes far enough. Combining these programs would improve their efficiency, but the real need lies elsewhere: It is to widen the programs' reach. Most of these programs can take only a limited number of volunteers; VISTA (domestic Peace Corps) has about 5,000; the Peace Corps has less than 10,000. Voluntary programs, moreover, have tended to attract people from affluent and well educated families, rather than from the more numerous blue collar and lower middle class. This has limited these programs' scope and impact.

Efforts are being made to widen the base of recruitment of such programs as VISTA, but this is hard to do: Most Americans can't afford full-time volunteer service; they have to earn a living and to help support a family. There may be two ways out of this box: expand opportunities for *part-time* voluntary service; and make full-time volunteer service an alternative to the draft. Both need to be explored.

VISTA once encouraged part-time service, and some 40,000 people were reportedly involved. The new agency proposed by the President could revive this effort and go even further: It could become a clearing house for those wanting either to become or to secure part-time volunteers. Private and public groups seeking these volunteers would register their needs with the agency; citizens seeking part-time service could also register; and the agency might put the two in touch with each other. If the agency also provided limited funding for non-labor costs of certain community type projects requiring part-time volunteers, voluntarism might become a truly national effort. Perhaps this expansion is what the President had in mind when, at Nebraska University, after speaking of "a volunteer service corps that will give young Americans an expanded opportunity for the service they want to give," he went on to say:

"To the extent that young people respond to this opportunity, I will recommend that it be expanded to new fields, new endeavors . . . For those who want to serve but cannot devote their full time, the new center for volunteer action will open new opportunities for millions of Americans of all ages to the extent they wish to contribute their time, their talents, their hearts, to building better communities, a better America, a better world."

There is a partial precedent in the foreign field: The International Executive Service Corps has, for the last five years, sent retired and active businessmen volunteers overseas for brief periods to help specific projects in developing countries. The IESC is a nonprofit corporation, directed and managed by private citizens; its volunteers aren't paid salaries, and its funds come from both private and public sources. Its people have worked quietly, professionally, and successfully; the relation between volunteers and host has proved amiable and mutually rewarding.

A national program for part-time service could benefit from this model: The new agency proposed by the President might place management of any such program in the hands of a mixed public-private board, which might draw money both from private and

public sources. The fact of its private management could enhance the attraction of part-time service to young people.

The other way to widen the scope and attraction of volunteer programs would be to make *full-time* voluntary service an alternative to the draft. Jonathan Bingham and nine other congressmen have proposed that young men be allowed to opt for voluntary civilian service, instead of taking their chances in a draft lottery. This civilian duty—in schools, hospitals, social service, etc.—could last longer and be less well paid then military service, to ensure against its being preferred by all draft registrants. Registrants unable to find one of these qualified civilian service jobs on their own initiative could enter a National Service Corps, which would operate federal programs in such areas of social need as reforestation. The idea seems to have found favor with the public; a Gallup poll showed 71 per cent favorable. If the President's proposal to create a National Service Corps goes forward, Congressman Bingham's idea could be readily translated into reality by an amendment to the Selective Service law.

All this would mean more volunteers, of more varied backgrounds, than ever before. This would be good for the country, since many useful community activities need more manpower—both part-time and full-time. But it would also be good for the people involved—bringing them together in common service which could erode barriers of class and race, and provide an outlet for the idealism which most Americans share. This has been the promise of voluntarism since the Peace Corps and VISTA were first launched. The President's Nebraska University speech could pave the way for action to fulfill that promise.

URBAN TWELVE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Virginia Delegation met for luncheon yesterday with members of Virginia's "Urban Twelve", an organization representing the 12 largest communities in the Commonwealth, to discuss their revenue problems and their support for some sort of a revenue sharing program.

One of the statements presented was made by Mr. Joseph L. Fisher, chairman of the Arlington County board. Mr. Fisher's statement gives some very clear examples of the problems involved in one of the leading communities of our State. I hope it will be of interest to my colleagues, and I insert it in full at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT ON REVENUE SHARING FOR VIRGINIA'S "URBAN TWELVE" TO VIRGINIA CONGRESSMEN

(By Joseph L. Fisher, Arlington County Board)

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

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

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

The revenue sharing bill soon to be considered by the Congress has several features that strongly appeal to Virginia's Urban 12. First, the distribution formula bases the share of each local government on its present local general revenue in relation to total State and local general revenue. Urban centers are where the people and the problems are; the Urban 12 jurisdictions have necessarily exerted a strong tax effort. Consequently, their revenue sharing distributions would also be relatively high and reasonably related to their pressing needs. The distribution formula puts the money where the people and problems are.

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

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

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

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

ANCIENT SWORD RETURNED TO CITY OF KOBE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting article by Alec Kerr, editor of the Harvey, Ill., Tribune, told of a fascinating series of events whereby an ancient Japanese samurai sword was returned to the city of Kobe. The article very effectively makes the point that the officers of the 108th Combat Engineer Battalion of the Illinois 33d Division exercised considerable diplomacy and skill in arranging for the sword to be returned to the city of Kobe.

May I add that Col. Frank Wittosch, who is prominently mentioned in the article, is an old friend and constituent of mine and Lt. Col. Francis Kane is a former member of the Chicago Metropolitan Sanitary Board. The article follows:

SOUTH HOLLANDER RELATES TALE OF RARE SWORD

(By Alec Kerr)

How a Japanese samurai sword, 800 years old, was returned to its home city of Kobe was revealed recently by a South Holland resident, Col. Frank A. Wittosch, public facilities chief of the 363rd Civil Affairs area (B) headquartered in Chicago.

It appears that the sword, seven feet long, was contained in a weapon turn-in by the Japanese to the U.S. military upon the conclusion of World War II, and seized by the 108th Combat Engineer battalion of the Illinois 33rd division.

The sword and its handsomely-carved scabbard were estimated to have been over 800 years old because a government translator could not identify the Japanese characters dating back beyond that period.

Commander of the battalion at the time was Lt. Col. Francis P. Kane whose executive officer was Frank A. Wittosch, then a major. The two officers, according to "Officer," a national military publication which originally carried the story, recognized the sword as unique and presented it to their division commander, Maj. Gen. Percy Clarkson, who declared it a division war memento and returned it to Chicago with the unit in 1946.

For the next 22 years the sword hung in the office of the commanding general. In September, 1968, the division was terminated. Kane by that time had become a major general and Wittosch a colonel. They were the only remaining officers of the old 108th battalion so they decided to return the sword to the City of Kobe.

But this was not as easy as it seemed. It appears that the Japanese look with dishonor on the return of a military weapon after defeat and its capture. By custom the Japanese could not accept the sword as a gift.

But after discussions with the Japanese consul in Chicago, it was arranged that the Kobe Historical Society would request the loan of the sword as an item of great historical significance. General Kane and Col. Wittosch presented the sword for shipment to the captain of the Japanese ship America

Maru who in turn delivered it to Mayor Chujiro Haraguchi of Kobe.

Umeo Kagei, Japanese consul in Chicago, extended his appreciation and that of the City of Kobe for the sword's safe return.

CALENDAR OF EVENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION—FEBRUARY 1971

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the calendar of events of the Smithsonian Institution for the month of February 1971. The Smithsonian, as usual, has planned an outstanding schedule of varied events of interest to people of all ages. Once again, I urge my colleagues and the American people, especially those living in the metropolitan area and those visiting our Nation's capital to visit the Smithsonian Institution.

The calendar follows:

FEBRUARY AT THE SMITHSONIAN

Tuesday, February 2—Illustrated lecture: The *Anacostia Museum Experiment*, by John R. Kinard, Director of the Smithsonian's Anacostia Neighborhood Museum. The first of its kind, this museum strives to be a meaningful part of neighborhood life. Lecture sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates. 8:30 p.m. History and Technology Building auditorium. Open to the public.

Wednesday, February 3—Lunchbox forum: The *Museum Aviation Collection*. Informal lecture and discussion by Jack Hilliard, Curator and Clyde Gillespie, Assistant Curator of the Marine Corps Museum, Quantico, Va. Sponsored by the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum. Noon. Room 2169, Arts and Industries Building.

Thursday, February 4—Creative screen: *Generation*—A Hilary Harris study in patterns of the playful images of the kaleidoscope; *Catlin and the Indians*—The paintings of George Catlin, painter-historian, law student turned artist, who recorded the culture and customs of the American Plains Indians and the rituals of the vanished Indian society. Continuous half-hour showing beginning 11 a.m.; last showing at 2:30 p.m., National Collection of Fine Arts.

Concert: *U.S. Air Force Woodwind Quintet*. 8:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium.

Saturday, February 6—Creative screen: *Generation; Catlin and the Indians*. Repeat. See Feb. 4 for details.

Concert series: *Music from Marlboro*. Six artists from the celebrated Marlboro Festival of Vermont present music featuring rarely heard works by Beethoven, Haydn, Webern, and Dvorak. Musicians will be Mary Burgess, mezzo-soprano; David Golub, piano; Miriam Fried, violin; Felix Galimir, violin; John Graham, viola; and James Kreger, cello. Second in a series of three concerts presented by the Division of Performing Arts. 8 p.m., Natural History Building. Tickets $4.50 and $5; series ticket (final two performances) $9. For information call 381–5407.

Tuesday, February 9—Illustrated lecture: *The Persistent Unicorn*, by Dr. John White, co-author of *Stonehenge Decoded*. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates. 8:30 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. Open to the public.

Wednesday, February 10—Lunchbox forum: *A Tour of the Research Center*. Informal lecture and discussion by Robert B. Wood, Chief, Historical Research Center, Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum. Noon. Room 2169, Arts and Industries Building.

Thursday, February 11—Seminar in marine biology: *Primary Organic Production*. Lecturer: John Ryther, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. First in a series of graduate-level lectures on current research in marine biology. Each lecture will present a general survey of the current status of knowledge in the field, review the main concepts and unsolved problems of the particular subject area, and conclude with the latest research data of the lecturer. A question and answer period follows each program. Persons interested in graduate credit should contact their own university. 7:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Public invited.

Lecture: *The Renaissance of Ferro-Concrete Watercraft*, by Cdr. William C. Filkins, Research and Development, U.S. Navy. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Division of Transportation. 10 a.m., West Conference Room, History and Technology Building.

Concert: *U.S. Air Force String Orchestra*. 8:00 p.m. Natural History Building auditorium.

Friday, February 12—Folk concert: Franklin George playing the fiddle, banjo and dulcimer presents *Folk Songs and Fiddle Tunes of Appalachia*. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Division of Performing Arts and the Folklore Society of Greater Washington. $1 admission for non-FSGW members. 8:30 p.m. History and Technology Building auditorium.

Exhibition: *Venice 35*. More than 30 prints produced in the Smithsonian's Graphic Arts Workshop at the 35th Venice Biennale, and photographs of the workshop activities. Graphics are by American artist-teachers resident at the shop during the summer and Fellows from the United States, Italy, England, Greece, Denmark, and Malaysia. Organized by the International Art Program, National Collection of Fine Arts. Through March.

Monday, February 15—Concert: *U.S. Air Force Chamber Ensemble*. 8:00 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium.

Wednesday, February 17—Lunchbox forum: *Is There an Airplane in Your Future?* Informal lecture and discussion by E. W. Robischon, Assistant Director, Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum. Noon. Room 2169, Arts and Industries Building.

Thursday, February 18—Creative screen: *Short and Suite*—A color cocktail inscribed directly on film by Norman McLaren with music written for jazz ensemble by Eldon Rathburn; *The Twenties*—How one era ended and another began. The paradoxes of the 20's shown as a battleground in politics, religion, law, morals and ethnic relations. Continuous half-hour showings beginning 11 a.m.; last showing at 2:30 p.m., National Collection of Fine Arts.

Lecture: *Pollock and His Teachers*, by Francis V. O'Connor, Senior Visiting Research Associate, National Collection of Fine Arts. 2 p.m., Room 337, NCFA.

Audubon Lecture: *Four-Fathom World*. Harry Pederson presents another of his remarkable undersea films, going into the world of the coral reef where the many inhabitants display their reactions to each other and to a human intruder. Sponsored by the Audubon Naturalist Society. Natural History Building auditorium. 5:15 and 8:30 p.m. Public invited.

Seminar in marine biology: *Kinetics and Growth of Phytoplankton Species and Communities*. Lecturer: Theodore Smayda, University of Rhode Island. See Feb. 11 for seminar details. 7:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium.

Friday, Feb. 19—*Protecting Mountain Lands* by Dr. Hubert W. Vogelmann, Department of Botany, University of Vermont. Dr. Vogelmann, a specialist in mountain ecology, uses the Green Mountains of Vermont to explain basic man-mountain relationships and the critical conservation problems which exist all along the Appalachian mountain chain. Sponsored by the National Parks and Conservation Association. 8 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. Public invited.

Saturday, February 20—Creative screen: *Short and Suite; The Twenties*. Repeat. See Feb. 18 for details.

Folk concert: by the *Southern Folk Festival Association*, including Mike and Alice Seeger, Libba Cotten, and Hazel Dickens. Sponsored by the Folklore Society of Greater Washington and the Smithsonian Division of Performing Arts. $1 FSGW members; $2 nonmembers. 8:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium.

Wednesday, February 24—Exhibition: *Romaine Brooks: "Thief of Souls."*

The first major retrospective of Romaine Brooks (1874–1970) since 1935 when she was acclaimed internationally for the exceptional quality and unique expression of her work. Thirty paintings are on display, including a self-portrait, portraits of Ida Rubinstein, Natalie Clifford Barney, and Gabriele d'Annunzio, as well as highly self-expressive drawings and associative material on the artist. Through April 3. National Collection of Fine Arts.

Lunchbox forum: *Space Documentation at NASM*. Informal lecture and discussion by Frank H. Winter, Historical Research Assistant in the Astronautics Department, Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum. Noon. Room 2169, Arts and Industries Building.

Thursday, February 25—Lecture: *American Artists in Paris, 1850–1870*, by Dr. Lois Fink, Coordinator of Research, National Collection of Fine Arts, 2 p.m., Room 337, NCFA.

Seminar in marine biology: *Techniques and Instrumentation for Marine Biology*. Lecturer: John H. Busser, Bioinstrumentation Advisory Council. See Feb. 11 for seminar details. 7:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium.

Saturday, February 27—Dramatic reading: *Stein Salon: An Afternoon with Gertrude Stein*. Directed by Dr. Donn B. Murphy of Georgetown University. Actor: Robert Frankfurt; Actress: Mimi Norton Salamanca. 3 p.m., Granite Gallery, National Collection of Fine Arts.

Workshop: *Experiment in City Building*. For young people 8–12 years old, conducted by Frank O. Gehry, Architect. Mr. Gehry has been involved in planning Newburgh, N.Y.; Hermosa Beach, Calif.; and Columbia, Md. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates. By subscription only; call 381–6158.

Sunday, February 28—Workshop: *Experiment in City Building*. Repeat. See Feb. 27 for details.

DEMONSTRATIONS

Museum of History and Technology

Musical Instruments—from the Smithsonian's collection. Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 3 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, 3rd floor.

Power Machinery—steam engines and pumping engines. Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, 2–3:30 p.m.; Saturday and Sunday, 10:30–noon and 1–3:30 p.m., Power Machinery Hall, 1st floor.

Spinning and Weaving—Monday and Thursday, 10–4 p.m., Tuesday and Friday, 10–noon. Textile Hall, 1st floor.

FOREIGN STUDY TOURS

Tours concerned with archaeology, the arts, museums, private collections and natural history are available to national and local Associates in 1971.

East African Safari and Cruise: March 20–April 15. Five days in game reserves; two-

week cruise from Mombasa to islands in the Indian Ocean. A few spaces still available.

Cyprus and Turkey: May 11–June 1. Waiting list only.

Architectural and Historical Tour in Scotland, Wales and Ireland: May 31–June 20. Waiting list only.

"No-Tour" Tour. May 26–June 16. Air France Excursion-Dulles/Paris/Dulles. Members make their own arrangements for travel in Europe.

Roman Archaelogy: July 1–22. Inexpensive excursion for students, teachers and parents.

South America: Aug. 2, 21 days. Brazil, Peru, Ecuador and Colombia, with emphasis on archaeology, old and new architecture, museum and private collections plus a short visit to the upper Amazon.

"No-Tour" Tour. Three weeks in September. BOAC Excursion—Dulles/London/Dulles. Members make their own arrangements for travel in Europe.

Russia. Sept. 20–Oct. 12. Samarkand, Kiev, Vladimir, and Novgorod, with extended visits to Moscow and Leningrad. Directed by Dr. R. H. Howland and Prof. George Riabov. Tour full. Second group departs Oct. 25 (through Nov. 19).

For itineraries and details, please write to Susan Kennedy, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, or call 381–5520.

CONTINUING EXHIBITIONS

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum

2405 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue (formerly Nichols Ave.) S.E.

. . . Toward Freedom. The civil rights movement from 1954 to the present is reviewed. Through March 28.

Arts and Industries Building

East 100th Street. Eighty photographs of one block in Harlem, taken by Bruce Davidson during 1967–68. Through March 8.

Apollo 14. As a background for the Apollo 14 launch, this display explains the current Apollo mission—its purpose, destination, participants, etc., with text, photos and a lunar relief map. Through February.

Aerial Exploration. Two airplanes of the 1930's—Sirius and Polar Star—that made pathbreaking polar flights.

Pakistani Prints. Prints from a creative workshop in Pakistan during 1967. Sponsored by the International Art Program of NCFA. Through Feb. 16.

Hand of Man on America. Photographs by David Plowden depict man-made objects and their impact on the American continent—past, present and future. Through Feb. 16.

The Genteel Female. Lithographs depict the romantic view of the American woman of the 19th century. Through Feb. 16.

SNAP-27. A duplicate of the nuclear device that supplies electric power for the package of experiments placed on the moon by Apollo 12 astronauts. On display indefinitely.

Astronautical Art. Realistic illustration, impressionistic and abstract paintings and sculpture inspired by the space program. Included are works by Norman Rockwell and other well-known artists. On display through Easter.

World Bazaar. Museum Shops sales/exhibition featuring objects d'art and craft from 50 countries.

Freer Gallery of Art

Whistler's Landscapes and Seascapes. Forty paintings show Whistler in his forgotten role as an avant garde artist. On display indefinitely.

Whistler's Etchings. Twenty-six prints and 16 canceled copper plates. On display indefinitely.

Museum of History and Technology

The First Two Years: A Photographic Impression of the Presidency. Fifty-picture exhibit showing President Nixon in a variety of activities beginning with his inauguration to the present time. Through Feb. 21.

Railway Mechanical Interlocking. Objects, prints and photographs relating to interlocking switches and signals, an important 19th century development in railway safety. 1st floor, through Feb. 25.

Yellow-Glazed Earthenware. A rare collection of some 600 pieces of English earthenware made between 1785 and 1830. Pieces will be rotated in the exhibit, which is permanent.

Do It the Hard Way: Rube Goldberg and Modern Times. Featuring cartoons, writings, sculptures and cartoon "inventions." On display indefinitely.

Rube Goldberg films are shown in the History and Technology Building auditorium in half-hour programs at 11 a.m. and 2 p.m., Feb. 1, 2–5, 9, 11, 12, 16–22.

Iron and Steel Hall. Exhibit of the American iron and steel business dealing with modern practices and some of the historical background. On display indefinitely.

Museum of Natural History

Moon Rock Research. Findings of research on lunar samples by Smithsonian scientists. On display indefinitely.

National Collection of Fine Arts

Paintings of the John Henry Legend. Twelve paintings by Palmer Hayden retell the legend of John Henry and the dramatic contest between the steam drill and the steel driver. On display through March 14.

A Look at the World: Mid-Century. Twenty-six American paintings and small sculptures give an individualist view of the 1950's. On display indefinitely.

Winslow Homer. Fifty-one oils, watercolors, drawings, and graphics, mostly from the artist's popular early period. On display indefinitely.

National Portrait Gallery

John Muir, 1838–1914. A display centered around the great naturalist Muir and the conservation movement in the United States at the turn of the century. Through June 1.

Along This Way. Portraits, photographs, death mask, and other artifacts of black culture exponent James Weldon Johnson. A teaching exhibition. Through May 31.

RADIO SMITHSONIAN

Radio Smithsonian is broadcast every Sunday night on WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5) from 9–9:30 p.m. This weekly program presents conversation and music growing out of the Institution's exhibits, research, and other activities and interests. Program schedule for February:

7th—The Alarius Ensemble of Brussels, in a concert ranging from contemporary to baroque music recently presented at the Smithsonian.

14th—"A Collection of Millions?", Dr. Richard S. Cowan, Director of the National Museum of Natural History; You Are More Attractive with a Flat Head!, Dr. T. Dale Stewart, Senior Physical Anthropologist.

21st—Council on Worms, Dr. Meredith L. Jones, Curator of the Division of Worms; Scientists at Sea, Dr. I. Eugene Wallen, Director of the Office of Environmental Sciences.

28th—Indians. A long look at a major area of Smithsonian scholarship, the American Indian, his culture, and some of his problems today.

Also heard on WAMU–FM (88.5) Tuesdays at 6 p.m.; WETA–FM (90.9), Mondays at 9:30 p.m.; and on WNYC–AM/FM in New York City.

TOURS

Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates
By Subscription Only

Our Natural Heritage, Feb. 21–26. Six-day study trip to the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge, Padre Island, and selected private areas in southern Texas. The unique bird population of south Texas will be emphasized. Phone 381–5159.

Winterthur and Odessa, March 6 or 27. One-day tours. Phone Mrs. King, 381–5157.

HOURS

Smithsonian Museums: 10 a.m.-5:30 p.m., 7 days a week. Cafeteria: 11 a.m.-5 p.m. daily, MHT. Snack Bar: 10 a.m.-3 p.m. daily, MHT.

National Zoo Buildings: 9 a.m.-4:30 p.m., 7 days a week.

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum: 10 a.m.-6 p.m., weekdays; 1–6 p.m., weekends.

Dial-a-Museum—737–8811 for daily announcements on new exhibits and special events.

Dial-a-Phenomenon—737–8855 for weekly announcements on stars, planets and worldwide occurrences of short-lived natural phenomena.

The Smithsonian Monthly Calendar of Events is prepared by the Office of Public Affairs. Editor: Lilas Wiltshire. Deadline for entries in the March Calendar: February 5.

MUSEUM TOURS

Walk-in Tours

Museum of History and Technology (meet in Pendulum area): Tues.-Fri. 10:30, 11:30 a.m., 1 p.m.; Sat. and Sun. 10:30 a.m., noon, 1:30, 3 p.m.

National Collection of Fine Arts—Mon.-Fri. 11:30 a.m., 1 p.m.

School or Adult Group Tours by Appointment

Museum of History and Technology, Museum of Natural History, National Collection of Fine Arts—381–5019; 381–5680.

Freer Gallery of Art—381–5344.

National Portrait Gallery—381–6347.

National Zoological Park—332–9322.

Mailing list requests and changes of address should be sent to the Smithsonian Calendar, 107 Smithsonian Institution Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20560.

SOLDIER PAID TRANSPORTATION COSTS BACK TO VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in January of last year I was introduced to the case of Sp4c. Thomas O. Jensen. This young mean, after serving an 8-month assignment in Thailand, volunteered for another 13-month hitch in Vietnam. For the period before transferred to his new station he was granted a 30-day leave, only to find that he would be forced to pay all his transportation costs back to Vietnam.

Jensen contacted me immediately, and I requested an explanation of the matter by the Defense Department. I was informed simply that this "was Army policy, and nothing could be done for Specialist Jensen."

To me, and I am sure to young Jensen, it seemed dubious policy indeed to require servicemen to contribute part of their sparse monthly pay for the "privilege" of going into a battle zone. Accordingly, I introduced legislation to authorize the Army to pay for travel expenses incurred by military personnel who are granted leave between two foreign assignments. The Defense Department sent the bill to the Office of Management and

Budget for approval, where it has stayed ever since. Apparently, no one over there thinks our servicemen deserve better treatment.

Despite this initial setback, I am reintroducing the bill, confident that it will receive the consideration it truly demands. I am sure my colleagues will agree that this is a worthwhile and thoroughly sound piece of legislation.

Frankly, I must wonder how the O.M.B. could possibly have rejected this bill. It has but limited application—to servicemen granted leave between two permanent foreign assignments—and it simply will not be very expensive.

Moreover, I think its benefits will far outweigh its costs. When we consider the low level of morale within the service and the even lower esteem in which it is held by the public, we must agree that any measure designed to ease the situation of the enlisted man will certainly be useful in restoring the military's somewhat tarnished public image.

Raising the pay of our servicemen, Mr. Speaker, was, of course, the major step in our drive toward high enlistment rates and a zero draft. But we must improve as well the conditions under which our courageous young men must live and fight for their country. Like any other Federal employees our soldiers ask only to be treated fairly and honestly. I believe they deserve a better deal.

RURAL LEAGUE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my fear that the credibility of the administration's commitment to the poor of our Nation is endangered by the failure of the Office of Economic Opportunity to immediately express its continued support of the California rural legal assistance program.

I call on Mr. Frank Carlucci, Director of OEO, to cease his posture of delay and promptly override Governor Reagan's veto before the faith of the poor is permanently shattered.

Unless the administration reverses its decision to fund the CRLA for only a temporary period the following damaging results appear inevitable:

A planned project establishing a local legal aid "back-up center" will have to be scrapped;

The projected hiring of 12 new lawyers has been rendered nearly impossible due to the uncertainty over funds;

The time and energy of CRLA staff will be expended in answering Governor Reagan's charges, instead of helping the poor;

And, finally, many CRLA staff will be compelled to search for secure employment, due to uncertainty over OEO backing, instead of efficiently carrying out their duties.

I am extremely disappointed that Mr. Carlucci has extended CRLA funds for only 6 months, thus postponing a firm decision on Governor Reagan's veto.

Mr. Carlucci and this administration have had more than ample time to study the matter, and are apparently procrastinating simply to avoid facing up to a tough decision.

They must act, and act now with a positive, long-range commitment to the California rural legal assistance program.

BLACK CONGRESSMEN VIEW NIXON

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, as most of my colleagues are aware, the black members of the House have attempted several times to gain an audience with the President. However, we have consistently been turned down. The President not only demonstrates a lack of common courtesy but also a lack of respect for elected officials who represent 25 million blacks. Because of his refusal to discuss with us the problems which confront our people, we in turn refused to attend his state of the Union address. Mr. William Raspberry, a columnist with the Washington Post has written an article capturing our view of Mr. Nixon and the total lack of concern for blacks which the President and his administration embraces.

Mr. Raspberry's article follows:

It was more than a fit of pique that led the 12 black members of the House of Representatives to boycott the President's State of the Union message.

It was more accurately a desperate move designed to get Mr. Nixon to listen—or to make crystal clear than he does not wish to listen—to what black Americans, through their elected representatives, have to say about the direction the country is headed.

Said Rep. William Clay (D-Mo.), who called the State of the Union boycott:

"We started with the assumption that Mr. Nixon has not surrounded himself with anyone who can speak for black Americans, nor even shown any interest in discussing the problems of blacks.

"In addition, he has refused to discuss these problems with black congressmen.

"Therefore we concluded that Nixon can't tell us anything about the State of the Union as far as black people are concerned. Our boycott was designed to serve notice that black people are disgusted with his policies and their effect on their lives."

Clay and Rep. John Conyers (D-Mich.) told me their desperation is no sudden thing. It dates back at least to last Feb. 18, when the Black Caucus (comprising all black members of the House) requested an audience with the President.

"We wrote him a letter, outlining our reasons for wanting to see him," said Clay. "We got no response until April 20. The thrust of the reply was that the President's schedule was such that he couldn't fit us in.

"You know, the don't-call-us-we'll-call-you kind of thing. And that was signed by a lower-echelon clerk."

"Well, now," corrected Conyers, "it was an upper echelon clerk. In fact it was the same guy who wrote to the little black poster girl in Kansas saying that the President didn't have time to have his picture taken with her for the muscular dystrophy poster, or whatever it was."

The point, Conyers and Clay agreed, is that the President, who does have time to meet with, say, hardhats, finds his schedule impossibly full when black people want to see him.

After the February letter, and after a second letter in August in which they said it was "imperative" that Mr. Nixon meet with them, the congressmen said they followed up their formal requests with efforts to have intermediaries—"highly placed administration figures"—impress upon the President the importance of their request.

The closest they got to an explanation of why the President didn't want to see them, they said, came in a Time magazine article when the question was put to Presidential Assistant John Erlichman:

"We try not to permit opportunists to use the Presidency as a grandstand. That group has been going around, with Adam Clayton Powell, holding hearings and taking extremist positions. This looked to me like a set up."

The explanation, if it is accurately quoted, is incredible. It is bad enough to imply that all black members of Congress are "opportunists."

But if every one of the black congressmen that black Americans have elected can be considered as advocating "extremist" positions, that in itself ought to say something about the state of the union as black folks see it.

Part of what is behind the administration's recalcitrance is its almost-pathological fear that some Negro will leave a presidential conference and issue a public blast against the President. The White House got burned that way once with the Rev. Ralph Abernathy and is loath to run that risk again.

It has become routine, one hears, to extract no-blast pledges from any black spokesman before granting him an audience with Mr. Nixon.

But even understanding the nature of White House fears, it seems incredible that a man who is rated a political genius would provide such useful campaign ammunition to the 12 black members of the House.

As they wrote him last July, the President has had "a record 30,600 personal guests at the White House."

They find it hard to believe that such a schedule would provide not a single opening for the 12 leaders blacks have chosen to represent them.

OBSCENITY CONTROL

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 1, a new Federal antismut law went into effect. Under the terms of this law, persons who do not want to receive offensive materials in the mails can complete a postal form requesting that their names be placed on a special computerized list. Anyone sending "sexually oriented" advertising or printed matter to an individual whose name has been on the list 30 days or more, has committed a Federal crime punishable by up to 5 years imprisonment, a fine of $5,000, or both. This new law also makes a break from past regulations that only enabled individuals to stop offensive mailings from specific concerns. Now, by getting on the special list a person can be protected against all filth peddlers.

While this new postal regulation certainly should prove significant in terms of stemming the rising tide of pornography inundating the Nation, it does not go far enough. The Federal Government must take stronger steps to halt the flow of obscene materials into the homes of America.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to provide a focus for congressional action I am introducing a bill which, if enacted, would step up the tempo of Federal regulation, and would hasten the demise of the smut trade. I propose that the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, be closed to the transmission of salacious advertising, or advertising that would pander to prurient interests. Any person or business convicted of violating this ban could be punished by up to a $50,000 fine, or up to 5 years in prison, or both for a first offense. A second conviction could bring a $100,000 fine, a 10-year prison sentence, or both.

In conclusion, I would point out that a bill similar to this was passed by the House during the second session of the last Congress, but was not acted upon by the other body. By introducing this bill today, I hope to expedite House action and provide the other body ample time to consider the obvious merits of this proposal.

WELFARE DIRECTOR'S EFFORTS ARE RECOGNIZED

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in a recent edition of the Louisville Ky., Times, in which Mr. Gordon Railey, Clark County, Ind., welfare director, is recognized for his years of service and dedication to the needy:

WELFARE DIRECTOR RAILEY EARNS REPUTATION AS A BATTLER FOR THE POOR IN CLARK COUNTY

(By Maxwell King)

Gordon Railey is of that timeless and paradoxical breed: the fighting Christian. A gentle, deeply religious man, he has often stood fast and fought for what he believed during his eight years as Clark County welfare director.

"I think the best Christians have got to fight sometimes," he said recently, explaining that he found nothing conflicting in his dual role as church leader and personnel director of the Indiana Army Ammunition Plant during the Korean War.

Since he left that position in 1958 and later became welfare director, Railey has continued to fight, this time as an administrator working to see that his clients get the benefits they need.

"There's been many a welfare check go out of this office," he said, "only because I fought long and hard to see that it did."

Railey's battles over the past few years have often been with members of the Clark County Council, who, worried over increasing welfare costs, have slashed his budget and his salary.

COUNCIL CUTS BUDGET, SALARY

These battles have reflected the conflict between welfare recipients and taxpayers. When Railey has defended the rights of his clients, and the county councilmen have defended the pocketbooks of their irate constituents, they have naturally clashed.

In 1969, the council cut the welfare department's proposed budget by half, and also cut Railey's salary from $7,800 to $4,300. The State Board of Tax Commissioners later restored most of the cuts, including Railey's salary.

When Railey came back at the end of 1969 for an extra appropriation of $158,000, the council did not approve it until Railey had threatened to sue.

In 1967, the county welfare board did go to court to pry loose an extra appropriation of $47,000 from the council.

Railey has steadfastly maintained that the cost of welfare has been rising, not because of free and easy spending policies, but because of the rising costs of medical care for the elderly and the indigent.

OLD, SICK NEED HELP

Inflation in the cost of medical care, and scientific advances that make it possible for people to live longer, are chiefly responsible for increased welfare costs, he has said.

"I feel that in this business," Railey said, "we are helping those who cannot help themselves. Those who can help themselves shouldn't be on our rolls, and we work very hard to keep them off.

"But those that are old or sick need someone to help them and fight for them, and that's what we do."

Railey (who grew up in a devoutly religious home in Westport, Ky., later attended a seminary, and still preaches occasionally in churches) views his role of welfare agent as part of society's Christian effort to help others.

Since he was a young man, he has been involved in church work for the infirm and elderly. "I feel like I'm carrying on my church work here (in welfare) by caring for the poor, the sick and the infirm. This work is definitely humanitarian," he said.

Railey was born in 1910 into the Cecil Railey family. His father, a saw mill owner, and mother were devout Christians and Gordon began attending church as a young boy.

After his family moved to Louisville, Railey attended Male High School and then the University of Louisville. He had to drop out of college before graduating because of financial problems.

"The depression hit right after I went to college," he recalled, "and it got so tough I had to drop out. I worked and went to school nights."

He also continued his involvement with the church. In the early '30s, he was elected the president of the Louisville Christian Endeavor Society, a group of young members of various churches who visited persons confined in institutions and carried out other volunteer church work.

Railey attended Louisville Theological Seminary for several years while he was working, and he originally planned to join the ministry. A brother, the Rev. C. Marion Railey, is a missionary in Mexico.

But Railey dropped out of the seminary after he was married to the former Edna Bair of Morehead, Ky. "I guess I always took on too many responsibilities at once," he said.

He worked as a chemist (he studied chemistry when he was in college) for a Louisville firm, but lost that job when the depression caused the company to lay off a number of workers.

He later worked as a salesman and credit manager for a home supply company in Louisville. "Those were the years when I was really raking in the money," he said wistfully.

But he was lured away from that job to become personnel manager at the ammunition plant in Charlestown, then known as the Indiana Ordinance Works. He took the job during the Korean War and was laid off in 1958, when peacetime slowed the plant's production.

He later worked as a shoe store manager in Louisville, then quit that to start his own sales firm.

But his varied career was altered again when the members of the Clark County Welfare Board convinced him to take the job of welfare director.

"I wouldn't have taken it," he said recently, "but I was told it was a part-time job that wouldn't interfere with my business."

RAILEY GIVEN CITIZENSHIP PLAQUE

He discovered that the director's position was very much a full-time position, and to continue as director he had to sell his business, even though it meant a large loss in revenue.

He started as welfare director with a salary of $5,400. Though he now makes $9,420, this is the minimum salary he can be paid under his state civil service ranking.

Railey's wife, Edna, works as a nurse and has been an employe of Clark County Hospital for more than 20 years. They have two children.

Railey received the Jeffersonville Social Concerns League Citizenship Plaque in 1967, and he was the 1969 state president of the Indiana Conference on Social Welfare.

Among the Railey's outside interests is square dancing, and he was chairman of the National Square Dance Convention held in Louisville in 1958.

Despite the low salary accorded him by the county, the 60-year-old director has no plans to retire: "What would I do, sit around and learn to knit?" he asks facetiously.

And he feels that, after the many different positions he has held over the years, he has found his chosen vocation: "I just regret that I didn't get into this (welfare work) as a young man. I think you can do more good here, really, than as a minister of a church. . . .

"Helping people . . . and seeing the appreciation they show us—particularly from the children who grow up and become self-supporting—that makes it worthwhile."

The only thing that has given him as much satisfaction is his record as a Sunday School teacher. He was Sunday School superintendent of the First Christian Church of Jeffersonville for 14 years, and during that time the school doubled in size and became the largest Sunday School in the city.

That was this fighting Christian's most pleasant victory.

THE GOOD THAT JACK HALL DID LIVES AFTER HIM

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, America lost a most remarkable and valuable man last month with the passing of Jack W. Hall, a great labor leader and truly a man's man.

For 25 years Jack Hall served, in the truest sense of service, as the regional director for Hawaii of the International

Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union.

The laboring man in Hawaii today enjoys independence, dignity, and economic well-being. To a substantial degree, he owes this present status to the tenacity, dedication, and organizational skill of Jack Hall. He was among the first to recognize the need for working men of all races to unify in order to achieve their common objectives.

Jack Hall was an unusual, if not unique, labor organizer and leader who commanded the respect not only of the working men but also of employee executives with whom he dealt during the bitter struggles of the 1930's, and the later more difficult, though less combative days of labor-management relations from the 1940's to his death.

Jack Hall's word was his bond and as good as gold. This was the reputation he developed over the years and he was one of those rare individuals trusted by politicians, regardless of party line. As so aptly expressed by Honolulu Star Bulletin's Shurei Hirozawa:

Hall's honesty more than anything else was the ingredient that improved labor-management relations in Hawaii and the deep respect that management developed for him.

Hawaii has suffered an irreplaceable loss with the death of Jack Hall, but the good that he did will live long after him. As one who was numbered among his friends I too have been enriched for having known him.

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin recently published both an extensive article on Jack Hall's life and a thoughtful editorial assessing his impact on the life of Hawaii. I include them in the RECORD at this point:

SOCIAL JUSTICE IS JACK HALL'S ISLE LEGACY

(By Shurei Hirozawa)

Jack W. Hall, whose death Saturday brought to an untimely end the career of a great labor leader, will be remembered for the major role he played in uplifting the lot of Hawaii's masses in this century.

In the history of Hawaii, Hall will be remembered as a visionary, a self-educated leader who, with his union, accomplished important social gains.

It was only a year and a half ago that Hall left Hawaii to fill a new post of vice president in charge of organization for the ILWU. This was after he'd served 25 years as the union's regional director in the Islands.

He had great plans when he left. He believed the ideas he had developed in Hawaii could be applied nationally. But Parkinson's Disease hospitalized him recently, and a massive stroke on New Year's Day claimed his life a day later.

Although he died in San Francisco, he will be remembered with more respect in Hawaii.

From age 21 to 53, Hall dedicated himself to the improvement of the conditions of the working man in the Islands.

Graduated from high school at the height of the Depression, when millions were unemployed, he took the only job he could find at the time—going to sea.

As he often mentioned, the times made a deep impression upon him, making him wonder if there wasn't a better way out of the social problems facing the nation. The answer he found was through trade union action.

He told me once that the 1934 West Coast dock strike taught him that interracial unity was the only way a union could win a strike where the work force consisted of more than one race.

Another tool that he adapted for use in agricultural Hawaii was the Wagner Act of 1935. That law gave unions the right to organize for the first time. This New Deal law gave rise to the great industrial unions of the CIO, led by the late John L. Lewis.

Young as he was, Hall quickly learned the principles laid down by Lewis. And these were to bring him success in his long battle for social justice for workers.

For trade union success, Lewis had preached independent political action and organization along industrial lines.

This is exactly what Hall said he did in the late 1930s on Kauai, which brought him his initial victories in organization and in political action.

He was assigned to help the dock strikers at Port Allen in 1937 and also to help workers organize in that area. Within a year a political action group he had organized was able to upset a highly favored candidate and elect labor-oriented J. B. Fernandes to the Territorial Senate.

In another year, Hall had won labor agreements for workers at McBryde Sugar Co. and Kauai Pineapple Co., the first contracts with agricultural firms in Hawaii, and probably the nation.

Hall forged the winning group out of a loyal nucleus of older nisei and English-speaking Filipinos and Portuguese in positions of leadership among the workers. When needed, these leaders did the translating into native tongues.

All of his work on Kauai was not without personal danger. He told me once of two attacks on him in Hanapepe in which thugs were sent to get him.

"One night four goons mistook a tall first mate off a freighter for me and hurled him into the river," he said. On another occasion, a thug went after him with a .45 caliber pistol in a bar and he was saved only by the quick-witted barmaid who turned off the lights and hid him under the steam table in the kitchen. Hall later escaped out of the building by the back way. He said he was never so frightened in his life.

As a high school student, I used to see Jack Hall at times when my friends and I hiked four miles to Hanapepe to see an occasional Saturday afternoon matinee.

His office, which I never saw, was two doors away from the theater. The times I saw him, the tall figure always appeared to be in a hurry, or busy in conversation with someone.

Not one of my friends or I realized what he was doing to the social fabric of the Islands. It was many years later that I met him for the first time while covering the labor beat for the Star-Bulletin. And it was many years more before I was to understand fully what he was trying to accomplish.

One particular assignment about 10 years or so ago for the Star-Bulletin gave me a pretty good clue to where his thinking pointed. He spoke to a church convention one Sunday morning and told what he saw coming with the containerization of freight.

Matson Navigation Co. had just begun to containerize freight for the Hawaii trade at that time, and great economies and advantages for consumers had been predicted.

But Hall talked about the effect this would have upon dockworkers, especially on the Neighbor Islands where he saw containerization reducing the docks to ghost ports.

Hall was concerned first about the eventual evaporation of work and finding a way to minimize the hardship that he saw coming.

The answer was to come seven years later, in the dock labor negotiations of 1967.

Hall had told me in many different ways during my years on the labor beat about his philosophy of the roles of labor and management in the American economic scene.

Employers under the free enterprise tradition have one major objective, and that is profits.

Unions, in the same context, have fought mainly for improvement in wages and working conditions for workers. In the early years of the ILWU, what seemed like serving its self-interest was actually an act of self-preservation and strengthening so the union could tackle the wider problems on another day, he said.

In this technological age, Hall felt employers have a social responsibility to help ease the problems arising from the shifting demands of today's fast-paced economy.

And unions have the same responsibility to push for solutions to social problems through collective bargaining and other means if it fails at the bargaining table.

Fortunately, an era of mature labor-management relations began in the early 1950s following the disastrous dock strike of 1949 when the ILWU firmly established itself as a part of Hawaii's economic structure.

Jack Hall and his union saw the changes coming in the labor-heavy sugar plantations and the social casualties that were sure to appear among the older non-English speaking workers who had been brought to Hawaii by the industry.

The union made a decision that it wouldn't waste its strength fighting mechanization, but would demand instead that industry pay workers a share in the benefits business got from the machine.

The fact that industry decided to work with the union toward this goal is a tribute to Hall's innovative thinking and the industry's social consciousness.

Older workers were given cash incentives to take early retirement. Aliens were given special cash incentives to retire and return to their homelands where American dollars expanded their purchasing power.

The union also took smaller wage increases and with the remaining funds purchased pensions for older workers who could then afford to retire earlier. Another incentive the union negotiated was a good medical plan for retired workers and their spouses.

Even with the elimination of thousands of jobs in the sugar industry, there was no reported hardship case or involuntary unemployment.

The union and the pineapple industry followed the same pattern for orderly elimination of workers with the same happy results.

The mechanization of the docks came 10 to 15 years later, and a somewhat similar program was used in easing the elimination of jobs.

Repatriation to the country of origin, generous severance allowances to older workers, transfers to docks on the West Coast financed by travel allowances were part of the program to trim the work force without throwing people into the streets.

For the ones who remained, longshoremen were flown to different ports within the State to equalize work opportunity, and each was guaranteed 38 hours of straight time pay a week.

The cost of flying workers to and from their home ports went beyond initial estimates and caused financial problems. But Hall's solutions for the social problems that might have occurred were achieved.

In the hard bargaining with industry, Hall was often able to win unheard of demands. His secret weapon was careful preparation and deep knowledge of the economics of the sugar, pineapple and longshore industries.

Even management people have told me that Hall's grasp of the economics of these industries was better than many on the companies' bargaining committees.

But the industries were rewarded for good-faith bargaining with the ILWU. Hall's leadership brought stability because his word was a bond and he never went back on it. Industry could depend on that.

Hall's honesty more than anything else was the ingredient that improved labor-management relations in Hawaii and the deep respect that management developed for him.

Aside from the bargaining table, Hall built the political influence of his union to such a potent force that the numerous social benefits won in the Legislature covered thousands of other workers as well.

Working with Sens. Fernandes and Clem Gomes whom labor helped elect from Kauai, Hall got the State Wage and Hour law passed in 1940.

In 1945, he was able to get a Little Wagner Act through the Legislature which gave agricultural workers the right to organize, and made it possible for the ILWU to bring sugar and pineapple into its fold.

In later years, the ILWU was instrumental in helping write the most liberal workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance and minimum wage laws of any State. The temporary disability insurance law, passed two years ago, is also a product of ILWU lobbying.

The union's success in creating an interracial membership with a discipline unequaled in Hawaii's labor history gave the ILWU the power it needed to win what it deemed right at the bargaining table or in the Legislature.

And Hall sometimes was not shy about using power when needed even at the expense of criticism from the community. One of his favorite sayings was, "We don't worry about losing our respectability, but we want to be respected."

During his last years in Hawaii, he took the position that government, business and labor working together will best solve the social problems that arise from our ever-changing economy.

He took little credit for bringing Hawaii to this stage where working people take hard-won dignity and human rights for granted.

But that's the way he was. His work was done when he left in June 1969. He said he was grateful for friends and foes for making his life so interesting and meaningful.

And if he was to be remembered for anything, he wanted to be remembered as "a rebel in paradise who struck a flame that was kept burning."

HE CHANGED HAWAII

Should the time come when monuments are erected to the builders of Hawaii, Jack W. Hall will have a rightful place among those selected.

Hall was controversial and tough.

He also was idealistic and brave—brave morally and brave physically.

Starting as a young man just off a ship from California, Hall dedicated himself to the task of improving the lot of the laboring man in Hawaii.

He gave his lifetime to it and he succeeded so well that he revolutionized life in these Islands.

Hall united working men without regard to racial lines for the first time.

Then he engaged in battles—some of them extremely tough and bitter—that won them economic democracy and with it political and social democracy.

Few people today would deny that, on the balance, the labor movement has been a force for good in Hawaii and that Hall's ILWU was the pioneer that made it so.

Many other unions now operate actively and freely in Hawaii but it was Hall and the ILWU that blazed the trail through the tough forest of resistance.

They challenged a well-intended but paternalistic and semi-feudal plantation system. From it, they won the independence, dignity, power and economic well-being that mark the laboring man's status in Hawaii today.

Hall's place of honor today is disputed by a few who say he was a Communist and see that as reason enough to dishonor him.

At one time he was. The 1950 Smith Act jury delivered a finding to this effect and the later reversal on technical grounds did not dispute the evidence.

Hall never said publicly that he had been a Communist but he did not deny it either. Instead he chose to say that he had not been a Communist since 1950.

The evidence at his trial along with six others suggested that he joined the Communist Party because it offered to help the ILWU at a time when no one else would. He was, in other words, a labor man first and a Communist second.

The late Arnold Wills, the National Labor Relations Board representative in Hawaii after World War II, knew something about Communists. He had been on the fringes of the party himself.

Wills, who liked Hall immensely as did most other people who knew him well, once waved a bony finger at Hall and told him: "You'll never make a good Communist, Jack. You've got a conscience."

Hall also was too bright and too pragmatic to be a Communist zealot. If he had ever believed in a Communist revolution as a means of winning independence and dignity for the American laboring man he certainly abandoned it as he saw what was happening in the totalitarian countries and contrasted it with the progress that he was making for his cause within the American system.

Like many critics before him, Hall wound up by making the American system better. He proved to be one of Hawaii's greatest builders.

No tribute to Hall can ignore his honesty.

He was respected in labor negotiations as a man who kept his word. He sought little for himself and got along on a relatively small salary compared to other labor leaders or to businessmen with far less responsibility. His union remained free of scandal.

When Hall left Hawaii for California in 1969, the round of alohas and goodbyes was overwhelming. Beyond the immediate sadness of the parting and the wide and deep aloha for him was the knowledge that his health was such that he might not be back, at least not in an active leadership position.

It has turned out that way. Hall's life was shorter than average but in Hawaii he will always be remembered and respected as a champion of the common man who was one of the most uncommon men of all.

VOLUNTARY PRAYER

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, the words of the first amendment of the Constitution should be interpreted as a safeguard to the exercise of religious beliefs—not as a prohibition. When these words: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof" were written, our Nation was still close to its fears of religious persecution. The colonies had been settled by men whose religious ideas were unpopular and in the minority, and the religious groups which sought freedom here were many and diverse. So when these words were written, the fears of religious persecution and the establishment of a state religion were in the minds of all men, for many of these groups had fled an England where there was, in effect, a state-created religion.

During the 1960's the Supreme Court and the courts of various States decided that certain prayers in public schools, since the schools were supported by the State, amounted to the State giving its endorsement to certain religious doctrines. These may have been logical rulings for, in some cases, the prayers may have favored one denomination over another. Furthermore, these rulings were designed to protect religious minorities and the right of men not to believe in what might happen to be the most popular religion of the time.

To protect the rights of the minority, these rulings have decreed, it is the wisest policy of the State to be impartial to religion, because if any State policy lends support to any one religious idea, someone, somewhere, might be offended because the State has given its official prestige to a religious idea which may be heresy to him.

The logical extension of this argument is the condition where the State neither voices any ideas which may be considered religious nor listens to any such ideas, but instead performs its duties in an isolated, empty room apart from the religious belief and strength of the people.

In the greater perspective, these rulings have actually prohibited the free exercise of religion. They decree that the separation of church and State means that when a man leaves his church and goes across the street to the courthouse, he must put aside—into a quiet corner—his religion as if it were something as discardable as his hat or coat.

With a constitutional amendment allowing voluntary, nondenominational prayer, we could avoid the question of the State giving its support to a particular religion and we would correct the error of past court decisions which are prohibiting the freedom of religion.

CEYLON'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the 23d anniversary of Ceylon's independence will be celebrated tomorrow, February 4, 1971.

Ceylon remains one of the most stable parliamentary democracies in the Far Eastern part of the world and, in fact, her record in maintaining democratic freedom compares favorably with those countries who have been independent for longer periods of time. His Holiness Pope Paul VI on his brief visit to Ceylon in December 1970 stated:

Lanka must be a beacon of peace throughout Asia, in all the lands bound by the Indian Ocean and throughout the World.

Parliamentary elections in Ceylon have been based on universal adult suffrage dating as far back as 1931, and a few years ago the age for voting rights was lowered to 18 years. This was made pos-

sible because of the considerable progress Ceylon has made in curbing illiteracy and, in fact, the literacy rate is the highest in the countries of the region with the possible exception of Japan. This in turn is the result of education being brought within the reach of everyone by making it free from the kindergarten through the university.

That the rule of law is firmly entrenched in the traditions in the country is evidenced by an active parliamentary opposition and a free press. This is further testimony to the vitality of the democratic process in Ceylon.

Another area in which Ceylon has made considerable progress is health. The life expectancy has been raised to 62 years owing to the greatly improved environmental sanitation, better medical treatment, and improved diet.

The present Government, which came into office after a general election in May 1970 under the leadership of Prime Minister Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, has given the highest priority to economic development through three major commitments:

It is committed to lay the foundation for transition of the economy to a Socialist one while preserving the democratic traditions through the strength of the ballot.

It is committed to maintain those measures which are an integral part of her social fabric in order to provide the necessities of life at reasonable prices to a majority of the people.

It is committed to a program of rapid economic growth of sufficient magnitude to absorb a sizable proportion of the unemployed and to bring the solution of this problem within sight during its term of office.

In order to fulfill these commitments the Government recognized that austerity must be the keynote to her social thinking during the next few years.

Ceylon has had to face a difficult balance-of-payments situation owing to a recent decline of her foreign exchange earnings. In the last 4 years there has been a steady decline in the export price of tea—which is the country's largest export; and the export price of natural rubber—which is the second largest export—has also declined due to competition from synthetics. While these factors are beyond Ceylon's control, they are the chief causes of Ceylon's balance-of-payments problems.

In the past 5 years Ceylon has received economic assistance from an aid-to-Ceylon group of friendly countries that had been convened annually by the World Bank. The United States has been one of the foremost supporters of this aid group. The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank have also given assistance to Ceylon by extending standby credit and by making soft loans for development projects. This is an indication of the confidence reposed in Ceylon's economy. The IMF, the World Bank, the United States and other countries in the aid group have continued to have confidence in Ceylon, and she hopes that with the help of these friendly countries she will be able, in a few years, to develop her economy so as not to have to rely on external assistance.

Mr. Speaker, having visited Ceylon, I found it to be a dynamic young country; the United States enjoys good relations with Ceylon. Her people are most friendly to Americans.

Ceylon's achievements on this 23d anniversary of independence are well worth noting, and, therefore, I am happy to pay tribute to Ceylon on its independence day.

THE STATE OF THE UNION

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Mary McGrory, a columnist for the Washington Star, recently summed up in one paragraph the dilemma of attempting to understand the policies and statements of the Nixon administration. In noting that Mr. Nixon's state of the Union address was truly a historic first, Miss McGrory pointed out that while other such messages have been faulted for failing to state solutions to problems, Mr. Nixon fails to state the problems as well.

True to form, the President polished his performance by utilizing broad, sweeping strokes of swollen rhetoric to paint a generally cheerful, but unrealistic and fuzzy picture of the state of our Nation after 2 years of "new leadership" under the Nixon administration. He unveiled his plans for a "new American revolution," replete with all the vague political slogans—"power to the people, quest for new greatness, prosperity in peacetime, full employment budget," and a new one, even for Mr. Nixon, "parks to the people." Indeed, another political columnist compared the speech to that of the insurance salesman's "dream of the golden years" pitch—that great day in the future when there would be no more war, no more inflation, unemployment, or unpaid hospital bills. But the truth is: That this is the same story we heard during the 1968 presidential campaign; yet the war Mr. Nixon promised to end continues to rage, unemployment has skyrocketed to its highest rate in a decade, and inflation remains unchecked.

Mr. Nixon speaks of revenue sharing, again in broad, general terms. Our basic problem today is not revenue sharing, but revenue itself, and Mr. Nixon is already sharing too much of our revenue—all over Southeast Asia. Furthermore, while the President is evidently planning to once again unleash Vice President Agnew in search of popular support for this latest Presidential brainstorm, he has yet to relate the details of this new plan to Congress—how it would actually operate, what existing programs would be eliminated, where the new money would come from, or what steps would be taken to assure that this revenue would be properly allocated and used.

The President urges other government leaders now to "give up power"—to return the power to the people. Yet he draws freely and heavily on his own Presidential power. Without hesitation he coldly vetoes important bills, passed by an overwhelming majority of those who represent the people in Congress. He sardonically refers to a "bureaucratic elite in Washington," but maintains for himself a bulging personal cadre of Presidential counsellors, assistants, special consultants, advisers and deputies—by far the largest White House staff in our Nation's history. He recalls Abraham Lincoln's government of 100 years ago—of the people, by the people, for the people. The Republican Party has come a long way since then, Mr. Speaker. Judging by present policies and political appointments, Mr. Nixon would be more candid in referring to the modern Republican administration as the Government of big business, by big business, and for big business.

Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 1971, Mr. Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Auto Workers delivered an excellent statement before the Joint Economic Committee. At this point I would like to insert a copy of that portion of Mr. Woodcock's remarks responsive to the state of the Union message in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY LEONARD WOODCOCK TO THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

I am sorry that the President's Message on the State of the Union was delivered so close in time to these hearings that it was not feasible to leave the completion of my statement until after the Message had been delivered. However, there are some comments I would like to make in the form of a supplementary statement.

Some of his suggestions, such as that of revenue sharing, I have dealt with in my statement. As we suspected, the greater part of the funds for revenue sharing would come from cutting back of existing federal programs. What is most serious is that the largest cutbacks, apparently, would be in federal aid to education. In many states, this would mean that the leverage now available to the federal government to fight segregation in the school system would simply disappear.

According to the New York Times, among the federal programs to be dismantled would be all those established under the Secondary and Elementary Education Act, most of the Model Cities Program, urban renewal and water and sewer grants, most of the federal manpower training programs, the anticrime funds appropriated under the Safe Streets Act of 1968, rural development programs and mass transit programs. All of these are essential programs, and there is no assurance that they would be carried on by the various states and communities. Indeed, the pressures for reduction in state and local taxes would almost ensure that a substantial proportion of the revenues would be used for this purpose rather than for continuing under state auspices present federal programs.

I am completely in favor of federal government assistance in cutting the present overwhelming burden of state and local taxation, but this should be accomplished by a federal program directed specifically to that purpose, and not by cutting down existing essential programs.

As to the argument that revenue sharing will restore "power to the people," that is complete nonsense. After all, members of the Senate and the House of Representatives have to be elected by the people just as do members of state and local governments, and

they presumably feel just as great a need to keep close to the people who have power to elect or unseat them.

As a matter of fact, there is every evidence that state and local governments are less concerned with meeting the needs of all the people, and more subject to the influence of special interests, than is the federal government. Why, for example, is state and local taxation so much more regressive than federal taxation? A major reason is that state and local governments are engaged in a competition to maintain a so-called "favorable climate" for business, which is actively fostered by large corporations in the form of demands for special tax and other concessions—all at the expense of the small taxpayer.

If the President really wanted to restore "power to the people," he might better have done so by recommending the direct election by popular vote of future Presidents and Vice Presidents.

Neither is there any evidence that municipally directed welfare programs, for example, are any less bureaucratic or dictatorial in their approach than federally controlled programs. On the contrary, for many minorities, especially the black people in the South, there is every reason to believe that those who administer federal programs will be much more responsive to their needs than the administrators of locally controlled programs.

In his welfare program, in fact, the President has completely misjudged the needs of the people. His frequently proposed floor of $1,600 a year for a family of four would represent only 42 percent of the $3,800 a year recently announced by the Department of Labor as the poverty line for an urban family of that size.

Mr. Nixon proposes to "stop helping those who are able to help themselves but refuse to do so." Actually, this is not the problem. The problem is rather that too many of those who "help themselves" nevertheless remain in poverty.

In 1969, there were more than a million families which received an income below the poverty level, even though the family head worked full-time, the year around.

Among black families, more than one-fifth received an income below the poverty level even though the family head had been working full-time all year-round.

All told, there were more than 5 million workers and dependents in 1969 who lived in poverty although the family head held a year-round full-time job.

With reference to inflation and unemployment, I think that the President is both too optimistic and too vague. He talks about the "tide of inflation having turned;" earlier in this testimony I have expressed my doubts that this is so. Moreover, I would have liked to see much more concrete policies geared to bring the unemployed back into the economic mainstream. In particular, I would have welcomed a firm commitment towards linking further cutbacks in military spending with efforts to provide adequate housing, restore the environment, and improve our transportation system.

As to health care, we will have to delay full comment until the details of the President's program are set forth. It may be significant, however, that his Message promised only to bring "basic medical care" within the reach of every family. This could mean a severely stripped-down program that would leave many major medical needs unmet.

As to the President's proposal for reorganization of government departments, again we will have to wait for details. But I fail to see how eight "monster departments" can be more efficient and less bureaucratic than twelve smaller departments. And one thing is sure, that if the Congress allows itself to become involved in the vigorous clashes of opinion and the prolonged debates that must precede any such far-reaching reorganization of the government, it will have little time left indeed to enact either the President's programs or any other of the urgently needed measures to halt inflation, to reduce unemployment, to provide for conversion of defense industries to the needs and purposes of peace, or to enact any other of the measures so vital to the welfare of this country's people.

NATIONAL MEDAL OF SCIENCE RECIPIENTS FOR 1970

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the list of outstanding scientists, who have been chosen by the President as recipients of the 1970 National Medal of Science, the Federal Government's highest award for distinguished achievement in science, mathematics, and engineering:

RECIPIENTS OF NATIONAL MEDAL OF SCIENCE

The recipients are:

Richard D. Brauer, Professor of Mathematics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, "For his work on conjectures of Dickson, Cartan, Maschke, and Artin, his introduction of the Brauer group, and his development on the theory of modular representations."

Robert H. Dicke, Cyrus Fogg Brackett Professor of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, "For fashioning radio and light waves into tools of extraordinary accuracy and for decisive studies of cosmology and of the nature of gravitation."

Barbara McClintock, Distinguished Service Member, Carnegie Institution of Washington, Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island, New York. For establishing the relations between inherited characters in plants and the detailed shapes of their chromosomes, and for showing that some genes are controlled by other genes within chromosomes."

George E. Mueller, Senior Vice President, General Dynamics Corporation, One Rockefeller Plaza, New York, New York, "For his many individual contributions to the design of the Apollo System, including the planning and interpretation of a large array of advanced experiments necessary to insure the success of this venture into a new and little known environment."

Albert B. Sabin, President of the Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovoth, Israel, "For numerous fundamental contributions to the understanding of viruses and viral diseases, culminating in the development of the vaccine which has eliminated poliomyelitis as a major threat to human health."

Allan R. Sandage, Staff Member, Hale Observatories, Carnegie Institution of Washington, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, "For bringing the very limits of the universe within the reach of man's awareness and unraveling the evolution of stars and galaxies—their origins and ages, distances and destines."

John C. Slater, Professor of Physics and Chemistry, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, "For wide-ranging contributions to the basic theory of atoms, molecules, and matter in the solid form."

John A. Wheeler, Joseph Henry Professor of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, "For his basic contributions to our understanding of the nuclei of atoms, exemplified by his theory of nuclear fisson, and his own work and stimulus to others on basic questions of gravitational and electromagnetic phenomena."

Saul Winstein, deceased November 23, 1969; formerly Professor of Chemistry, University of California, Los Angeles, California, "In recognition of his many innovative and perceptive contributions to the study of mechanism in organic chemical reactions."

The National Medal of Science is the highest award of the Federal Government for outstanding contributions to scientific and engineering development. Since 1962, the award has been presented annually to the nation's most distinguished scientists.

Recipients are judged, by a selection committee, to have profoundly changed the whole field of science or engineering in which he works. Six past recipients of the National Medal have later received the Nobel Prize.

The award was established in 1959 by Act of Congress, signed by President Eisenhower. The President's Committee on the National Medal of Science which assists in making the selection of recipients, is currently chaired by Dr. John R. Pierce, Executive Director, Research Communications Science Division, Bell Telephone Laboratories.

THE AMERICAN SPIRIT

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, in 1968, while he was a candidate for President of the United States, Richard Nixon set forth some of his basic philosophy of government in a great speech on October 2, 1968, in Williamsburg, Va.

I know that many of my colleagues will want to read this and renew some of the spirit which the President expressed on that great occasion. Some of what he expressed in 1968 is coming to pass in some of the new programs which he has suggested to the Congress.

The speech follows:

THE AMERICAN SPIRIT

(Speech by President Richard Nixon)

Williamsburg is a revered place in America. Here was the capital of Colonial Virginia; here was a revolutionary war headquarters of George Washington and here, during the Civil War, was the scene of a bloody battle between Blue and Grey forces.

In modern times, Williamsburg has been restored to its historic setting; today, men of the twentieth century can walk through a village of the eighteenth century, absorbing the mood that surrounded the men who built this nation.

It is fitting, then, to pause in the election campaign of 1968 at a place, steeped in our heritage; this is a proper moment to examine our past for some keys to our future. Perhaps we can draw some strength and gain some insight from what has gone before.

When we recall the days of our Revolution, we think of the phrase "the spirit of '76." That is not just a slogan; there was a real "spirit of '76." That spirit was the driving force within most Americans of that revolutionary era.

I believe that a nation, like a person, has a spirit.

I believe that a national spirit comes to the fore in times of national crisis.

I believe that each time a national spirit makes itself felt, it speaks to its own time

with a different message directed to the problems of that time.

That is why a searching look at the American spirit is needed today. The American spirit, as I envision it, is not the visitation of some ghost of the past; rather it is the affirmation of a deep national yearning that all of us feel today.

Whenever America falls short, that spirit appears—not to comfort us, but to make demands on us. Not to salve our conscience, but to spur our conscience.

Our history shows that as a people we have responded to these new demands each time they were made.

Almost two centuries ago, at the time of our Revolution, the American spirit demanded political liberty. And so a nation was born.

A century and a half ago, the American spirit demanded a choice in national leadership, calling for a framework that encouraged the cut and thrust of controversy. And the two-party system was born.

A century ago, at the time of our Civil War, the American spirit demanded an end to slavery and an end to sectionalism. And so the nation was born again, this time into a deeper unit.

At the turn of this century, the American spirit demanded a fair share for all in the fruits of our economic system; trust-busting was born and the labor movement gained momentum.

A generation ago, with tyranny on the march, the American spirit stirred again; a new internationalism was born, and America shouldered her world responsibilities.

With hindsight, we can now see how the American spirit reappeared time after time in our history; looking back, it is easy to detect its differing demands and the great changes it achieved.

But the Americans living through those times did not have the benefit of hindsight. The men who gathered at places like Williamsburg two centuries ago were not then a distinguished group of statesmen known as Founding Fathers—they were a band of practical idealists risking the gallows by talking of revolution.

The great eras of changes are clear enough for us in retrospect. But to the men living through those times, America was upset and uncertain; strong cross-currents of opinion roiled the waters and hatreds flared.

That is the kind of era we are going through right now. The textbooks of the next century—if textbooks are still in use—may sum up the new demands of the American spirit in a sentence or two. But now it is up to us to work it out for ourselves.

Here in 1968, what is missing from American life that has called up this spirit of change? What void in each one of us needs to be filled?

Of course, we think first of the obvious answers. We need peace in the world; we need the good life for all; we need justice for all, in the framework of law. But let's go a step beyond.

We are told of a man who was seen digging around the walls of his house; when he was asked why, he gave this strange and intriguing answer: "I am letting the dark out of my cellar." That is what we must do now; as we dig for the demands of change, we must let the dark out of our cellars.

I believe that an underlying reason for the feeling of emptiness in so many hearts today stems from the loss of personal freedom.

I believe that the American spirit is reappearing now to demand the return of that personal freedom.

As in our past, these demands are thundered in stormy times. Some of us are all too noisy; some of us are all too silent; but each of us knows that this is the time to stand up for his own individual identity.

We won our fight for political freedom two centuries ago; we won a battle for human freedom a century ago; today, we are in a fight for our personal freedom.

Personal freedom, to me, is at the root of human dignity.

Personal freedom is room to turn around in life. It is the right to grow in your own way, to learn what is not yet being taught; it is both the right to privacy and the right to participate.

Personal freedom is not a license to disrupt, but it is a liberty to dissent; not a duty to destroy, but an obligation to challenge.

Personal freedom will not ensure that every man will get all he desires; it will ensure that every man will get all he deserves.

Those Americans who once had personal freedom and lost it, now want it back; those who never had it at all, want it now.

In striving for a worthy goal—security—we have lost a worthy asset—individually, the hallmark of personal freedom. In trying to provide for the material needs of all, we have stolen from the personal freedom of each.

Where did we lose our way? Where did we begin to trade away our personal freedom?

Some would say we lost our way when we began our ever-expanding welfare programs. Others would say we lost our way when we took on the responsibility of helping to defend the free world.

I don't agree. These were steps that changed the course of history; these were steps in the right direction.

We were right to want to help the poor, the sick, the unemployed, the elderly. We were right to want to help advance the cause of democracy around the world.

But in making these advances, we lost something. We became so busy doing so much for the "people" that we forgot about the person. We became so obsessed with the collective needs that we overlooked the individual need.

At first we didn't feel the loss. Our American system had so much momentum; there was so much to be done and so much to do it with. We could not detect the slow erosion of our personal freedom, the gradual diminishing of human dignity.

But now, a generation later, we feel it. And we miss what we lost. We miss it in the feeling so many Americans have of being hemmed in; of being a cog in a huge machine; of being no longer in control of our own lives; of not having our own important say in the direction of our communities and our nation.

Well, what are we going to do about it? We cannot turn back the clock; we must not undo all the good we have done, as we try now to regain the freedom we have lost.

Nor can we throw up our hands and say that one man does not count anymore—that we've traded personal freedom away for the security of a big, paternal government.

We do have another choice. We must find a way to make government work for all of us without dominating any one of us. We have to establish new respect for the qualities of initiative, personal sacrifice, and readiness to seize opportunity, that made the individual American the wonder of the world.

And we have to reawaken this respect the hard way: without tearing down the structure we have built to help those who cannot help themselves.

That is why a political promise of "more of the same" is wrong, and why a promise of "less of the same" is just as wrong. We need neither more nor less of the "same"—we need an approach that is entirely different.

Welfare is too important to be left to the Welfare Staters. We are going to change our welfare system to make it fit the American system, to provide each person with a means of escape from welfare into dignity. This is not an impossible dream. America needs it: with leadership that understands the American spirit, America is going to get it.

And that's not all. Each of us wants to get back that sense of participation in government, that hand in our own destinies.

We are going to reverse the flow of power to the Federal Government in Washington, and channel more power back to the states and localities. Tax sharing; bloc grants; decentralization; local option; community participation; this is the direction I believe America is about to choose.

What's more, the pendulum is going to swing back to an emphasis on individual opportunity. But something new will be added: genuinely equal opportunity, starting from childhood. The industrious person will get ahead and the lazy man will fall behind, no matter what their background or heritage or skin color.

How can I be so certain about all this?

Because I believe that is what the American spirit now demands. Because the American people are not "the masses"—they are 200 million individual persons who are discovering what they have lost, and are determined to get it back.

Our present leaders are out of touch with this new mood and cannot comprehend this new need. They see the future as bearing down on us. They are fearful of the future, fearful of the change it will bring, and they brace themselves for the shock that they know will come.

In the eyes of the fearful, tomorrow is a threat that must be faced; in the eyes of the hopeful, tomorrow is a vision that must be realized.

An American poet put it this way: "dive for dreams, or a slogan may topple you." We must turn away from the old slogans that trigger responses that are no longer responsive; we must dive for the dreams we can make come true.

The way to the future is not along the path of least resistance. We will only earn back our personal freedom along a path of great resistance.

The American spirit is presenting its demands today, as it did in different terms to generations before us. Once again, those demands require sacrifice and ingenuity:

The American spirit demands an explosion of education into the mind of every child in every corner of this land;

It demands a career—not just a job, but a career—open to every man and woman who has the capacity to get ahead;

It demands an end to the slamming of doors, with the answering echo of gunfire that we have heard in the past;

It demands a plunge into community service by each of us, rather than delegating compassion to government;

The American spirit of today demands that the helpless be cared for, and the hopeless be cared about;

It demands that there be greater rewards for initiative and hard work and self-reliance;

It demands that privacy be respected, that the individual be respected, that the law be respected.

Most of all, the American spirit today demands the self-determination of the human being. This means a shift from Federal rule to home rule, a shift from faceless manipulation to personal participation.

There is a mystery to America that its detractors have never been able to grasp.

Just when our idealism appears to be swamped in a sea of material wealth; just when our native morality seems to be flooded by a wave of crime and disorders; just when our international power and prestige appear frustrated by the ineptness of our leadership—something remarkable happens.

The American spirit wells up and we snap

out of it. We let the dark out of our cellar. We choose new leaders with new ideas and we tell them we're ready to make any sacrifice required to set our nation right.

We don't ask new leadership to put us back to sleep. We don't ask new leadership to fix everything without bothering us. Instead, we demand to know what we need to do—what each individual one of us must do.

At watershed moments like these, the unconquerable American spirit comes alive. We stand at a pivot point; the nation is poised to turn and move in the direction the spirit of America demands.

That is why I have been saying that the choice in this election year is perhaps the most important in our lives. If we fail to seize this moment, if we let slip this chance to recapture our personal freedom—the moment may never come again in our lifetime.

Therefore, let us not lightly dismiss the agony of the American spirit today as only "growing pains."

Let us recognize it as hunger pangs, for now is a time that our body politic hungers for new directions, new answers to new needs.

At moments like these throughout our history, it has been America's genius and good fortune to satisfy this appetite for orderly change. This generation of Americans shall not be the first in 200 years to deny the demands of the American spirit.

Rather, I believe this generation will choose to rise to the challenge: we shall promote the general welfare, yes—but we shall preserve our personal freedom as well.

We shall hold fast to the quality that made America great, as we reach out for new qualities that will make America greater.

Woodrow Wilson described the challenge of such a moment. The year was 1913. The nation was badly torn; a third party movement had split the majority vote. There was war in the Balkans that threatened to spread to the rest of the world.

In his first Inaugural Address, this is what Wilson told his countrymen: "Men's hearts wait upon us; men's lives hang in the balance; men's hopes call upon us to say what we will do. Who shall live up to the great trust? Who dares fail to try?"

In this campaign my fellow Americans, we can feel the American spirit stirring.

It calls upon us to make a mighty effort to rekindle our hope, our courage and our passion for personal freedom. We dare not fail to try.

The American spirit today demands an awareness of the need for change.

It requires the exploration of new horizons of justice.

It insists on the rediscovery of the worth of the individual.

It will accept nothing less than a reach for greatness.

The next President of the United States could possibly serve until 1976, the 200th anniversary of the birth of our nation.

That next President will lead this nation in its reach for greatness only if he summons a new "spirit of '76"—a spirit conceived in old glories, born to speak to its own time, destined to shape a glorious future.

GREEK COMMUNITY IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, last December, I had the pleasure and privilege of attending a banquet in which His Excellency Basil Vitsaxis, the Royal Ambassador of Greece to the United States, spoke. The occasion was the commemoration of the consecration of the Greek Orthodox Church in Atlanta, Ga.,

I wish now to share with my colleagues Ambassador Vitsaxis' interesting remarks about the intrinsic worth of a religious heritage such as that of the Greek community in the United States:

AMBASSADOR VITSAXIS' REMARKS

Once upon a time, in a village of a distant country, the pupils asked their teacher: "Where is Greece?"

"Greece—he answered—is near our hearts; mine as well as yours. She dwells in our Libraries in our Universities and in our Academies. She lives in our temples, in our churches and in our galleries; she is present in wherever there is light; for, light is her substance and her dwelling."

The teacher of our story had a concept of his own concerning geography, and strange was the answer he gave to his pupils. But indeed strange is the whole geography of the mind and heart. There, the countries are given a place, not on a map, big or small, but in the infinity of time and in the endless space of human soul.

Greece is not a country, or better, not only a country she is mainly a concept and a moral value, an idea which transcends the human boundaries of time and space and lives at its essence within the realm of the spirit.

I have chosen to tell you this little story, at the outset of the few remarks I am going to offer you tonight, because I felt that, instead of praise—a well deserved praise—for your achievements to which I shall revert in a moment—it would be only proper to share with you tonight some thoughts on the very essence of the guidelines of your community life: Hellenic Ideals and Greek Orthodoxy.

For many years now, since my first tour of duty in the United States back in 1957, the Community life of Americans of Greek Ancestry has been very close to my mind and heart. I have unceasingly tried, from the position where my country placed me, to listen to the heartbeats and especially to its problems and to its worries. For I consider, that, problems and worries in this realm are nothing but challenges to all of us, leading to new approaches, not destructive but constructive through the process of "synthesis" of old and new elements in the appropriate proportions. Let us, for a moment turn our attention—our affectionate attention to the worries and the problems.

There has never been an up-rooting without consequences; nor have new roots ever bloomed into life without struggle. The consequences of their up-rooting are still felt by the community of Greek ancestry.

With the deepest affection and, at the same time, with some concern, I follow its struggle to assert its own presence in this land, which it has chosen for its new country. With some concern, because the faith in the continuity—religious and otherwise—in the tradition in the ideals, which are its own by an ancient heritage, might be shaken.

In the struggle for survival, the tradition which acts as a life line between generations, wore thin. This life line which is both a guarantee and a promise. So the future seeming to be cut off from the past, became uncertain. The rest are but mere symptoms or consequences.

The tendencies to introduce foreign elements to our religious life, the gradual abandonment of the language, the very disbelief in the idea of unity in general, are the expression of the difficulties we are faced with. It is from this uncertainty that originate the differentiations between, what we call the generations of Americans of Greek ancestry, therefrom stems a movement for a so called religious liberalism—and all those consequences of the central cause: the uprooting. Of the deeper, personal uprooting which leads to the quest—the vain quest—for new foundations and traditions and denies to look at the old ones, its very own, which still today, as they always have been, are full of rich promise.

This is the difficulty in its essentials. Whether we approach it synthetically or analytically we arrive at the same conclusion. Can this difficulty be overcome?

Many believe that any attempt is romantic and naive and therefore vain. That it is a lost cause. Others think that the difficulty can still be overcome.

Yet, which is this "lost cause", what is the difficulty which can still be overcome. This question proves, I believe, that there is a difference in the approach of the question; and this difference leads to the cleavage between "optimists" and "pessimists".

If we aim at a community of Greek ancestry which would remain totally unaffected by its surrounding, if we should ask of it to remain faithful to the secondary and insignificant traits of the past, if, in other words, we should wish the third and fourth generations to differ in nothing or in very little from the pioneer generation, then we are naives and romantics. Then the struggle is futile and the cause lost.

If, however, we believe that it is not the details which are important, and that our great heritage—the great heritage of your community—religious and hellenic, is oecumenic, world embracing, and that it applies to all and always, like the daylight which is poured without distinction as to what it illuminates, then the cause takes a completely different aspect. It then concerns the eternal and undestructible values. The values that know no boundaries and are unaffected by the element of time.

The precepts of the Orthodox religion do stop before human boundaries. There are no boundaries for truth. And the hellenic ideals do not fear time, for they have conquered it.

So, with ideals which have been those of heritage, but which can and do belong to all men, the American community of Greek ancestry must feel, for it is, closely connected with the eternal human legacies of its very own past and upon them build its own future.

Eternal, is not only that, what has survived the long chain of centuries it is that, mainly that, which can be a guarantee for the future.

I, therefore, feel particularly happy to partake tonight to the joy of your community for the inauguration of its new magnificent church and facilities for community needs.

The building of a church is an act of faith. An act of faith to God, of course, but also an act of faith to your Past and to the future, an act of faith to yourself.

Speaking on another occasion I said that Past is nothing but a memory and future nothing but a dream and present does not exist unless it is a perfect blending of memories and dreams.

A perfect blending, of memories and dreams is your church we are inaugurating tomorrow. Memories of a glorious past and dreams for a bright future of our Greek Orthodox Community in this fascinating city of the South East and for that matter in this great country of yours as a whole.

Let me, in closing these remarks, convey to you on behalf of Greece and its deeply religious people and on behalf of the Government I have the honour to represent our warmest congratulations and our most heartfelt thanks.

You have offered a new tangible proof in this country that the Greek Orthodox faith

of ours, is a living faith! A faith for the alive; not only good for beyond the coldness of the grave, but a faith for the cheerful and the gay, a faith for the smiling and for the young. I am tempted to say "for the young of every age and of all ages."

OBSERVANCE OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UKRAINIAN INSURGENT ARMY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Volodymyr Y. Mayewsky, of the Committee for the Observance of the 25th Anniversary of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, who is a friend and constituent of mine, recently called my attention to a letter he wrote in early January to the editors of a number of national publications. Several of the newspapers have published his letter, but for the benefit of many Americans who did not have an opportunity to read it, I insert its full text at this point in the RECORD:

COMMITTEE FOR THE OBSERVANCE OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UKRAINIAN INSURGENT ARMY

DEAR SIR: Many families sitting down to their Christmas dinner this holiday season in America were missing a husband, father, son or brother who are languishing in POW camps in North Vietnam, often under conditions appallingly inhumane and brutal.

To the Ukrainian people, however, such a situation is nothing new. Members of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army including women, who fought bravely against both German Nazi and Russian Communist forces to free their homeland, have now been enduring the horrors of Siberian prison camps for more than 20 years—and no one seems to be particularly concerned. In both cases, Soviet Russia bears a heavy responsibility for its and Hanoi's POW policy. It is no coincidence that Alexander Shelepin, the Kremlin Politburo member and former head of the KGB, travelled to Hanoi three years ago to give the North Vietnamese the benefit of the KGB's experience in handling prisoners. There is little doubt that if Moscow brought pressure to bear on Hanoi, the POW policy would change overnight; but at this point Moscow has no more intention of doing this than it has of freeing the Ukrainian POWs in its own camps. Indeed, the Soviet Union last month successfully blocked a Human Rights resolution in the United Nations because it fears repercussions in its own prison camp empire.

In such a situation the President and Congress, as well as the United Nations and the the case of the Leningrad trial) a great deal to ease the plight of both American and country's news media, could do (as it was in Ukrainian POWs (and also all other prisoners and inmates in the USSR) by pointing out to the American people and the rest of the world Moscow's role and responsibility in the matter. Everyone should do what he can to muster public opinion and force Moscow and Hanoi to abide by the Geneva Convention and the UN Declaration of Human Rights so that the suffering of these forgotten human beings can be ended as quickly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

Press Secretary.

VOLODYMYR Y. MAYEWSKY,

PRESIDENT'S REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very well-reasoned editorial endorsement of the President's reorganization proposal appeared in the January 26 issue of the Chicago Daily News. While expressing approval of the Chief Executive's plans for streamlining the Federal departments, the writer also points out some of the difficulties that he will face in securing legislative enactment.

I most emphatically agree with the editorial's closing word:

If the plan falters it will be opponents of change who must carry the burden of proof.

The editorial follows:

NIXON'S BIG RESHUFFLE

"Change is hard," President Nixon conceded when he confronted Congress with proposals for sweeping changes in government organization. And although the need for change in any number of musclebound institutions of government can be readily demonstrated, the road to achievement is long and lonesome, and strewn with booby traps.

The elements of Mr. Nixon's plan to restructure federal departments are soundly conceived. Even to the untrained eye, it is clear that the functions of Cabinet officers overlap at many points, and at lower levels the mushroom growth of federal agencies in recent years has created a bewildering jungle.

The proposed new structure would leave only four of the present departments intact—State, Defense, Treasury and Justice. The remaining seven (now that the Post Office has been set aside) would be refined into four, under the headings of Human Resources, Community Development, Economic Development and Natural Resources.

This formulation grew out of a study under the chairmanship of Roy L. Ash, president of Litton Industries, and seeks to apply some of the management techniques of big business to the biggest business of them all, the federal government. But the political touch is also evident in the proposed labels. "Natural Resources" has a certain ring that is lacking in the Department of the Interior, which would be the nucleus of the new department and who could resist the appeal of a whole wing of government dedicated to "Human Resources"?

Plainly, there would still be some overlap, for every department meets all the others coming 'round the bend. Economic development doesn't exist in a neat little compartment walled off from human and natural resources or community development. Coordinating the whole remains the job of the President. But merging most of the functions of Commerce, Labor, Agriculture and Transportation into the single Economic Development category would surely make sense.

The obstacles to such sweeping changes, however, are formidable. Long-established relationships between special interest groups and their government would be severely scrambled. The farm lobby, to cite only one example, cannot be expected to welcome the disappearance of a Cabinet-level Department of Agriculture. The reorganization would also disrupt any number of cozy positions of influence on congressional committees. The committees themselves would have to be reshuffled to align with the new look in the Executive branch. Between the external lobbying and the foot-dragging within Congress, the reorganization plan isn't likely to give the proverbial snail much competition.

Nevertheless, the challenge has been hurled and Congress can't very well ignore it. Mr. Nixon can carry his appeal again to the people, on the same grounds that he laid down in his State of the Union message: The reorganization is needed to make government more responsive to the people, as well as more efficient.

That's an impressive selling point, and if the plan falters it will be the opponents of change who must carry the burden of proof.

AMERICAN YOUTH VICTIMS OF LIBERAL ENVIRONMENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that some 10,000 Washington area teenagers ran away from home in 1970, should provoke serious discussions as to the cause of and solution to this crisis.

I doubt that many will buy the bleeding heart theory that the action of the youthful runaways can be attributed solely to discipline in the home and parental control. Rather, I feel that we should reassess the liberal environment of our Nation's Capital and the contributing influences of television, radio, and the press in creating an unrealistic environment of overpermissiveness, nonconformation, and rebelliousness that is rampant in this area; to say nothing about the drugs, pornography, and a well coordinated and sponsored program to discourage self-respect, responsibility, and pride in parents, home, and country.

The greatest threat to future generation in our Capital City area is the lack of morality.

Given such an environment, we are further advised by a parent in Fairfax County, Va., that the public school system in that county has proposed a Family Life Education program which includes courses and discussions to further alienate the parent-youth relationship.

With the Nation's conscience focused on pollution and environmental dangers, it is time that the parents of America awaken to the threat to our youth from immoral influences in a so-called liberal revolutionary society which seeks to justify itself behind the veneer of advancing a pollution free environment.

I hereby insert in the RECORD the following news clippings:

[From the Evening Star, January 30, 1971]

FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION

Sir: Recently the Fairfax County Board of Education held an open hearing on the proposed "Family Life Education Program" to be used in the Fairfax County Public School System. The majority of these attending the hearing were overwhelmingly against the program, a complete and comprehensive program from kindergarten to the 12th grade.

According to the manual, one of the goals of this program is "to afford each individual opportunities for gaining knowledge which would help mold attitudes and practices that are socially acceptable and meaningful." Whose attitudes and practices will our children learn? Is this not an invasion into the privacy of our homes?

I wish to quote several other gems from this manual:

(1) "Cite instances where parental guidance is and is not needed."

(2) "Discuss acceptable and unacceptable types of parental discipline."

(3) "Conclude that family conflicts and disagreements are normal and have students suggest sensible solutions." Won't it be delightful to have your family arguments discussed in the classroom?

Is this the type of help that we parents need? Is this the type of program that we wish for our children and all the children attending the Fairfax County Public School System?

MARGERY G. PFLUG.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 31, 1971]

PARENTS CRY: "SHE ISN'T THE KIND TO RUN AWAY"

(By Paul Hodge)

On Dec. 29, three days after her 14th birthday, Terri Lynn Whisman buttoned her suede jacket, the one with the fringe, walked out of her family's Takoma Park apartment and became one of the 10,000 Washington-area teenagers to run away from home in 1970.

From a family of strict Seventh Day Adventists, she had never seen a movie, ridden in a bus, had a date or even been to Georgetown, her parents said, before she left to visit the apartment of a friend.

Her parents, Carl and Loretta Whisman, immediately called, and then sent pictures to, police in Takoma Park, Prince George's County and Washington. They also notified the FBI.

The police, inundated with calls, letters and reports of runaways from all over the nation, said they "couldn't do anything," according to Mrs. Whisman. "They've got so many missing," she said.

They also told the Whismans not to worry. The majority of runaways return within a few days and most others straggle in within a few months. A few never return home, but almost all are eventually accounted for, police noted.

But the Whismans did worry. After a week they began leaving letters and messages in hippie hangouts around Dupont Circle and Georgetown.

They even spent one Saturday night parked in front of the Hot Shoppes Jr. on Wisconsin Avenue in Georgetown, watching crowds of milling street people.

"I'd never been to Georgetown before myself," said Mrs. Whisman, who attended the same Seventh Day Adventist School in Takoma Park as her daughter.

After two and one-half hours of watching and waiting, she wasn't sure she would be able to recognize her daughter if she saw her. "They've got some nice looking children down there," she said, "but they all look alike."

The helplessness and unhappiness of the Whismans, who have now gone a month without a word from their daughter, is an experience shared by the families of an estimated 500,000 children who run away from home each year, according to the New York City Youth Board.

New York and California are the destinations of many runaways with Washington considered the third most popular youth mecca. At least 500 youths under 18 are hiding here on any one day of the year, according to police.

One of the major reasons for an almost three-fold increase in runaways in the Washington area in the past five years, police say, is that children now have a place to run away to.

Runaways in the old days went off with the circus or fairs, police say. They were easy to track down, and were usually lonely and ready to come home.

The 12-year-old boy who ran off with the circus here last year and the two youths who ran off with horse shows were all quickly returned home, police observed.

UNDERGROUND COMMUNITY

Today, however, runaways can virtually disappear in the underground community that exists here and in many cities, reassured and safe in their numbers, room and board and free medical attention offered, catered to and written about in their own underground newspapers.

"Leaving Home for Fun and Profit," a two-page compendium on running away published in Washington's "Quicksilver Times" tells how to "split successfully from your home" forever or just for a few days "to frighten the old folks back home into their senses."

It tells how to acquire fake identification, driver's license, library and credit cards, bogus Security and Selective Service cards and even a fake birth certificate. It abounds with hints about disguise (dye your hair, throw away your braces, change your clothes), shoplifting—known as "ripping off"—look out for mirrors and television cameras and "be cautious, be quick, look confident, thank-you and come back soon") and generally how to survive like an undercover agent in a foreign land.

The Quicksilver Times article also recommends that every serious runaway know "a set of 'on-call' parents," a willing couple versed in a fake family background for police to call. Just remember, the article concludes "act scared when police call them."

Once discovered, a runaway under 18 can be forced to return home unless he requests, and a juvenile court grants, some kind of foster care. But little can be done to prevent him from running off again.

Merritt Raymond, regional supervisor of Maryland's youth services, says, "The family structure, close-knit groups, are not important to the child any more." Even the ethnic groups "which traditionally have had strong family ties . . . Chinese and Jewish families . . . are no longer what they used to be," says Raymond.

Adults tend to think of runaways as problem children, says Raymond, "without realizing that they, the adult members of the family are part of the problem."

ORDINARY CHILDREN

Studies of runaways, such as the 1964 report on 1,000 Prince George's County runaways, reveal that most do not come from broken homes as was once presumed, but are ordinary children, "very much like their non-runaway counterparts."

What causes a child to run away in the first place is that parents frequently are "strict to the point of being unrealistic . . . turning their homes into convents . . . requiring conformity in nonessential matters such as hair cuts," says William Zaslow, 22, a counselor with Maryland's Department of Juvenile Services.

"We've had many runaways over haircuts and one even ran away because his parents burned his blue jeans. Parents are definitely forcing the issue in many cases."

Children, on the other hand, are frequently just as intolerant and impatient as they accuse their parents of being, says Zaslow—don't-trust-anyone-over-30 school of thinking.

"Kids get two weeks restriction then split without a word. Nothing wrong, just that their parents wouldn't let them stay out after 10 p.m. So they left . . . the kids aren't willing to stick around and try to help their parents, they just reject them. Kids should try to make friends with them. Some really good people are parents," concludes Zaslow.

Counseling and compromises by both parents and children are recommended by juvenile officials in most runaway cases. But such counseling usually does not occur unless a runaway is reported missing, officially declared delinquent and apprehended by police.

Maryland's Juvenile Services Department, established in 1967 and expanded in 1969, is still relatively unknown and unconsulted. Its staff of psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers—offering probably the best juvenile counseling in the Washington area—see relatively few runaways.

The Prince Georges division saw only a few hundred of the approximately 2,500 children who ran away in the county in 1970 (county police only began keeping count of runaways last August, but has been averaging will over 200 runaways a month).

Such counseling is outside Maryland's police-juvenile court system and is credited with helping to solve juvenile problems without giving children criminal records. In November, 1970, for instance, the number of juvenile cases handled informally by Juvenile Services increased 517 over November, 1969, says Raymond, while cases handled "formally" by the courts decreased by 133.

UNOFFICIAL GROUPS

A number of unofficial groups also have been found to act as intermediaries between parents and runaways, including Washington's Runaway House, at 18th Street and Riggs Place NW.

Praised by almost all suburban police and youth officials, it is begrudgingly given sanction by Washington police. It actually houses runaways—more than 1,000 in its 2½-year existence—and technically breaks the law by harboring delinquent children. Its operators refuse to divulge information on any runaways in the house, but encourage the runaways themselves to contact their parents.

Police have used subterfuge to force their way into Runaway House in search of a particular runaway on six or seven occasions, says William Treanor, 27, founder and director of the house and two nearby group foster homes. Treanor says no court has issued a warrant to enter Runaway House.

Many runaways dont' like the youth-hostel atmosphere of Runaway House, which prohibits liquor and drugs and has separate floors for boys and girls, preferring the crash pads and communes that abound in the Washington area.

Other groups help runaways find the crash pads, food, clothing and medical help. These include Free Clinic in the basement of the Georgetown Lutheran Church, financed by grants from the Junior League and the Social Hygiene Society, Grace Episcopal Church, the Switchboard—an underground telephone service which also offers advice to callers—and the Quicksilver Times, which offers free classified ads.

The Whismans already have contacted most of these groups, leaving notes to Terri Lynn on bulletin boards already full of forlorn messages from parents of runaways.

The Whismans have now reluctantly concluded that their daughter has gone to California, Florida or New York, perhaps accompanied by a 13-year-old boy who ran away from the same Takoma Park Seventh Day Adventist School about the same time.

They have prepared flyers with her picture and vital statistics, to send to out-of-state police departments. They are also placing an advertisement in a new publication called

the National Missing Youth Locator—$28.50 per ad—which mails weekly bulletins to police stations around the country.

SUSPECT FOUL PLAY

Like most parents of runaways, they feel their child's disappearance is the result of foul play although police assure them there is no evidence to believe so. They refuse to believe that their daughter has rejected them and voluntarily left.

"It's a mystery," says Mrs. Whisman. "The kid has never been two blocks away by herself. She isn't the kind to run away. She doesn't even know her way downtown."

"Terri never showed she was unhappy and she had more freedom than I ever had," adds the mother. "I've never been to a movie and all I did as a girl was go to church on weekend nights . . . not too far from Takoma Park . . . and everybody was happy."

"We never spanked her and she's had plenty of money. Why, she has clothes in her closet with the price tag still on them . . . and she had plenty of records," says Mrs. Whisman.

The only thing Mrs. Whisman could think of that her daughter had wanted and been denied was a maxi coat.

"She'd wanted a maxi for two years. But I said no. They are horrible looking. My neighbors love her and gave her some money to buy one. But I said no maxi. But you know, I wish I hadn't now. She's out there in the cold . . . all she had on was that little suede jacket, with the fringe."

THE FUEL SHORTAGE

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 22, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, for still another winter this Nation has had to grapple with a fuel shortage, a shortage which particularly affects those of us from the Northeast. Attempts to locate the particular agency or policy responsible usually end up in a shouting match with those affected hurling charges and countercharges. The following article from the current issue of Consumer Reports shows how futile this exercise is. It points out how eight agencies of the Federal Government, in addition to the several State regulatory agencies, all contribute to the problem by working at cross purposes. The result is the individual is often left holding the bag, and the Nation, particularly the Northeast, left with dangerously low fuel reserves.

I believe a unified approach to fuel policy is necessary before the country can ever hope to solve "the fuel crisis." A good example of this kind of approach is the recent Environmental Protection Agency. As with energy, an excess of regulatory departments and agencies, frequently pulling in opposite directions, have plagued attempts to administer effective solutions for the protection of the environment. EPA was created by consolidating those agencies scattered throughout the huge Federal bureaucracy into one function to coordinate all efforts to preserve our environment. Serious consideration should be given to a similar consolidation of agencies charged with regulating the production and distribution of energy. It is evident the present patchwork approach is more elaborate and less effective than a device constructed by the late Rube Goldberg. The following article from Consumer Reports is of interest:

COLD FACTS ABOUT THE FUEL SHORTAGE

Remember last summer's brownouts—those miserably hot days when the electric power companies in some sections of the country reduced their voltage and deliberately blacked out entire areas to avoid massive power failures? Remember the curious spectacle of utility company executives, after having spent millions of dollars to encourage the purchase and use of air-conditioners and other electrical appliances, pleading with customers to turn them off?

The utility companies muddled through that summer crisis. Now there's a winter crisis. As winter approached, a White House official said, "The number one problem facing electric utilities in the cold months . . . is getting adequate supplies of coal, oil and natural gas, not generating capacity." By mid-December the situation had eased somewhat, but fuel reserves remained precariously low.

Because of the shortage, fuel prices had already reached an all-time high by December. The price of coal was up 56 per cent from 1969. Residual oil, which is used to generate electricity and to heat large buildings, was up 47 per cent. As a result, electric bills were rising, too. The Tennessee Valley Authority, a Federally owned utility, was among the first to act, increasing its rates 23 per cent. Nationwide, according to one estimate, higher fuel costs will raise consumers' electric bills by $1 billion this year.

The cost of heating homes was rising steeply, too. Furnace oil has skyrocketed, in some areas by as much as 40 per cent. Natural gas, which is regulated by the Federal Power Commission and state public service commissions, was more stable in price, but supplies are at an all-time low. Joseph Swidler, chairman of the New York State Public Service Commission, reports that there will not be enough natural gas to provide continuous service for all industrial users this winter. The situation in other states is similar, according to Mr. Swidler. The Federal Power Commission chairman, Josn Nassikas, says that the demand for natural gas this winter will exceed the supply by 3 billion cubic feet per day—the amount needed by a very large city.

WHAT HAPPENED

The shortage of fuels stems from a variety of seemingly unrelated factors. There is no immediate shortage of coal, oil or natural gas underground. The nation's reserves of all three fuels should be adequate for some years to come.

The four major sources of electrical energy—oil, natural gas, coal and uranium for nuclear generators—are to a certain extent interchangeable. Thus, a shortage of one fuel increases the demand for other fuels and, in times like these, can lead to a general shortage. Much of the current difficulty can be traced to the Atomic Energy Commission, which oversold the immediate importance of nuclear energy. Coal companies, convinced that uranium fuel was about to come into its own, grew reluctant to open new coal mines. Railroads, similarly misled, cut back on purchasers of coal cars. But the construction of nuclear generators has fallen behind schedule. None of the 10 new plants scheduled to begin operation this winter will be ready on time. That alone has created an unexpected demand for 20 million additional tons of coal.

At the same time the U.S. has been *exporting* coal at a fantastically increased rate. In 1961, 34 million tons were shipped abroad; the figure has now nearly doubled to 66 million tons a year. Increased exports have intensified the shortage of railroad cars for domestic deliveries. To make matters worse, as many as 20,000 coal cars were for some time tied up at East Coast dock areas, partly because of a quirk in coal-car rental rates. Under rates set by the Interstate Commerce Commission, it was said to be cheaper for an East Coast railroad to keep cars standing empty in freight yards than to return them to Midwest mines. Coal cars piled up, moreover, while waiting for ships to become available—or while waiting for coal prices to go higher.

THE POLLUTION FACTOR

New air-pollution-control laws in many cities limit the sulfur content of fuels. That increases the demand for coal with low sulfur content. But adequate supplies of low-sulfur coal have yet to be developed because the relatively high-sulfur coal in Ohio, Illinois and West Virginia is cheaper to deliver to major users than low-sulfur coal from Wyoming, North Dakota and other Western states. As a final touch, coal production of late has been slowed by a new and much-needed mine-safety law, which forced a number of mines to close, and by a series of wildcat strikes related to mine safety.

Faced with a shortage of coal, and particularly of low-sulfur coal, many manufacturers and power companies might have converted to clean-burning natural gas, had it, too, not have been in short supply. The major oil companies, which dominate the natural gas industry, claim that the gas shortage results from unrealistically low prices set by the Federal Power Commission. The industry says it just doesn't pay to search for and develop new supplies.

Critics of the industry, such as Mr. Swidler and Lee White, another former FPC chairman, accuse the industry of deliberately holding back on developing new wells in order to create a gas shortage that would force the FPC to grant a price increase. Mr. Swidler claims the industry "has virtually been on strike in an effort to discredit Federal regulation of gas prices."

Much of the nation's natural gas reserves lie beneath the waters of the outer continental shelf. In contrast to off-shore oil, this gas can be developed with little fear of polluting the ocean. The U.S. Department of the Interior has sold some 1000 leases for oil and gas exploration along the Texas and Louisiana coast. According to a recent report prepared by a group of state public utility commissioners chaired by Mr. Swidler, the incentive for rapid development of many leases is minimal, since they were sold for amounts so low that the big petroleum companies, which bought most of the leases, could easily afford to delay production pending a rate increase. Mr. Swidler's group suggests, therefore, that the Interior Department exercise its authority to require expeditious development of offshore gas properties, that it put additional leases up for sale, and that it change the bidding procedure to encourage small producers to participate in the development of the outer continental shelf by permitting lesses to pay for their leases over an extended time.

OUT OF OIL

Contrived or not, the gas shortage coupled with the shortage of coal has created an unprecedented demand for oil. The kind of oil in shortest supply is residual oil, which as the name implies is basically the sludgy stuff left over after the refining process has removed the lighter, more profitable oils and gasolines from crude oil. Twenty years ago the output of U.S. oil refineries necessarily included 23 per cent residual oil. Since then, millions of dollars have been invested in new refining processes to produce more spe-

cialized petroleum products and less residual oil, so that now the production of residual oil has been reduced, on average, to 7 per cent of the refinery output.

Because of its low price, residual oil makes a good fuel for heating big buildings and for generating electricity. U.S. users are heavily dependent on Venezuela for residual oil. With coal and gas temporarily in short supply, the natural course would have been to increase imports. But it now turns out that residual oil, and especially low-sulfur residual, is in short supply throughout the world. Until recently the demand for residual had been increasing at an annual rate of only 2 per cent. This winter, however, demand is up 15 per cent.

A tanker shortage proved the crowning blow to U.S. residual-oil supplies. Last May a Syrian bulldozer "accidentally" cut a key oil pipeline carrying 500,000 barrels of oil a day to the Mediterranean for shipment by tanker to Europe. At the same time, Libya put the squeeze on oil prices at its own fields by reducing production by 500,000 barrels a day. With the Suez Canal already closed, European nations are being forced to ship oil from the Persian Gulf all the way around the southern tip of Africa. The vastly longer voyage is responsible for the current shortage of tankers.

ALL THIS AND A QUOTA, TOO

Oil industry spokesmen exploited the tanker shortage and the uncertainties of Middle East and North African politics as object lessons to those who have been trying to convince President Nixon to remove a 12-year-old quota on the import of crude oil and most refinery products. The oilmen argued that those events proved the wisdom of America's not being dependent on foreign supplies of oil. The President, if he had not been previously persuaded to accept the oilmen's point of view, has accepted it now by putting aside all consideration of abandoning the quota system.

The oil quota in fact intensified the current fuel shortage by discouraging foreign refineries from producing more of the low-sulfur residual oil so badly needed right now. Unlike other petroleum products, residual oil may be imported in unlimited quantity for use in the eastern U.S.

Thus, there is a ready and open market in this country for desulferized residual oil from overseas.

The catch is that the desulfurization process reduces by 30 percent the residual on produced from a barrel of crude oil, while increasing proportionally the amount of gasoline and other oil products. Because of the U.S. import quota, additional foreign gasoline and other oil products cannot be sold here. That being so, foreign refineries have been unwilling to manufacture the desulfurized residual oil, which *can* be sold here.

American refineries have run into similar problems. In 1967 Gulf Oil Co. asked the Interior Department's permission to import high-sulfur residual oil, desulfurize it and sell both the cleaned-up residual and the gasoline and other products that would have come out of the process. The proposal was rejected.

A major foreign source of naturally low-sulfur oil is the North African nation of Libya. The U.S.-owned Occidental Oil Co. controls extremely rich oil fields in Libya and wants to import low-sulfur Libyan crude. It has offered to guarantee that a relatively high percentage would be turned into residual oil. In exchange, Occidental has asked for a free-trade zone to be created at Machiasport, Me., permitting Occidental to build facilities there for refining Libyan crude oil imported outside of the existing quota. Thus far, the plan has not won approval. Indeed, it raises serious environmental questions. But according to one expert on residual oil, "If the Occidental proposal and others like it are rejected, it is difficult to see from where any large amounts of very low-sulfur residual oil are to come."

HIGH COST OF QUOTAS

Restrictions on imports of low-cost foreign oil for over a decade have cost the U.S. consumer as much as 5¢ per gallon of gasoline and as much as 4¢ per gallon of home-heating oil, according to one expert. The total burden of oil-import quotas on consumers was estimated by a Cabinet-level Presidential task force last February at $5.2 billion a year. At expected consumption levels 10 years from now, the figure is expected to reach $8.4-billion a year. The burden falls unevenly across the country, in general getting heavier toward the East. The quota is said to cost an average of $17 a year per person in California, $22 a year in Illinois, and $35 a year in Massachusetts. For a family of four in Boston, that means an extra $140 a year for gasoline, heating oil and other petroleum products.

The quota was imposed in 1959 by President Eisenhower, acting under authority of a law permitting the President to restrict imports that pose a threat to the national security. Then, as now, supporters of the quota argued that foreign competition would destroy much of the domestic oil industry, leaving the country dangerously dependent on foreign oil. President Eisenhower's closest adviser, Sherman Adams, later acknowledged, however, that the President's decision to limit oil imports had more to do with protecting the U.S. oil industry than with national security.

A majority of the 1970 oil-import task force, including the Secretaries of Defense, State and Treasury, reported to President Nixon that the oil import program "bears no reasonable relation to current requirements for protection either of the national economy or of essential oil consumption." The quota, the majority said, "is no longer acceptable."

Government oil policy has not only failed to guarantee the nation a comfortable fuel supply this winter, but has also failed to develop adequate long-term reserves of oil. Indeed, U.S. oil reserves are on the decline. It is therefore very difficult to understand how the national security has been served by a system of import quotas that forces the immediate consumption of domestic oil at times when foreign oil is cheap and plentiful.

The tanker shortage provides a convenient but unsatisfactory explanation. True, if import restrictions were lifted at once, there would not be enough tankers to carry the amount of foreign oil needed here. But the Libyan crisis shows signs of abating, an unprecedented number of new tankers are on the ways, and increased tanker rates may encourage ship owners to delay the retirement of old, formerly uneconomical tankers and to equip cargo ships, grain and ore carriers to carry crude oil. Indeed, a director of Royal Dutch Shell predicts a surplus of tankers within the year even if the situation in Libya and Syria remains unchanged.

WINTER OF DISCONTENT

The energy crisis is traceable largely to hydra-headed and uncoordinated government regulations.

The Texas Railroad Commission and the Louisiana Department of Conservation largely determine how much domestic crude oil will be pumped from the ground.

The Interior Department administers coal mine safety standards, oil quotas, and the development of off-shore oil wells and vast, untapped lodes of shale oil.

The Atomic Energy Commission lobbies for atomic energy.

The Interstate Commerce Commission affects the coal industry through its regulation of the railroads.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has jurisdiction over air pollution standards.

The Federal Power Commission regulates the interstate price of natural gas.

State public utility commissions regulate the local price of natural gas.

The Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission enforce the antitrust laws under which oil companies have been allowed to enter the coal and uranium business. The oil industry now owns 25 per cent of the nation's coal production and 45 per cent of its known uranium reserves.

The Treasury Department administers and interprets tax laws that have an important bearing on domestic oil and gas exploration. (A Treasury Department ruling, for example, has actually encouraged huge international oil companies, such as Jersey Standard, Gulf, Texaco and Mobil, to explore for oil overseas instead of at home by deducting overseas royalties from their Federal income taxes.)

Responsibility for the maintenance of an adequate fuel supply clearly cannot be entrusted to a host of agencies working at cross-purposes. Nor can it be entrusted to the forces of the market. Private industry's quest for profits does not necessarily coincide with public needs—it does not, for example, produce enough emergency supplies of residual oil when gasoline is more profitable.

Existing regulation not only fragments the public interest. It is also a one-sided affair, shielding the politically powerful oil industry from the price competition of an unrestricted supply of crude oil and petroleum products while leaving the consumer to pay the bill at times when shortages force up prices. Rational management of the nation's energy needs will demand intelligent and well coordinated use of regulation, freed from the shackles of petroleum politics. Economist Walter Adams summed up the situation at a Senate hearing:

"You cannot make speeches about noninterference by Government and cite Jeffersonian texts on the Fourth of July and in the country clubs and counting houses and then come up to Capitol Hill and lobby for governmental interference which will protect special and vested interests, not of the poor and the underprivileged, but of the powerful, the wealthy, the favored. When Government is used as a mask for privilege, then it becomes an Elizabethian institution. I do not want to be corny but this is what the American Revolution was all about."

SEAMAN DAVID SIMMONS—A DEDICATED SERVICEMAN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, during the second session of the 91st Congress, I inserted in the RECORD a letter written by Seaman David Simmons, a young PBR sailor, to the newspaper of the university he had previously attended, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume. 116, part 12, page 16845.

In his letter, Simmons told about the cooperation in combat between the South Vietnamese and American sailors, and he described the inhumane atrocities of the Vietcong against the South Vietnamese, especially against children.

Simmons concluded his letter with these reflections which are just as

apropos today as they were when written:

But to some of you back home, these are other peoples problems. You think you don't have to worry about things like this back "in the world." Well, Jack, look around. What is happening now is the start. And man it is going to get a whole lot worse if some people don't open their eyes.

Right now Americans are being killed by other Americans. I don't mean just the few who are killed in "dissent turning to violence." I mean the hundreds and thousands who are being killed here because the communists have had their confidence bolstered by the protesters and the violence and a slanted news media in the United States.

I want to come home to my wife and my 8-month-old son. I want to return to LSU and finish the two semesters I have left there. I want to live and work in the United States, but not the way it sounds now. It's almost safer here. Here, it's almost over, one way or another. There, it's just beginning.

Seaman David Simmons was recently awarded the Navy Commendation Medal for "untiring devotion to duty and courage under fire in keeping with the highest traditions of the U.S. naval service."

I am proud to represent an area and people which produces such a courageous and dedicated young American. I take pride in inserting the citation of Simmons' meritorious service following my remarks:

CITATION

The Secretary of the Navy takes pleasure in presenting the Navy Commendation Medal to David L. Simmons, Seaman, United States Navy, for service as set forth in the following:

"For meritorious service while serving with friendly foreign forces engaged in armed conflict against the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong communist aggressors in the Republic of Vietnam from October 1969 to September 1970. While serving as a gunner on river patrol boats attached to River Division Five Nine Four, Seaman Simmons participated in one hundred seventy-seven combat patrols and engaged the enemy on twenty-three occasions. During those patrols, he boarded and searched numerous junks and sampans, interdicted cross river traffic, enforced curfew, inserted and extracted friendly forces in hostile territory and provided fire support for besieged units and outposts. On the night of 10 April 1970, while en route to waterborne guardpost, his boat detected an evading sampan. Seaman Simmons immediately opened fire while his patrol simultaneously came under intense enemy rocket and automatic weapons fire. Reacting quickly, he directed his guns against the enemy's firing positions, laying down an accurate volley of fire which silenced the enemy. His quick actions facilitated the advantage to his own units and inflicted casualties on the enemy force. Seaman Simmons' exemplary professionalism, untiring devotion to duty and courage under fire were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service."

The Combat Distinguishing Device is authorized.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF POINT PARK COLLEGE, PITTSBURGH, PA.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we in Pittsburgh are proud of the accomplishments our city has made in the past 10 years. We are fortunate indeed that we have so many civic minded citizens, who dedicate their time and effort for the betterment of our community.

Willard F. Rockwell, Jr., chairman of the board of North American Rockwell has devoted much of his time to the growth and development of Point Park College, an urban center of higher education. Mr. Rockwell, chairman of the board of Point Park College and Arthur M. Blum, president of Point Park have guided Point Park College to its present excellence in the field of education.

Recently, Mr. Rockwell and Mr. Blum addressed a corporate and foundation meeting of Point Park College in Pittsburgh, commemorating Point Park's 10th anniversary. It is a pleasure to place their addresses in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

ADDRESSES OF ARTHUR M. BLUM, PRESIDENT AND WILLARD F. ROCKWELL, JR., CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD POINT PARK COLLEGE AT THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COLLEGE PITTSBURGH, PA.

REMARKS OF ARTHUR M. BLUM

Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to Point Park College. Our purpose in inviting you to be with us today is two fold. First, to show our appreciation for the part you have played in the achievements of Point Park College during our first decade of service. And secondly, to share with you our goals for the future.

It was in 1960, that Point Park College was chartered by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as a private, non-profit junior college. In April, 1966, the Commonwealth granted the petition of the College for a charter change and after examination by a Commission of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the College was admitted to membership in the Association as fully accredited baccalaureate institution in December, 1968.

Currently, Point Park College offers fifteen baccalaureate major programs in the Liberal Arts and Science and fourteen in the Liberal Arts professions.

Since 1961, the full-time student body has increased just over 664%; and the increase in the full-time faculty has kept pace in numbers and faculty.

Today we celebrate our Tenth Anniversary. Let's consider the first decade of the College's history in light of the interesting sixties, thereby drawing analogies between trends of that era and directions in which the College has been moving:

1. In the field of Conservation-Point Park College is cooperating with the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy in the operation of educational programs at the Wildflower Reserve, where a Comprehensive Conservation Program for our own students, innercity children, and adults has now been launched.

2. Through an affiliation with the Allegheny Round Table, the College provides weekly forums for the discussion of current, social, environmental and political issues. These are shared with the community by means of radio and T.V.

3. Within the College, a consortium of the performing arts has emerged resulting in multi-media performing arts programs. For the past two summers the Pittsburgh Playhouse, the Pittsburgh Ballet, and the American Wind Symphony have collaborated in producing the Pittsburgh Festival of the Arts. The addition of the 28-hour Environmental Circus, in 1970, brought to the Festival still a new dimension.

The College's Department of Education is now operating Point Park Academy, a laboratory school of the performing arts for high school age youngsters.

4. Committed to community action, the College is rendering service in a number of areas. For the Pittsburgh Model Cities Agency, the College is conducting a summer creative arts program in the Hill and Lower Oakland—a Visual Arts Program, expanding the Part-time Playhouse classes and Television-Radio Photography training in cooperation with our Journalism department.

This year the Pittsburgh Ballet will provide four free performances, and will perform in many schools and colleges. Under the U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Program, nineteen New Careerists are working toward degrees at the College while employed in service-oriented jobs.

5. During the completion of Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle our own Lawrence Hall has been renovated and converted into a dormitory and student union. The rooms in the new addition to Lawrence Hall have provided a faculty dining room, a ballet studio, and an art gallery. The upper floors of Lawrence Hall provide residence facilities for 400 men students. On the opposite side of Wood Street, adjacent to Academic Hall, Thayer Hall houses 379 women students. Plans for an expanded College Library will provide our neighbors with an esthetic experience. The architect's sketches of a roof garden above the two-story library and glass-walled Thayer Hall give promise of a handsome facade toward the Gateway and Point State Park. It will also provide our students and faculty with additional study space that is vital to our academic programs.

PROJECTION

As we embark on our second decade, sensitive to new issues and challenges, we accept the responsibility to provide relevant programs and to maintain our flexibility. Our planning includes consideration of the following:

1. Provision for additional educational programs for younger women who may have postponed college or dropped out of college, and for mature women, who desire to finish college work.

2. Continuing development of the area between the College and the Monongahela River—some six blocks or more of land which has not yet been included in the Renaissance. We will continue to be innovative in circular design to meet changing academic needs.

Many of you have visited our campus before. For you we have planned an abbreviated tour to include only the most recent innovations. For our guests who have not visited us in the past we have planned a tour of additional areas of the College so that you may see what has been happening at the College during this first decade. Neither tour will last more than twenty minutes. Both tours will conclude in the faculty dining room so that you may pick up your coats. At that time my staff and I will be happy to discuss with you what you have seen on the tour and answer your questions.

Thank you all for sharing in this joyous event and best wishes during this holiday season.

REMARKS OF WILLARD F. ROCKWELL, JR.

President Blum has given you a pretty good picture of Point Park's past, present, and future. He's given a clear and concise view of this dynamic, young school that has established itself in our community here as a major independent institution of higher education.

This is the reason I have invited you here today. I wanted each of you to see first hand and to hear of the accomplishments of Point Park College. Only with an in-depth picture can you be made aware of the areas in which our school can continue to grow with your interest and support.

During the years I have worked with Point Park I have developed a great appreciation for what the College has done. I have seen the growth through stages—as Art Blum outlined for you—from Pittsburgh's first junior college to a fully accredited four year institution in less than 10 short years. I have seen it, admired it, and proudly helped to guide it. I am also prepared to continue my financial support and I hope each of you will choose to join us in a development program.

As foundation and corporate leaders in this community, you have traditionally appraised the future of education and provided leadership in its programs. The greatest problem of higher education is money. Tuition alone, regardless of the enrollment, is not adequate to meet growing needs. Tuitions are used to offset normal operating expenses, salaries, supplies, services, and to a lesser degree, maintenance of the physical facilities. Unfortunately, Point Park as yet, does not have significant endowment income and our independent status rules out a share of government program subsidies.

We have no illusions about the magnitude of our job. We speak to you today to appraise you of our immediate and long range needs for capital improvement, endowment, and academic programs income.

We are prepared to launch a two million dollar development program and in a few days we will invite each of you to share in the expansion of this institution.

During the past we feel that we have managed the fiscal affairs of this college in a business-like manner and used community funds in a judicious way.

As you have read, all private colleges are in serious financial trouble. We, too, are faced with those same inflationary costs confronting every institution of higher learning. However, through sound fiscal management and maximum utilization of staff and facilities we approach you from a position of strength, not financial panic. With your help and your support we can continue to maintain our high level of academic excellence and look forward to a future of even greater development and growth.

REALISTIC DETERRENCE: INFERIORITY ACCEPTED—II

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Hilaire Belloc, in "A General Sketch of the European War," said:

> Every war, then, arises from some conflict of wills between two human groups, each intent upon some political or civic purpose conflicting with that of his opponent.

Wars, as Mr. Belloc makes clear, are caused by conflicting political intentions of two groups. Today the Soviet Union intends to complete its conquest of the globe and the United States intends to see that this does not happen. There is a conflict of wills but as yet no direct armed clash. The war to this point has been cold; but there is a war.

It is the strategic means available to the Soviets, in relation to the strategic means held by the United States, which determine whether they might actually attempt to fulfill their design for global mastery through initiating direct armed conflict. Soviet strategic capability is our best indicator of whether the cold war will become red hot.

The U.S. strategic force posture must be based, therefore, both on Soviet intentions and their strategic ability to transform these intentions into direct armed acts against us.

Communism is a messianic force system limited only by the forces which oppose its extension. If these forces, both spiritual and material, which stand in the way of total Communist world power were removed tomorrow, the conquest would be completed at that date. It is not the Soviets' desire that limits the extension of their power, but rather their inability, at this time, to destroy the resistance which has been organized against them.

It is important to understand this in order to view our strategic weapons systems in the proper light. They are an essential element of organized resistance in the chain of resistance which confronts the Soviets across the planet. History shows conclusively that the Soviets will use armed force to achieve their end if they think this method of conquest will be successful.

Some of the popular writers on nuclear defense matters, especially the group known as the "arms controllers," have become hopelessly confused as to the relationship which exists between weapons and war. Noting several instances of mutual armament before some armed conflicts, these "defense intellectuals" come to the conclusion that it is a so-called "arms race" which causes the conflict, and not the hostile intentions of one power—and the understanding of these intentions by the group targeted for subjugation—which sometimes causes both groups to arm.

Notice that it is only sometimes that both groups arm before the battle. At other times one group does not take the measures necessary for successful defense. This does not prevent the battle; it simply results in easy victory for the aggressor. The "arms controllers," impervious to the facts of history and the nature of war, continue to insist that arming of itself causes war, and advocate U.S. disarmament in the name of peace.

It is not like this in the real world. For every unit of U.S. power that is reduced, the Soviets gain just that much in relative strength. For example, if we dismantle one of our strategic bomber bases overseas, this is just one less target for the Soviets to hit. The weapons and weapon systems which would have been used to destroy that target can then be used against another increment of U.S. strategic force, say, a Minuteman base in North Dakota. As we lose one unit, they automatically gain the same amount.

Another misconception about strategic forces is that possession of limited quantities of nuclear weapons by the United States is enough to forestall Soviet armed advance. This theory is known as "automatic deterrence." A typical statement of it is Richard Rovere's comment that:

> If the Russians had ten thousand warheads and a missile for each, and we had ten hydrogen bombs and ten obsolete bombers . . . aggression would still be a folly that would appeal only to an insane adventurer.

People with this view feel that as long as we do not totally give up our nuclear weapons, there is little chance of Soviet attack. They forget that disarmament can be brought about not only through congressional shortsightedness, peace marchers, prolonged industrial strikes, and McNamara-type thinkers. There is also such a thing as a disarming strike.

The Soviet forces, from huge ICBM rockets to fractional orbital bombs, nuclear powered attack submarines, and antisubmarine warfare carriers, are all being configured to achieve just such a goal—disarming the United States with one giant blow. Cutting our strategic forces to the point where it becomes possible for the Soviets to rapidly and violently disarm us opens to the Communists an avenue of sure conquest.

What do you think the 20th century's most successful killers would do should their material forces become capable of achieving their political objective?

BRONX ARTS COUNCIL

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, my home county of Bronx, N.Y., has in the past suffered from a bad press. This was typified by the famous—it should be infamous—couplet by Ogden Nash, reading:

> The Bronx?
> No thonx.

We who represent the Bronx know better. We are proud of our county. A special cause for pride in these days is the Bronx Council on the Arts. The New York Times on January 12 carried an excellent article by Mr. McCandlish Phillips on the Bronx Council on the Arts, which was quite properly headlined: "Lively and Innovative Bronx Arts Council Promotes Cultural Fare on a Shoestring."

In commending this article to my colleagues in the Congress, I should like to note further that Bronx County is, of course, a part of New York City, and to add that the current reports of New York City's imminent demise are, in the words of Mark Twain, "grossly exaggerated." The article follows:

LIVELY AND INNOVATIVE BRONX ARTS COUNCIL PROMOTES CULTURAL FARE ON A SHOESTRING

(By McCandlish Phillips)

To Mrs. Irma Fleck, Gerald Klot is "the Sol Hurok of the Bronx." It is not that he does things on a Hurokian scale, but that he knows how to make something—a symphony orchestra, for instance—out of nothing. When he has a little bit, he can make a great deal of it.

Mr. Klot is a school principal who came to adulthood in the Bronx when it was, in his own words, "a cultural desert," but he trusts that before his work is done it will be a garden of many cultural delights. He is chairman of the lively and innovative Bronx Council on the Arts. Mrs. Fleck is its executive director.

The team of Fleck and Klot has given the Bronx a vision, a means and a structure for a local development of the arts, and many have rallied to their banner—The Bronx Banner, a monthly publication that proves in every issue that the borough offers an uncommonly generous a la carte menu of cultural fare for the hungry.

There are four other boroughwide arts councils in the city as well as one that covers the black community, the Harlem Cultural Council.

"HEART OF CULTURE"

The Bronx council's blue-fronted office gleams in a row of one-story brick stores, wedged between a former judo academy and a storefront synagogue that sits hard by a small delicatessen.

"The carved-out heart of culture in the Bronx," Mr. Klot announced, pushing into the place, at 57 East 184th Street near Walton Avenue. His reference was to the job it had been to carve out a seat of culture amid much indifference and dollar scarcity.

"It was a big, barnlike store when we took it over, a factory actually. They made skirts," said Mrs. Fleck, a woman who looks like an abbreviation for Mitzi Gaynor. Her secretary's desk is wedged into a small store window by the front door, with a large board set in place to cut drafts from the frequently opened door.

Her own cubicle, at the end of the row, borrows a little warmth from a large poster bearing a Rembrandt self-portrait from the Rijks-museum, Amsterdam. Mrs. Fleck sits with her back to it, so that Rembrandt appears to be gazing over her shoulder at whatever is on her desk.

In the course of a week he would see documents telling of the Bronx Opera Company, the Bronx Experimental Theater, the Festival of Poetry, the Bronx Showcase of the Visual Arts, the May Arts, Festival, forthcoming exhibitions of paintings and photographs, and easily 20 other major thrusts.

In a nearby area, two tables had been pushed together, Mrs. Edna Meschel, captain of the mailing team, and three volunteers were stuffing 1,200 copies of The Banner into envelopes, sorting them by zip codes, and tieing them into bundles.

"They're screwed up," one woman said, squinting at the addresses. "The letters near the ends of the lines are wrong. This is all done by computer and the machine may be on tilt."

"We get I.B.M. data processing service from the Bronx Community College, one of the big supporters of the council," Mrs. Fleck said. "We couldn't have got along without them. The president, Dr. James A. Colston, is still sort of our fairy godfather over there."

In the time of World War II, Mr. Klot said, "I saw the cultural desert that existed in the Bronx, and I made a blueprint of attack. The first thing we needed was an orchestra.

"In 1945 I organized the Bronx Symphony Orchestra under the direction of Irwin Hoffman, who became associate conductor of the Chicago Symphony. We had 45 members in it—lawyers, dentists, doctors, housewives, and even a tree pruner.

"It has had a continuous existence since that time, at least four or five concerts a year and they're all free to the public. Not long ago, a left-handed violinist came back and got a standing ovation after a solo. We'd had that violinist as an 11-year-old player. It shows what you can do with youngsters who have that musical surge and urge.

"The orchestra's going stronger than ever now, under Michael Spierman, the seventh conductor. We had a full house for the first time ever on Dec. 12, a completely full house. I think I broke down a little. It was the complete fulfillment of a dream."

PAID AT EQUITY SCALE

Throughout the 1950's, Mr. Klot presided over live professional theater in the Bronx, using the actors and productions of the Equity Library Theater of Manhattan and paying them at scale.

As principal of the Clinton-Walton Youth and Adult Center at 100 West Mosholu Parkway, which offers 120 courses "out of the regular day-school climate, he had an advisory board that, seeing "the dire need for cultural events throughout our area," formed the original Bronx Council on the Arts in 1961.

Mrs. Fleck, aggrieved at the shoddy way the Bronx is represented to the rest of the world, decided to try to improve its tone and image by founding the Bronx Committee on the Arts in June, 1967.

She broached it to Herman Badillo, then the Borough President, and he put his office behind the effort.

The two separate organizations, with parallel visions, found marriage expedient, and the present organization came of that in September, 1967. The Bronx Community College took the merged council in out of the cold.

"We began really in the lap of Prof. William C. Woolfson," Mrs. Fleck said. Professor Woolfson, a genial and portly man who once was a financial writer for The Herald Tribune, is now cultural relations officer for the college. "We had a couple of drawers in a file there," Mrs. Fleck recalled.

The council has grown at an astonishing rate since then, adding a long list of programs, productions, exhibitions and services to its name. Some of these it regards as only the earliest forms of far larger ventures.

The Bronx Museum of Art exists now only as a fraction of what it is intended to be. Half of the council's office space has been made into a cream-walled gallery, 40 feet long by 11½ feet wide. Six double sets of sunlamps bathe the works in a tropic glow.

There were 10 works on the west wall, including sketches, water-colors, a cubist painting, a portrait in oil, and a college of brown corduroy with holes in it, with bright red flannel showing through, all stretched tight on a frame.

Mrs. Ethel Bramson, the gallery director, shares Mrs. Fleck's views regarding shortshrift for the Bronx. "I say come visit Zeroland," she said, with a satiric bite. She recalled that art gallery operators would never come to see her paintings while she had her studio in the Bronx but that after she moved it to Manhattan, they came.

The council has used a larger space for exhibitions, the rotunda of the Bronx County Court House, showing 200 works at a time.

"The rotunda is a magnificent space, a great, huge marble hall that is going to waste," Mrs. Fleck said. "We feel this should be a year-round art gallery. I envision one central gallery there, then little satellites all over the Bronx—libraries, hospitals, banks, even the walls in a supermarket are terrific for that kind of thing."

The council has about 750 members and runs on a total annual budget of $65,000. It keeps in touch with 75 to 80 neighborhood centers—storefront agencies, settlement houses and the like—through the ambassadorial journeys of Mrs. Mary Jane Hanzlik, a vivacious former actress and model from Boston.

"We coordinate, we develop, we inspire, we instigate, we promote the arts in every possible way," Mrs. Fleck said.

"Our major support is from the New York State Council on the Arts. We just got a grant of $17,500 from them for administrative expenses for a year. It keeps us alive and we're grateful for that.

"The City Department of Cultural Affairs granted us $7,000 for programs. So I take a medicine dropper and I apportion out program grants, a little bit here and a little bit there, with the intention of just keeping these groups alive.

"I feel terrible about giving them such small sums, but we are very pragmatic. We would love to do deficit spending, but we can't. We just have to spend exactly what's in our hot little hands.

"We've got $2,000 a year from the Grand Street Boys Club Foundation, and that has helped us pay the rent in our very lean times."

STUDENTS AID CENTERS

Working with what Mrs. Fleck calls a consortium of six colleges, the council established a College-Community Cultural Program in September, in which students who are skilled in painting, drama, the dance or any of the arts go out to neighborhood centers to spend time with people who gather in them—children, adults, old people, the poor, as well as members of the blue collar class—who wish to learn such skills.

Mrs. Fleck said that for a long time the colleges in the Bronx had "existed as little enclaves—little castles with a moat around them is the way the community felt about them."

With the help of Msgr. Gustav J. Schultheiss of St. Raymond's Church, who served as the host of a get-together dinner meeting, the council pulled the colleges into a common effort.

"This is the first time in the history of the Bronx in which all the colleges have come together. It's a fantastic thing that's happened here," Professor Woolfson said.

Twenty students are in the field now, Mrs. Fleck said, "but when we get in full swing we ought to have 250 to 300 students working in it."

The council formed a Business Men's Committee on the Arts two years ago to stimulate support for the arts in the business community.

"We feel that what we can do by way of cultural awakening can improve the community," Mrs. Fleck said. "By keeping our middle class from moving away, we're aiding business as well. Therefore, it's a good business point."

Among the prime movers on the committee is Donald Darcy, executive vice president of the North Side Savings Bank, an art collector and a student of the life and work of Edgar Allan Poe, who has lectured and written on the writer.

BOROUGH EVENTS LISTED

Since the Bronx has no daily newspaper and "one end of the borough doesn't know what the other end is doing," Mrs. Fleck explained, The Bronx Banner seeks to present a complete calendar of artistic, cultural and intellectual events in the borough.

A recent issue, listing 41 events, gave Bronxites a choice of "Fiorello" or "Figaro" on the same day.

Nine concerts offered a trio performing Yiddish Folk Songs; the New York Baroque Ensemble; Johanna Meier, soprano, with Guido Dellavecchia, tenor; a recital by Gerald Kaga, cellist; and a choral concert by the Amalgamated Worker's Circle Chorus.

Or a reader could pick among Alfred Hitchcock and Jennifer Jones Film Festivals; a satiric revue called "A Time to Heal"; "Apollo of Bellac" played in French by the French Art Theater Group of New York University; a lecture on Vergil's Aeneid, and two exhibitions of paintings.

"If we were measured by population, the Bronx would be bigger than Boston, Cincinnati, Denver or Dallas," Mrs. Fleck said. "Most such cities have their own professional symphony orchestras, their own operas, their own cultural centers—places much smaller than the Bronx."

"We have dreams, let's put it that way," Mr. Klot said.