

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATOR RANDOLPH URGES
ACTION TO REDUCE SOLID WASTE
LITTER—STRESSES INDUSTRY
RESPONSIBILITY

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from West Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works (Mr. RANDOLPH), is one of the most knowledgeable and articulate Members of the Senate concerning the environmental problems faced by this country.

His wide experience in this field continues to contribute greatly to the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, which I chair. Senator RANDOLPH has done much to focus attention of the American people on the challenges involved in creating and sustaining a clean environment. He has traveled tirelessly about the country, addressing thousands of people, always stressing to them the necessity for personal commitment and involvement to support the work we do in the Congress.

On Tuesday, Senator RANDOLPH took his message to Toledo, Ohio, where he addressed the Wholesale Beer Association of Ohio. On this occasion, he emphasized the problems associated with solid waste disposal, particularly as they relate to the beer industry.

Mr. President, Senator RANDOLPH's address in Toledo was a forceful statement on what needs to be done to reduce the accumulation of litter, and steps that can be taken to reach this goal. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, Senator RANDOLPH's address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEANING THE UGLY COSTLY FACE OF
POLLUTION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, nearly 10 months ago the United States observed Earth Day. This day of concentrated attention to the abuses of our environment was planned as the beginning of a full scale effort to end these practices and to prevent their recurrence in the future.

In the light of what has happened, we could almost say that 1970 turned into Earth Year.

Certainly the environment was on our own minds during 1970. It was a topic of discussion on college campuses, in the public media, and by organizations of all types and, of course, on Capitol Hill, in Washington, D.C., and in your State Capitol in Columbus.

In the Committee on Public Works, which I chair, environmental issues occupied a substantial portion of our time and energies. Major legislation for environmental controls in several areas was processed. During the 91st Congress we enacted new and strengthened laws to help in the battle against environmental contamination.

The Water Quality Improvement Act, the Resource Recovery Act and the National Air Quality Standards Act addressed themselves directly to environmental questions. Portions

of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 and the Rivers and Harbors Act also contained important sections relating to the environment.

I have no doubt that the ecological explosion we witnessed last year will continue. I am confident that the Congress will be called on again this year to review the need for further environmental legislation, especially in the field of water pollution.

Very often we see public interest and concern centered on an individual topic for a few months, only to wane and be diverted in other directions. Therefore, the continuing high level of environmental concern is in some ways unique, but it is not surprising since this is really a life and death matter affecting all of us. We are now reaping the fruits of many years of neglect of our natural surroundings, and these past abuses cannot be overcome quickly or easily. We are now acutely aware of the large quantities of pollutants that are regularly poured into the air we breathe and the water we drink. The growing mountains of solid wastes are threatening our increasingly concentrated population with dirt and disease. In addition, our technological society has produced a new hazard of noise pollution with which we must contend.

We have no choice but to face squarely the problems of the environment. The United States no longer has physical frontiers to which our people can escape and postpone the necessity of dealing with our hasty and thoughtless actions. Furthermore, we are now aware that our abundant natural resources are not limitless and must be conserved through reuse to the greatest extent possible.

I have been encouraged by the response of the American people to the need for environmental action. That they realize the seriousness of the threat to our world was demonstrated in last November's elections when environment-related issues were given substantial voter support. While other financial questions on the ballots were being rejected in large numbers, most proposals to pay for environmental enhancement were approved.

At many levels of our national life there are plans and proposals to further the knowledge needed to meet the growing challenge to the environment. I view this as a healthy sign, for not only is action needed to end environmental abuse but extensive research to define the problems and pose solutions is essential.

A number of proposals have been made in this direction.

Senators Muskie and Baker have sponsored legislation to create a National Environmental Laboratory. As you know, Sen. Muskie is deeply involved in these problems as chairman of our Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution.

All members of the Congress share the concern over the damage that is being done to our environment. Your own Senators Saxbe and Taft and the Ohio delegation in the House of Representatives work closely with us in developing the legislation needed to maintain a clean environment.

I am informed that the Administration will propose an Environmental Institute as a joint venture of the government and private groups. The National Academy of Science has considered involvement in similar efforts.

A new organization, the National Center for Solid Waste Disposal, has been created by a broadly based group of industries, to further research and exploration of effective ways to meet the challenge of solid waste. This is the kind of industrial response to these problems that is heartening to me and strengthens my belief that we will find the

answers. I am glad that your association fully supports the center's goals and work.

This ferment is encouraging, for it means that we are willing to support our concern over pollution with the commitment to hard research that must be made if we are to succeed.

Every segment of the American Industrial complex is affected by the new concern with the environment. I am sure that no industry can correctly claim that it does not contribute in some degree to our national pollution problems.

The American beer industry must share the blame for being the initial producer of a substantial quantity of our solid waste. I know you realize the responsibility that this places on you.

In your Ohio association there has been a long standing concern over environmental issues. As early as 1964 you exhibited an understanding of the problems created by discarded beer containers.

Just over a year ago you responded to the growing public pressure by creating an Ecology Committee.

Incidentally, I wonder if it is only coincidence that this active group is chaired by a man named Litter. Your Ecology Committee obviously has been active under Bob Litter's leadership.

Products of the beer industry, one of our largest, are found almost everywhere.

It is this widespread distribution of canned and bottled beer that has made your industry not only successful, but has produced specific and unique problems. A motorist has only to drive along virtually any highway to be appalled at the sight of cans and bottles lying along the roadway . . . and on private property. Your industry cannot, of course, be blamed for the thoughtless actions of your customers who toss containers out of their cars, but in many instances the finger of suspicion is pointed at you.

During our hearings on solid waste disposal, the Committee received testimony on a number of new techniques that are being developed to collect, sort, dispose and recover solid wastes. It was encouraging to learn of the intensive activities that will help us cope with the solid waste problem.

As representatives of the beer industry, you are fully aware of the demands to reduce or eliminate the accumulation of bottles and cans that carry your products to the public.

This awareness is reflected in the campaign of your association to distribute thousands of bags throughout Ohio in which beer cans and bottles could be collected instead of discarded.

This is one imaginative way in which the beer industry can contribute directly to reducing the accumulations of trash.

The promotion of anti-litter signs on members' trucks and the sponsorship of effective legislation in the state legislature are activities that reflect the willingness of the Wholesale Beer Association of Ohio to accept a responsible role in improving our environment.

The beer industry has been one of enormous growth in recent years and there has been increasing use of non-returnable bottles and cans to carry your product to the consumer.

It is, therefore, not surprising that we hear many demands for the elimination or outlawing of these convenient bottles and cans.

Such action may, on the surface, seem to be a quick and effective way to meet the problem. I believe, however, that few long-range benefits would result from the banning of throw-away cans and bottles.

In the first place, there is evidence that the public views throw-away and returnable bottles in virtually the same light. In other words, returnable bottles, on which a deposit is paid, are regularly thrown away as are the cheaper non-returnable bottles. Equally disturbing is the fact that reusable bottles are least popular in the large urban areas where most of our people live and where the solid waste disposal problems are the most acute.

Added to the public's reluctance to use returnable bottles in larger numbers, is the unwillingness of retailers to take on the added cost of handling them.

The challenge seems to me to be one of finding ways of recycling discarded cans and bottles instead of trying to impose the reuse of containers on a public and business structure that does not want them.

As I mentioned, there is increasing knowledge in the country of ways to recover and use again many materials that were once simply discarded.

I have many times in the past year discussed environmental problems before groups such as yours and before audiences representing other segments of American society. On each occasion, I have stressed that an essential requirement in the fight against pollution is a change in attitude by all of us.

We must stop thinking of ourselves as consumers. We are actually users of materials that are passed along for processing and continued use. The challenge we face was well stated by Athelstan Spilhaus, former President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, who declared that "waste is simply some useful substance we do not yet have the wit to use."

I think American technical genius is well advanced to devising the processes we need to reclaim and reuse many of the left-overs we formerly considered trash suitable only for disposal.

Testimony before the Public Works Committee last year included discussion of a number of ways in which bottles and cans, the sources of concern to your industry, can be usefully recycled. The knowledge, for instance, that cans are now made of simpler materials and, in fact, less metal per can, will make the task of sorting refuse easier. If this takes place, the incentive for recovery and reusing of cans becomes economically greater.

There are now two pilot programs for recycling of cans that possess great promise. One is being conducted by Weirton Steel Company at its Weirton, W. Va. plant on ways of separating and reclaiming steel cans. Reynolds Aluminum Company is pursuing the same goals for aluminum cans at plants in Miami and Los Angeles.

New techniques also are providing easier ways to separate glass from other materials and to make it into such useful substances as building bricks, glass wool for installation, glass beads, and even a material known as glassphalt. This last is a mixture of ground glass with asphalt that may become of importance in highway construction.

The conduct of separation activities on a large scale is now approaching economic feasibility.

Only a few days ago recommendations were made for the construction of a large refuse recovery plant in the Washington, D.C., area to provide newly-developed techniques a full test. The proposed plant would process the trash from a community of 200,000 people with the aim of recovering enough reusable materials to make it pay for itself.

The economical separation of waste materials continues to be one of the greatest problems confronting those who must cope with solid wastes. But another serious obstacle is concerned with marketing materials once they have been reclaimed. We have had evidence that there is resistance by some producers of raw materials to hav-

ing used substances introduced into the manufacturing cycle in competition with them.

This is an obvious opportunity for these reluctant industries to adopt a statesman-like posture for the benefit of society. Any real or imagined financial harm they fear could be ameliorated by these companies entering the recycling field themselves.

There is no single or simple solution to this problem, and its resolution must be sought in several areas. The sorting problem is compounded, for example, by nothing more complex than the decline in the number of communities that require householders to sort their trash before it is collected. Simple actions such as this may be one way in which the public can support its desire for a cleaner environment.

We in Congress recognize the demands being made on the beer industry to somehow reduce the litter of discarded bottles and cans. We also recognize that you are not wholly to blame for the environmental degradation to which they contribute. I believe you will agree, though, that you have a critical role to fill in easing this particular solid waste problem. And, I believe you are aware of the need and are deeply involved in doing your part.

Our country is being subjected to a test of its ability to adapt. How we respond to these pressures in the months and years ahead may well determine the form of society and perhaps even our continued existence as a viable democracy in the future. The strength and dedication of all our citizens is needed, and I ask you to join with me in pledging our best energies to a strong and durable America.

In the final analysis, the success of man's battle against pollution will be determined by his will to break away from old habits, to reject what Abraham Lincoln called the dogmas of the past, and to come to grips with the fact that the environmental crisis is one of life and death.

Man created environment pollution, and only man can end it.

To this commitment let us pledge anew our words, but more importantly, let us pledge our deeds.

A rebirth of personal responsibility is the answer, in part, to the elimination of ugly and costly contamination.

THE TIME HAS COME TO REFORM GOVERNMENT OIL POLICIES

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article, "Cold Facts About the Fuel Shortage," in the February issue of the highly respected Consumer Reports.

The article focuses much of its attention on Government oil policy which, it says, "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."

This concise explanation of our present bankrupt oil policy helps to explain why I and many of my colleagues have long opposed the oil import quota system which costs the U.S. consumer over \$5 billion annually in artificially high prices.

Recent developments, described in the article, have also made clear that State oil production controls serve only to maintain unreasonably high prices.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I sent a letter to my colleagues inviting their cosponsorship of two bills which will effectively end both these programs. I also include a copy of that letter at the close of these remarks. I hope that all my colleagues will examine this Consumer Reports study. Having done so, I am confident it will encourage support for these legislative reforms. The material referred to follows:

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, John Nasikas, 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 purchases of coal cars. But the con-

struction 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 lies beneath the waters of the outer continental shelf. In contrast to offshore 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 lessees 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 specialized 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 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 desulfurized residual oil from overseas.

The catch is that the desulfurization process reduces by 30 per cent the residual oil 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 gasolines 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 regulations 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 Elizabethan institution. I do not want to be corny but this is what the American Revolution was all about."

PROTECTIONISM, QUOTAS, AND FREE ENTERPRISE, TEXAS STYLE

Again this year Congress is under pressure to convert the Trade Expansion Act, which made possible the Kennedy round of tariff reductions, into a protectionist measure the likes of which hasn't been seen since the Smoot-Hawley Act 40 years ago (Consumer Reports, May 1969). Imports of textiles, clothing and footwear would be controlled by means of a quota (at a cost to consumers estimated by a member of the Federal Reserve Board at \$3.7 billion a year in higher prices by 1975), and severe constraints would be placed on the President's authority to abolish oil import quotas.

The oil-quota provision was patched onto the trade bill last year after a Cabinet-level task force had advised the President to replace oil quotas with a tariff that would be less restrictive on imports and would therefore force down the price of gasoline, home-heating oil and other petroleum products. To tie the President's hands, the 1970 trade

bill would have prohibited him from using tariffs in place of quotas. The bill was passed by the House, and was killed by the Senate only under threat of a filibuster.

Instead of trying to perpetuate oil quotas, Congress should abolish them. Keeping low-priced foreign oil out of the country is an essential part of an elaborate Federal-state system for propping up the price of oil from U.S. wells. Shortly after World War II, the oil industry found itself overinvested. Quite simply, it could produce more oil than it could sell. Excess capacity of anything, be it oil or potatoes, should mean lower prices as sellers are forced to compete for the available market. To curb excess capacity, the leading oil-producing states, Texas and Louisiana, began limiting production. Furthermore, after the U.S. Supreme Court had ruled that offshore oil fields belong not to the states but to the Federal government, the Interior Department dutifully began enforcing offshore production limits drawn up by the adjacent states. Thus, production control was extended to the vast resources of the outer continental shelf off Texas and Louisiana. Federal and state governments now can shelter most crude oil from the forces of supply and demand.

The Texas Railroad Commission, which sets oil production quotas in that state, has at times ordered wells shut down all but eight days a month. Production controls at their best are hardly calculated to promote industrial efficiency. The pro-rationing system, though seems designed to make oil production as inefficient as possible. It does so by setting production limits on each well, instead of on the overall output of an oil field. To produce as much oil as the state allows, an oil field developer may drill four wells where only one well could drain the field at maximum efficiency. Superfluous oil wells, according to one oil economist, have added an estimated \$1 billion to the production costs of crude oil since 1948. In 1960 it was proposed that more than three quarters of some 17,200 East Texas wells be capped as superfluous, but the Texas Railroad Commission rejected the idea because of the bad effect it would have had on the local economy.

Last November major oil companies increased the price of crude oil by 25¢ a barrel. The cost to motorists was expected to be 1¢ per gallon of gasoline, or some \$600-million a year for all car owners. The potential price increase for all oil products was put at \$1.25-billion a year. Despite the crude oil price increase, the Texas Railroad Commission went ahead and cut production quotas for December, a decision which the White House noted "would have the effect of reducing the supply of crude oil and supporting the price increase."

Texas acted, moreover, after Mobil Oil Corp. had requested a production cutback on the ground that its stocks were too large. Thus was Mobil able to increase prices when, as the White House observed, excess inventories "ought to have been moving [the industry] in the direction of stable, to perhaps declining prices."

President Nixon quickly exerted some of the power at his disposal to roll back oil prices. He permitted a limited increase in imports to bolster immediate petroleum supplies. More important for the long run, he removed production limits on off-shore oil wells. If these measures didn't work, he still held the trump card. He could eliminate all quotas on oil imports with a stroke of his pen.

FEBRUARY 1, 1971.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: For years American consumers have suffered from two government oil policies which have led to artificially high oil prices: severely restrictive import quotas and state production controls, or prora-

tioning. The latter is an interference with interstate commerce made possible only by a Federal law known as the Connally "Hot Oil" Act.

In May of 1969, I introduced a bill, ultimately cosponsored by 65 of our colleagues, to eliminate the import quota system. Events since then have made clear that these quotas should be ended and the Connally Act should be repealed. I am writing to invite you to join me as a cosponsor of two bills to accomplish these ends.

Let me briefly indicate the rationale for these two bills. In February, 1970, President Nixon's own Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control found that quotas annually cost U.S. consumers over \$5 billion in artificially high prices, that the present quotas are not justified for reasons of national security, and that they should be replaced by a tariff which would permit greater imports and lower prices. Regrettably, no action was taken to implement these recommendations.

The present tight fuel supply situation offers further proof that oil quotas have not been able to guarantee adequate supplies. It has also provided dramatic evidence that state prorationing should be abolished. Despite unprecedented demand and declining inventories the state regulating commissions in Louisiana and Texas have actually cut back production.

This cutback continues despite recent inflationary oil price hikes so severe that they prompted the first federal investigation, still underway, to determine whether import quotas should be increased or changed to assure adequate supplies and reasonable prices.

These developments combined to force the President on December 4, 1970 to take two steps: He increased allowable imports from Canada, and ended the practice of limiting Federal off-shore oil production in *voluntary* compliance with these state production controls. In taking this latter step President Nixon stated that these controls "are not necessary for national security; moreover, they actually interfere with the freedom of our domestic market system." A more complete discussion of the President's action can be found in the Congressional Record for December 10, 1969 at H.11523.

While these were welcome moves, I believe it is essential for the Congress to take more decisive action. My first bill would abolish all oil import controls by January 1, 1972. In view of the deep concern about the present supply situation in the Middle East, let me stress that the President would retain the right to impose a tariff as the Task Force recommended. It should be noted that the Task Force called for the use of tariffs to restrict imports from that region to no more than 10 percent of U.S. demand, assuring we will not become unduly dependent on this source.

The second bill, repealing the Connally Act, would remove federal sanction from state prorationing and render it inoperative. The combination of these two programs has cost at least \$40 billion over the past decade. Their abolition will not only relieve chronic shortage problems of particular concern to the Northeast heating oil consumer, but also create a strong downward pressure on prices across the nation. It is too little appreciated that gasoline consumers have been paying 5 cents more per gallon because of these anti-competitive programs.

If you wish to join in this bipartisan reform effort to provide needed consumer relief, I hope you will agree to cosponsor these two bills. Since I plan to introduce them on Thursday, February 25th, please advise Myrna Vanden Eykel of my staff (ext. 55335) by Wednesday the 24th if you wish to join me.

With warmest good wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

SILVIO O. CONTE,
Member of Congress.

CINCINNATI COLUMNIST LIGHTENS
SST DEBATE

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, Congress has been debating continued support of the supersonic transport for many months. The Senate, as most of my colleagues are well aware, was tied up for weeks in a prolonged discussion of the merits of the SST and debate will undoubtedly continue.

At times, I am sure all of us would agree, there is a need for levity. Bob Brumfield, a very talented columnist for the Cincinnati Enquirer, has provided some of that in a recent column entitled "The Wisconsin SST." I am sure my distinguished longtime friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, will enjoy the article.

While I have no plans to join Mr. Brumfield's Wisconsin dairy products boycott, my wife advises that avoidance of butterfat would certainly not hinder my waistline and might do as much for me as jogging to work.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Jan. 25, 1971]

THE WISCONSIN SST

(By Bob Brumfield)

Sen. William Proxmire (D.-Wis.) wants to kill the SST.

Okay, so I think Americans should boycott Wisconsin dairy products.

Now, at first glance, it might look like I'm just being vindictive because the Cincinnati area has so much to lose if the SST program is killed, but this is far from the truth. I think there should be a boycott on Wisconsin dairy products simply because of the environmental dangers they present.

Wisconsin cows are dirty animals. They're always . . . well, they make it necessary to watch carefully where you walk. And they attract flies. Not only that, but they add to noise pollution with their mooing. Wisconsin cows eat grass, and unless something is done soon, they will completely strip the Earth of grass.

The argument has been advanced that Wisconsin dairy products are necessary to the nation's health. This just isn't true. Wisconsin dairy products are simply a jet set food. The country can get by fine with the excellent margarine now on the market. There also is an excellent synthetic cheese on the market that is plenty good enough for cheeseburgers.

You may ask: "But what about milk for babies and cats and for putting on breakfast food." And to this I reply (rather smugly, actually): Did the Indians have Wisconsin milk for their babies and cats and for putting on their breakfast food? Of course they didn't. They ate their shredded wheat dry, the way nature intended it to be eaten. They nursed their young. And when a cat came around meowing for Wisconsin milk, they kicked it all the way to Milwaukee.

As for their health, they were plenty healthy enough to beat hell out of General Custer.

Wisconsin dairy products are not only unnecessary for the nation's health, but they also might be extremely harmful. Many

reputable scientists are of the opinion that these dairy products contain high percentages of cholesterol, and that this might be contributory to heart disease. Although these are just unproved theories, there is enough scientific evidence against Wisconsin dairy products to warrant an extremely cautious approach to their use. We just can't take the chance.

Proponents of Wisconsin dairy products say that there will be no harm done by just a little of their cheese here, and a little of their milk and butter there. They advance the argument that unless we permit a few Wisconsin dairy products to be sold, we'll never be able to prove or disprove their dangers.

Baloney! If we let them sell a little of these products—produced through massive federal aid in the form of farm subsidies—the next thing you know it will get completely out of hand. If we need any dairy products for experimental or other purposes, we've got plenty of good old Ohio, Indiana and Kentucky cows.

A GRANDMOTHER'S MOVEMENT TO
RESTORE DECENCY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many parents, ministers of the Holy Gospel, educators, and other citizens abhor and are deeply concerned about the torrent of indecent, obscene, and pornographic art, plays, literature, periodicals, films, and television programs inundating this great country. They are rightfully concerned since history records that no nation has survived a successful assault upon its morals.

There exists today a frightening parallel in crime rise and the proliferation of smut material which not only advocates acts in conflict with God's natural law, but debases traditional virtues and standards.

Our runaway Supreme Court Justices, who by their unconscionable and unwise decisions have promoted this onslaught of salacious materials, seem to have forgotten that America was founded as a Christian nation and that the earliest schools in America were established to teach children to read so that they could read the Holy Bible.

In his Epistle to the Ephesians, St. Paul says:

Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers.

And in Psalms 127:1, we are reminded:

Except the Lord build the house; they labor in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchmen waketh but in vain.

It is encouraging and refreshing to learn of a grassroots movement by concerned citizens individually and collectively through organizations to attempt to stem the tide of pornography and obscenity, to restore decency throughout America, and to get America back on the right moral track prescribed by Almighty God in Holy Scriptures.

One such individual is Mrs. Billie Lasker, a grandmother, of 7815 Pershing

Avenue, Clayton, Mo. 63105. Her crusade for decency is told in a news release by Gerald P. McAtee, of Fitzgerald Enterprises, 9216 Clayton Road, St. Louis, Mo. 63124. I insert at this point Mr. McAtee's release and a news clipping:

REMARKS BY GERALD P. MCATEE

A widowed grandmother in Clayton, Missouri, has hurled down the gauntlet to the powerful paladins of pornography now riding the crest of a golden wave estimated in excess of a billion dollars yearly.

Mrs. Billie Lasker has sent some 8,000 signatures to Senator James O. Eastland, Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, in the past five months. Almost 3,000 of them were secured within the past four weeks as her lone crusade against filth gathers momentum.

But for the intervention of Death, Mrs. Lasker's crusade would be far advanced over its present development. After fifteen years of caring for an invalid husband, she was crushed by his death only six months after she began her campaign. It was almost a year later before, rising in indignation from the trauma of her grief like the legendary phoenix from its ashes, she again took up the sword against the forces of filth.

Gene Lasker was reduced to a nervous wreck by financial ruin. Three years and six hospitals later, the Laskers' home and savings were gone. For the next fifteen years Billie Lasker struggled to support her ailing spouse.

To make ends meet, she began a small antique business which she conducted in her home. Her husband's illness, housemaking and the business left her little time for anything else. And she felt that she would be content with life if she could just keep her head above water and meet the everyday expense of doing so. Then a reeking piece of imported cinematic feculence exploded in her consciousness and nothing has been quite the same ever since. Outraged at this blatant opus, she drew up a petition to the late Senator Everett M. Dirksen with the help of a friend and sallied forth to counter-attack the powerful forces of the pornographic world. Despite the already heavy demands on her time, energy and emotions, she spent two hours a day, three days a week, accosting people in a neighborhood shopping center to ask them to sign the petition to deprive the Supreme Court of the jurisdictional authority to overturn decisions of lower courts in cases involving pornography.

"And if you don't believe the Supreme Court is involved," says she, "just look at the record. Thirty-eight lower court decisions were reversed by the Court in just three years from 1967 through 1969. And those decisions have opened wide the floodgates through which this tidal wave of filth now surges in upon us. And, aside from the fact that much of it is vile enough to nauseate a vulture, it is corrupting our young people. Every parent in the country ought to be up in arms about this abominable assault upon our children. Every mother should join this fight now and put this despicable enemy to route once and for all. The time has come for all Americans to stand up and be counted for decency."

But even Death allied itself with the evil Billie Lasker, undaunted by overwhelming odds, had attacked. In May, 1969, Gene Lasker died. And for the next ten months grief robbed the doughty widow—who had already mailed more than 1,000 signatures to Senator Dirksen—of the strength to continue the fight.

Then a "particularly revolting picture advocating drug usage and perversion" galvanized her into action once again. She was doubly shocked to observe young teenagers serving as ushers and ticket takers and to see other youngsters in the audience. She imme-

diately wired the Prosecuting Attorney of St. Louis County and phoned her friends to urge them to do likewise. The picture abruptly disappeared. She doesn't take credit for the change—just says, "Five days later, it was gone."

One must draw one's own conclusions. Says this twentieth century Joan of Arc: "Some people say there is no legal definition of obscenity—but that is not true. In 1957 in the case of Roth versus the United States, the Supreme Court declared that 'obscenity is not within the area of constitutionally protected speech or press'. The Court further stated, clearly and unequivocally, that material is obscene when 'to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material, taken as a whole, appeals to prurient interests'."

Mrs. Lasker can now be seen daily at one of the busiest shopping centers in the St. Louis area buttonholing people to ask for their signatures on this "petition against filthy movies and other forms of pornography". She averages approximately 100 signatures a day. On weekends she stands in the rear of churches to ask the support of churchgoers as they leave services. On three Sundays within the past month she obtained a total of almost 1,000 signatures in this effort.

"It should have been twice as many and I believe it would have been if there had been more help," she says.

Mrs. Lasker expects to obtain 100,000 by spring in the St. Louis area.

"If enough people will join this fight, we can make it a million," she says. "And I think they will. People are calling or writing me every day asking for copies of the petition which they work on themselves and return to me after they have completed them by securing twenty signatures on each copy. A retired Catholic priest requested copies and returned them with one hundred signatures. One woman ordered twenty-five petitions for use in local hospitals and other institutions, then had one hundred duplicates made up herself which she sent to people she knows all over the country. I hope this campaign will grow into a national crusade for decency that will sweep this abomination back into the cesspool where it belongs—for good."

Who foots the bill for all this? "Nobody," answers the fighting lady. "But some people are very thoughtful. A few have enclosed stamps with requests for petitions. One woman sent two dollars. Another sent ten. And a well-known and dedicated businessman has printed hundreds of petitions for me and also provided stationery and secretarial help."

For many years, when she was younger, she visited local nursing homes of the Little Sisters of the Poor to sing twice monthly for the aged inmates. She also entertained veterans in veterans' hospitals in the area.

"They were so appreciative," says she. Mrs. Lasker's life has been characterized by service, charity, dedication, and self-sacrifice.

The world has all too few Billie Laskers. Valiant is the name for Billie.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Jan. 30, 1970]

WOMAN FILES PETITIONS IN ANTI-SMUT FIGHT

A Clayton grandmother who is waging a one-woman crusade against pornography has added more than just a handful of signatures to the collection she has been sending regularly to U.S. Sen. James Eastland (Dem.) Mississippi.

The crusader is Mrs. Billie Lasker, 7815 Pershing ave., who collects about 100 signatures a day on petitions which she circulates at various shopping centers in the county.

Her latest batch of petitions, containing 2,860 signatures, was put in the mail Tuesday addressed to Eastland, who heads the

Senate Judiciary Committee and is responsible for consideration of any new anti-smut legislation.

In her letter Mrs. Lasker asks, "When is Congress going to end the unconscionable usurpations of the Supreme Court which has opened wide the floodgates of iniquity through which this hellish torrent of unspeakable rotteness thunders in upon us from all sides?"

PROPOSED AMERICAN AIRLINES-WESTERN AIRLINES MERGER

HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I believe the proposed merger of American Airlines and Western Air Lines will benefit the people of Alaska. If done properly and American maintains its positive attitudes about its advent on the Alaska scene, I see the following advantages being realized:

First. It will provide Alaska, for the first time, with the services of American Airlines, one of the world's leading airlines.

Second. Alaska's developing oil industry will obtain an important new one-carrier link to Texas.

Third. The merger will provide a new single-carrier service between Alaska and a long list of major cities in the Southwest, Midwest, and East which American serves and which are a great potential source of Alaskan vacation travel. It also will provide one-carrier service to the South Pacific. American will use its promotional efforts to stimulate these Alaskan vacation markets.

Fourth. American will be able to improve Alaska's air services. American has 10 Boeing 747 aircraft in service, another six on order, and has delivery positions for six Boeing SST's. It has also ordered 25 Douglas DC-10's. American promises to provide improved service over the Alaskan routes now serviced by Western.

Fifth. American has a fleet of 17 all-cargo jet aircraft available to meet the needs of the people of Alaska.

Because of the peculiarities of Alaska's cost functions and other factors, it has been clear for some time that the State will be developed largely by big capital. Big capital is generally available in the private sector to the big firms, and transportation and the airlines are no exception to these maxims. For these and other reasons I welcome the possibility of American Airlines merging with Western Airlines which presently serves Alaska routes.

Such a merger seems to me to be a logical step in the evolution of air transport carriage in Alaska—Pacific Northern Airlines having earlier merged with Western and now Western merging with a still larger carrier with still greater financial strength and diversity of equipment and service. American, with its extensive marketing capability, can be very helpful in promoting tourist travel to Alaska, an increasingly important factor in that State's economy as personal in-

comes and leisure time increase, air travel times diminish, and fewer places remain to be visited by the vacationing public. Through American's subsidiary enterprises, new and selectively located hotel accommodations may be added to the Alaska tourist industry.

In the business and commercial fields I see the connecting of the traditional oil areas of Southwestern United States with the emerging oil areas of Alaska to be of particular importance both in the transport of passengers and cargo. If, as I believe is likely, the development of Alaska—particularly the northern areas—will not involve dramatic increases in community size, this implies the substitution of a high-speed air transportation network for migration and settlement itself.

For the consumer of air transportation and the benefits it can bring, the real payoff is, of course, in reasonable air fares and reliable frequencies of service. I am aware that there has sometimes been a history of major air carriers being interested in acquiring new routes and then moving to "skim the cream" of the high density traffic for themselves, leaving communities and the traveling public on the thinner routes to shift as best they can.

American Airlines has assured me that this will not be the case, and I, therefore, hope the merger with Western will be approved when all the requirements for the transaction are met.

VOTING RECORD IN THE SECOND SESSION OF THE 91ST CONGRESS

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, once again I take this opportunity to insert an account of my voting record for all rollcall votes during the second session of the 91st Congress. I believe this report will be of interest to the residents of the 12th Congressional District whom I am privileged to represent in the Congress. My constituents are entitled to this accounting. This continues my practice of making my record readily and succinctly available.

During the 91st Congress, Members cast votes which were not recorded; however, only recorded votes are available; they are generally considered representative of a Member's position on issues. I fully realize how difficult it may sometimes be to properly interpret a Member's position when a half dozen votes are involved. We do not always have the opportunity to make clear-cut votes on every issue. However, my affirmative votes reflect a judgment that a bill includes more good than bad.

If any constituent desires more detailed information concerning any particular issue, I will be pleased to furnish it.

Due to official business away from Washington, it was occasionally necessary to miss a rollcall vote. On these measures, I have indicated my position.

My report follows:

VOTING RECORD OF BURT L. TALCOTT OF THE 12TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

(Yea—for; Nay—against; NVA—not voting, against; NVF—not voting, for; NVPA—not voting, paired against; NVPF—not voting, paired for.)

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote	Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
4	Jan. 27	H.R. 15149: To make appropriations of \$2.5 billion for Foreign Assistance and related programs for fiscal 1970. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 202 to 162).....	Yea	49	Mar. 16	H.R. 14896: To provide for the preservation of additional historic properties. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 317 to 9; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea
5	Jan. 27	H.R. 860: To amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit, in certain instances, employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products. On passage. (Passed 189 to 186).....	Nay	54	Mar. 18	S. 952: To provide for the appointment of additional Federal district judges. On passage. (Passed 366 to 18).....	Yea
7	Jan. 28	H.R. 13111: To make appropriations of \$19,747,153,200 for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for fiscal 1970. To override veto. (Failed 226 to 191; 2/3 vote required).....	Nay	56	Mar. 19	H.R. 16196: To reorganize the courts of the District of Columbia; to revise the procedures for handling juveniles in the District of Columbia; to codify title 23 of the District of Columbia Code. On passage. (Passed 294 to 47, "present" 1).....	Yea
9	Jan. 29	H.R. 14864: To amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 to authorize measures to protect defense production and classified information released to defense industry against acts of subversion. On passage. (Passed 274 to 65).....	Yea	59	Mar. 23	H.R. 15728: To authorize the loan of surplus naval vessels to foreign countries. On passage. (Passed 281 to 66).....	Yea
12	Feb. 16	H.R. 1049: To amend the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act of 1965, relating to the conservation of Anadromous fishing resources. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 301 to 19; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea	61	Mar. 24	H.R. 15628: To extend the Foreign Military Sales Act through fiscal 1972. On passage. (Passed 351 to 26).....	Yea
14	Feb. 17	H.R. 15062: For the relief of sundry claimants. Hall motion to strike title I (H.R. 3732) to provide for the relief of Robert G. Smith. (Failed 59 to 288).....	Yea	62	Mar. 25	H. Res. 884: To authorize the expenditure of \$450,000 for the expenses of the House Committee on Internal Security. On passage. (Passed 307 to 52).....	Yea
15	Feb. 17	H.R. 15062: Gross motion to strike title II (H.R. 5000) for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido. (Failed 56 to 290).....	Yea	63	Mar. 25	H.R. 4148: To amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 358 to 0).....	Yea
16	Feb. 17	H.R. 15062: Brown motion to strike title III (H.R. 6378) for the relief of Noel S. Marston. (Failed 67 to 288).....	Yea	66	Apr. 7	H.R. 514: To extend programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education, aid to impacted areas, and other education legislation. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 312 to 58).....	Yea
17	Feb. 17	H.R. 15062: Duncan motion to strike title IV (H.R. 2214) for the relief of the Mutual Benefit Foundation. (Failed 51 to 306).....	Yea	67	Apr. 7	H.R. 15733: To amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide a temporary 15 percent increase in annuities. On passage. (Passed 379 to 0).....	Yea
18	Feb. 17	H.R. 15062: To provide for the relief of sundry claimants. On passage. (Passed 318 to 51).....	Nay	70	Apr. 9	H.R. 16844: To increase the pay of Federal employees. Corbett recommittal motion with instructions to delete sections establishing unrelated allowances or benefits for Army Corps of Engineer dredge workers and certain personnel who perform duty at remote workites. (Passed 261 to 124).....	Yea
22	Feb. 18	H.R. 15165: To establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. On passage. (Passed 371 to 13).....	Yea	71	Apr. 9	H.R. 16844: On passage. (Passed 372 to 7).....	Yea
25	Feb. 19	H.R. 15931: To make appropriations of \$19.4 billion for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal 1970. Previous question. (Passed 238 to 157).....	Yea	73	Apr. 13	H.R. 16900: To make appropriations of \$9,492,702,000 for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President and certain independent agencies for fiscal 1971. On passage. (Passed 333 to 3).....	Yea
26	Feb. 19	H.R. 15931: Michel recommittal motion with instructions to provide authority for the President to withhold 2 1/2 percent of the funds. (Failed 189 to 205).....	Yea	75	Apr. 14	H. Res. 909: To concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendment to S. 3690 (H.R. 16844), to increase the pay of Federal employees. Previous question. (Passed 309 to 65).....	Yea
27	Feb. 19	H.R. 15931: On passage. (Passed 315 to 81).....	Nay	77	Apr. 15	H. Res. 916: To provide for the consideration of H.R. 16311, the Family Assistance Act. On passage. (Passed 205 to 183).....	Nay
29	Feb. 24	H.R. 10937: To authorize a study of the construction of an Eisenhower National Memorial Arena. On passage. (Failed 136 to 230).....	NVA	80	Apr. 15	Motion to adjourn. On agreement. (Passed 81 to 75).....	NVA
30	Feb. 24	H.R. 10335: To revise certain laws of the District of Columbia relating to offenses against hotels, motels and other commercial lodgings. On passage. (Passed 246 to 117).....	NVF	82	Apr. 16	H.R. 16311: To authorize a family assistance plan providing basic benefits to low-income families with children; to provide incentives for employment and training to improve the uniformity of treatment of recipients under the Federal-State public assistance programs; and to otherwise alter such programs. Collier recommittal motion with instructions to delete the word "suitable" from the description of the employment welfare recipients must accept. (Passed 248 to 149).....	Yea
31	Feb. 24	H.R. 14608: To change the procedure for return and cancellation of liquor licenses in the District of Columbia. On passage. (Failed 97 to 262).....	NVF	83	Apr. 16	H.R. 16311: On passage. (Passed 243 to 155).....	Yea
33	Feb. 26	S. 2523: To amend the Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act, to extend programs of assistance to community mental health centers, for the treatment of alcoholics and narcotic addicts, and for the mental health of children. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 369 to 0).....	Yea	85	Apr. 20	H.R. 10666: To establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 261 to 11; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea
34	Feb. 26	H. Res. 799: To provide for the consideration of H.R. 12025, the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act. On passage. (Failed 150 to 228).....	Yea	86	Apr. 20	H.R. 780: To authorize \$28.5 million for the Merlin Division, Rogue River Basin Project, Oregon. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 271 to 15; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea
36	Mar. 3	H.R. 15931: To make appropriations of \$19.4 billion for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for fiscal 1970. Motion to lay on table the motion to instruct House conferees to agree to the amendments of the Senate. (Failed 164 to 222).....	Nay	89	Apr. 23	H.R. 16516: To authorize appropriations of \$3,600,875,000 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1971. On passage. (Passed 229 to 105).....	Yea
37	Mar. 3	H.R. 15931: Motion to instruct House conferees to agree to amendments of the Senate. (Passed 231 to 152).....	Yea	91	Apr. 27	H.R. 14714: To encourage, through the National Park Service, travel in the United States. Recommittal motion. (Failed 111 to 222).....	Yea
39	Mar. 3	H.R. 15931: Adoption of conference report. (Passed 324 to 55).....	Yea	92	Apr. 27	H.R. 14714: On passage. (Passed 238 to 94).....	Yea
40	Mar. 4	H. J. Res. 1112: To prohibit strikes or lockouts in the railroad dispute until 12:01 a.m. April 11, 1970. On passage. (Passed 343 to 15).....	NVF	93	Apr. 27	H.R. 14385: To authorize subsidized transportation for Public Health Service employees affected by the transfer to the Parklawn Building in Rockville, Maryland. On passage. (Failed 64 to 273).....	Nay
42	Mar. 5	H. Res. 862: To provide for the consideration of S. 2910, to amend Public Law 89-260 to authorize additional funds for the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building. On passage. (Passed 289 to 62).....	NVF	95	Apr. 28	H.R. 16200: To extend through fiscal 1971 and 1972 authorizations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Gross recommittal motion with instructions to reduce funds from \$17.5 million to \$13.125 million. (Failed 87 to 280).....	Nay
43	Mar. 5	S. 2910: Snyder recommittal motion with instructions not to report back until plans and designs are completed. (Failed 150 to 196, "present" 1).....	NVF	96	Apr. 28	H.R. 15693: To prohibit the mailing of obscene materials to persons under 17 and to permit persons to preclude such materials from coming into their homes by mail. On passage. (Passed 375 to 8).....	Yea
44	Mar. 5	S. 2910: On passage. (Passed 209 to 133, "present" 1).....	NVA	100	May 4	S. J. Res. 193: To provide for appointment of James E. Webb as citizen regent of the Smithsonian Institution. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 309 to 16; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea
46	Mar. 11	H.R. 15945: To authorize \$429,300,000 in fiscal 1971 to build and operate American merchant ships. On passage. (Passed 370 to 12).....	Yea	103	May 6	H.R. 17123: To authorize fiscal 1971 appropriations of \$20,237,489,000 for procurement of military equipment and weapons, and for other purposes. Previous question on recommittal motion. (Passed 248 to 146).....	Yea
48	Mar. 16	H.R. 15143: To provide the grade of Lieutenant General for the Chief of the National Guard Bureau. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 269 to 44; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea				

VOTING RECORD OF BURT L. TALCOTT OF THE 12TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

(Yea—for; Nay—against; NVA—not voting, against; NVF—not voting, for; NVPA—not voting, paired against; NVPF—not voting, paired for.)

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote	Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
104	May 6	H.R. 17123: On passage. (Passed 326 to 69).....	Yea	162	June 10	H. Res. 1069: To provide for the consideration of H.R. 17255 to authorize the Secretary of HEM to establish nationwide air pollution standards. On passage. (Passed 336 to 40).....	Yea
107	May 7	H.R. 17399: To make supplemental appropriations of \$5,764,115,791 for fiscal 1970. Previous question on recommittal motion with instructions. (Passed 220 to 134).....	Yea	164	June 10	H.R. 17255: On passage. (Passed 374 to 1).....	Yea
108	May 7	H.R. 17399: On passage. (Passed 334 to 6).....	Yea	167	June 11	H.R. 17970: To make appropriations of \$1,997,037,000 for military construction and family housing. On passage. (Passed 308 to 57).....	Nay
110	May 11	H.R. 17138: To amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1968, and the District of Columbia Teacher's Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries. On agreeing to committee amendments. (Passed 183 to 142).....	Yea	168	June 15	H.R. 17958: To increase the rates of disability compensation and to alter criteria for determining the eligibility of widows for benefits. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 313 to 0, "present" 1; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea
111	May 11	H.R. 16595: To authorize fiscal 1971 appropriations of \$527,630,000 for National Science Foundation. Roudebush recommittal motion with instructions to cut authorizations from \$527,630,000 to \$500,000,000. (Failed 137 to 188).....	Yea	169	June 15	H.R. 15361: To establish the Youth Conservation Corps. On passage. (Passed 256 to 54).....	Yea
112	May 11	H.R. 16595: On passage. (Passed 312 to 6).....	Yea	171	June 16	H. Res. 1077: To provide for the consideration of H.R. 17070, to reorganize the postal system. Previous question. (Failed 139 to 219).....	Nay
117	May 13	H.R. 14465: To provide for the expansion and improvement of the Nation's airport and airway system, to be financed in major part by user taxes. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 362 to 3).....	Yea	175	June 17	H. Res. 914: To provide for agreeing to Senate amendments (including the lowering of the voting age to 18 and uniform residency requirements for voting in presidential elections) to H.R. 4249, to extend and amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Previous question. (Passed 224 to 183, "present" 2).....	Nay
118	May 13	H. Res. 960: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1970 creating a Domestic Council and enlarging the Bureau of the Budget, to be called the Office of Management and Budget. On passage. (Failed 164 to 193).....	Nay	176	June 17	H. Res. 914: On passage. (Passed 272 to 132).....	Nay
120	May 14	H.R. 17575: To make appropriations of \$3,106,956,500 for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and for the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal 1971. On passage. (Passed 321 to 14).....	NVF	179	June 18	H.R. 17070: To reorganize the postal system. Gross recommittal motion with instructions to report the bill back with a recommendation to delete the entire bill except an 8-percent pay raise for postal employees and a reduction to 8 years required to reach the top pay steps within a grade of postal field service. (Failed 77 to 306).....	Nay
121	May 14	H.R. 14685: To amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote foreign travel to the United States. On passage. (Passed 173 to 88).....	NVF	180	June 23	H.R. 17070: On passage. (Passed 359 to 24).....	Yea
123	May 18	S. 2624: To alter the judicial machinery in customs courts. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 301 to 0; 2/3 vote required).....	NVF	182	June 22	S. 2315: To restore the golden eagle program for annual permits of entry to all national parks and forests. On passage. (Passed 314 to 1).....	Yea
124	May 18	S. 1508: To amend provisions of the law relating to the retirement of Federal judges. Motion to suspend the rules and pass. (Failed 109 to 198; 2/3 vote required).....	NVA	184	June 23	H.R. 11833: To extend and amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act. On passage. (Passed 339 to 0).....	Yea
125	May 18	H.R. 3328: To authorize annexation of the Soboba Indian reservation to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California to provide for construction of a water supply for the reservation. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 287 to 11; 2/3 vote required).....	NVF	188	June 25	H.R. 11102: To extend program of Federal grants for construction and modernization of health facilities. To override veto. (Passed 279 to 98, "present" 2; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea
127	May 19	S. 952: To provide for the appointment of additional district judges. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 331 to 21).....	NVF	189	June 25	H.R. 17399: To make supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1970. Cohelan motion to agree to Senate amendment adding \$587.5 million for urban renewal grants. (Failed 137 to 236).....	Nay
130	May 20	H.R. 17604: To authorize \$1,999,634,000 for military construction. Previous question on recommittal motion. (Passed 251 to 133).....	Yea	190	June 25	H.R. 17495: To alter the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of housing. On agreeing to committee amendment to provide for establishment of National Development Bank. (Passed 216 to 112).....	Yea
131	May 20	H.R. 17604: On passage. (Passed 335 to 47).....	PR	191	June 25	H.R. 17495: On passage. (Passed 324 to 2, "present" 1).....	Yea
132	May 21	H. Res. 1022: To provide for the consideration of H.R. 17550, to increase Social Security benefits by five percent. Previous question. (Passed 201 to 181).....	Yea	194	June 30	H.R. 16916: To make appropriations of \$4,420,145,000 for the Office of Education for fiscal 1971. Flood motion to table motion of Cohelan to instruct House conferees to agree to Senate amendments striking provisions prohibiting use of funds for busing or the closing of schools and providing for freedom of choice plans. (Passed 191 to 157).....	Yea
133	May 21	H. Res. 1022: On passage. (Passed 297 to 83).....	Yea	195	June 30	H.R. 17825: To authorize \$3.15 billion in Federal law enforcement assistance funds for fiscal 1971, 1972, and 1973. On passage. (Passed 345 to 2, "present" 1).....	Yea
135	May 21	H.R. 17550: Betts recommittal motion with instructions to add amendment providing for automatic cost-of-living increases. (Passed 233 to 144).....	Yea	196	June 30	S. J. Res. 88: To create a commission to study bankruptcy laws. On passage. (Passed 334 to 12).....	Yea
136	May 21	H.R. 17550: On passage. (Passed 344 to 32).....	Yea	197	June 30	H.R. 16065: To authorize funds through fiscal 1973 for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. On passage. (Passed 262 to 78).....	Yea
137	May 21	H.R. 15424: To amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1934. On passage. (Passed 307 to 1).....	NVF	199	July 6	S. 3592: To amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act, to permit custom slaughterers to engage in the retailing and wholesaling of meat. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 297 to 2; 2/3 vote required).....	NVF
139	May 25	H.R. 17601: To exempt FHA and VA mortgages and loans from D.C. usuary laws until April 1972. On passage. (Failed 118 to 176).....	Yea	201	July 7	H.R. 16327: To authorize appropriations for the Peace Corps. Gross recommittal motion with instructions to reduce authorizations by \$28.8 million. (Failed 118 to 245).....	NVF
140	May 25	H.R. 15073: To amend the Federal Deposit Act to require insured banks to maintain certain records; to require that certain transactions in United States currency be reported to the Department of the Treasury. On passage. (Passed 302 to 0, "present" 1).....	Yea	202	July 7	H.R. 16327: On passage. (Passed 316 to 46).....	NVF
141	May 25	H. J. Res. 1117: To create a Joint Committee on Environment and Technology. On passage. (Passed 285 to 7).....	Yea	203	July 7	H.R. 8673: To establish a civil remedy for misrepresentation of the quality of articles composed in whole or in part of gold or silver. On passage. (Passed 351 to 9).....	NVF
143	May 26	H. Res. 796: To amend House rules relating to financial disclosure. On passage. (Passed 335 to 1).....	Yea	205	July 8	H. Res. 1031: To authorize the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to investigate lobbying and campaign contributions. On passage. (Passed 382 to 0).....	Yea
146	May 27	H.R. 17755: To make appropriations of \$2,579,579,937 for Department of Transportation and related agencies for fiscal 1971. Previous question on recommittal motion. (Passed 176 to 162).....	Yea	206	July 8	H.R. 279: To exempt from antitrust laws certain joint newspaper operating arrangements. On passage. (Passed 292 to 87, "present" 2).....	Yea
149	June 3	H. Res. 1051: To provide for consideration of H.R. 17802, to raise the temporary and permanent debt ceilings. Previous question. (Passed 273 to 85).....	Yea	207	July 9	H.R. 15628: To amend the Foreign Military Sales Act. Previous question on agreeing to send to conference. (Passed 247 to 143).....	Yea
150	June 3	H.R. 17802: On passage. (Passed 236 to 127).....	Nay	208	July 9	H.R. 15628: Mays motion to lay on table Riegle motion to provide that House conferees be instructed to concur in Senate-passed Cooper-Church amendment on Cambodia. (Passed 237 to 153, "present" 1).....	Yea
152	June 4	H.R. 17867: To make appropriations of \$2,220,961,000 for Foreign Assistance and related programs for fiscal 1971. On passage. (Passed 191 to 153).....	Nay	209	July 9	H.R. 17070: To reorganize the postal system. Dulski motion to table Henderson motion to instruct House conferees to insist on right-to-work provision in House-passed version of the bill. (Failed 153 to 230).....	Nay
154	June 8	H. Res. 976: To authorize an Indochina Study Committee. On agreeing to Committee amendment to enlarge from 11 to 12 members. (Passed 227 to 95).....	Yea				
155	June 8	H. Res. 976: Previous question. (Passed 246 to 80).....	Yea				
156	June 8	H. Res. 976: On passage. (Passed 223 to 101).....	Nay				
157	June 8	H. Res. 976: On agreeing to Committee amendment to strike the preamble. (Passed 210 to 84).....	Yea				
161	June 10	H.R. 11102: To extend authorizations for three years for Federal grants for modernization and construction of health facilities. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 378 to 0).....	Yea				

VOTING RECORD OF BURT L. TALCOTT OF THE 12TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

(Yea—for; Nay—against; NVA—not voting, against; NVF—not voting, for; NVPA—not voting, paired against; NVPF—not voting, paired for.)

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote	Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
210	July 9	H.R. 17070: Henderson motion to instruct conferees. (Passed 227 to 159).....	Yea	262	Aug. 10	H. J. Res. 264: To propose a constitutional amendment banning discrimination on account of sex. Motion to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration. (Passed 332 to 22).....	Yea
211	July 9	H.R. 16968: To provide for adjustment in Government contribution with respect to the health benefits coverage of Federal employees. Gross recommitment motion with instructions to reduce the contribution from 50 percent to 38 percent. (Failed 146 to 200).....	Yea	263	Aug. 10	H. J. Res. 264: McCulloch recommitment motion with instructions to hold hearings thereon. (Failed 26 to 344).....	Nay
212	July 9	H.R. 16968: On passage. (Passed 284 to 57).....	Yea	264	Aug. 10	H. J. Res. 264: On passage. (Passed 350 to 15).....	Yea
213	July 13	S. 3215: To authorize appropriations through fiscal 1973 for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 237 to 69).....	Yea	265	Aug. 10	H.R. 18619: To establish a nonvoting delegate from the District of Columbia in both the House and Senate. On passage. (Passed 338 to 23).....	Yea
216	July 15	S. 2601: D.C. Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 332 to 64).....	Yea	266	Aug. 10	H.R. 18725: To establish a Commission on the Organization of the Government of the District of Columbia and to provide for a nonvoting delegate in the House from the District. On passage. (Passed 300 to 57).....	Yea
217	July 15	H.R. 16595: To authorize \$537,730,000 for activities of the National Science Foundation plus \$2,000,000 in excess foreign currencies for fiscal 1971. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 311 to 76).....	Yea	269	Aug. 11	H.R. 18110: To amend the Public Health Services Act to extend assistance programs to states and localities for comprehensive health planning. On passage. (Passed 275 to 1).....	Yea
219	July 16	H.R. 14685: To amend the International Travel Act of 1961 to expand U.S. Government efforts to attract foreign tourists. Adoption of conference report. (Failed 174 to 207).....	Nay	271	Aug. 11	H.R. 18434: To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to exempt major party candidates for the Presidency from equal-time provisions of the Act and to establish limitations on campaign spending for political broadcasting. On passage. (Passed 273 to 98).....	Nay
220	July 16	H.R. 16916: To make appropriations of \$4,420,145,000 for the Office of Education for fiscal 1971. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 357 to 30).....	Yea	274	Aug. 12	H.R. 8298: To amend the Interstate Commerce Act to alter certain restrictions upon the application and scope of the exemption provided therein. Nelson amendment in the form of a substitute for the Committee amendment. (Failed 181 to 194).....	Yea
221	July 20	H.R. 18253: To increase availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 326 to 0; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea	275	Aug. 12	H.R. 8298: Nelson recommitment motion. (Failed 141 to 230).....	Nay
222	July 20	H.R. 14114: To improve administration of the national park system. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 325 to 0; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea	276	Aug. 12	H.R. 17570: To amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and alter the existing program relating to education, research and training in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases. On passage. (Passed 365 to 0).....	Yea
228	July 22	H.R. 17619: To make appropriations of \$2,028,524,700 for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal 1971. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 387 to 3).....	Yea	278	Aug. 13	H.R. 16916: To make appropriations of \$4,420,145,000 for the Office of Education for fiscal 1971. On passage to override veto. (Passed 289 to 114; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea
231	July 23	H.R. 14705: To extend and alter the Federal-State unemployment compensation program. O'Hara motion to recommit the conference report with instructions to agree to Senate amendment extending coverage to certain agriculture workers. (Failed 170 to 219).....	Nay	279	Aug. 13	H.R. 17548: To make appropriations of \$18 billion for Independent Offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for fiscal 1971. On passage to override veto. (Failed 204 to 195; 2/3 vote required).....	Nay
232	July 23	H.R. 14705: Adoption of conference report. (Passed 388 to 3, "present" 1).....	Yea	280	Aug. 13	S. 3302: To amend the Defense Production Act of 1950. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 216 to 153).....	Nay
233	July 23	H.R. 18515: To make appropriations of \$18,824,663,000 for the Departments of Labor, and HEW, OEO and related agencies for fiscal 1971. On passage. (Passed 362 to 14).....	Yea	281	Aug. 13	S. 3547: To authorize the Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Narrows Unit, Missouri River Basin Project, Colorado. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 337 to 4).....	Yea
238	July 29	H.R. 17548: To make appropriations of \$18 billion for Independent Offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for fiscal 1971. Motion to recommit conference report. (Failed 156 to 227).....	Yea	283	Aug. 13	H. Res. 1182: To provide for two hours debate on H.R. 17809, to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government. Previous question. (Passed 235 to 86).....	Yea
242	July 30	H.R. 15733: To provide a temporary 15-percent increase in railroad retirement annuities. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 344 to 0).....	Yea	287	Sept. 9	H.R. 17809: On passage. (Passed 231 to 90).....	Yea
243	July 30	H.R. 13100: To extend for three years programs of assistance for training in the allied health professions. On passage. (Passed 343 to 1).....	Yea	288	Sept. 9	H.R. 16542: To provide for the regulation of the mailing of unsolicited credit cards. On passage. (Passed 301 to 0).....	Yea
244	July 30	H.R. 14237: To amend the Mental Retardation Facility and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. On passage. (Passed 339 to 0).....	NVF	290	Sept. 10	H.R. 17795: To amend Title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. On passage. (Passed 282 to 32).....	Yea
247	July 31	H.R. 17880: To amend the Defense Production Act of 1950. Blackburn recommitment motion with instructions to report back with a provision requiring the President to freeze prices, rent, wages, salaries and interest at their May 25, 1970 level and authorizing a ceiling of no more than \$2 billion to carry out provisions of the freeze. (Failed 11 to 270).....	Nay	291	Sept. 10	H.R. 11913: To amend the Public Health Service Act to provide authorization for grants for communicable disease control. On passage. (Passed 312 to 1).....	Yea
248	July 31	H.R. 17880: On passage. (Passed 257 to 19).....	Yea	293	Sept. 10	H.R. 9306: To provide for the establishment of Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in Wisconsin. Kyl recommitment motion with instructions.	NVA
250	Aug. 3	H.R. 18260: To authorize \$45 million through fiscal 1973 to establish programs on environmental education. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 289 to 28; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea	295	Sept. 14	H.R. 18306: To authorize United States participation in certain international financial institutions. On passage. (Passed 177 to 140).....	NVF
251	Aug. 3	H.R. 11032: To prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 322 to 4; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea	299	Sept. 16	H.R. 16900: To make appropriations of \$3,004,711,000 for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office and certain independent agencies for fiscal 1971. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 342 to 8).....	Yea
252	Aug. 3	H.R. 2076: To provide for the withholding from the salaries of Federal employees income taxes imposed by certain cities. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed 145 to 184; 2/3 vote required).....	Nay	300	Sept. 16	S. 3637: To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to exempt major party candidates for the Presidency from equal-time provisions of the Act and to establish limitations on campaign spending for political broadcasting. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 247 to 112, "present" 2).....	Nay
255	Aug. 5	H. Res. 1117: Relating to compensation of two positions providing for staff created by H. Res. 543, 89th Congress, providing for a staff member for both House Democratic Committee and House Republican Conference. On passage. (Failed 90 to 284).....	Nay	304	Sept. 17	H.R. 17654: Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. Schwengel amendment to provide that no vote may be cast by proxy. (Failed 156 to 187).....	Yea
256	Aug. 5	H.R. 18546: Agricultural Act of 1970. Teague recommitment motion with instructions to delete titles dealing with payment limitations and wheat, feed grains, cotton and land-retirement programs. (Failed 167 to 218).....	Yea	305	Sept. 17	H.R. 17654: On passage. (Passed 326 to 19).....	Yea
257	Aug. 5	H.R. 18546: On passage. (Passed 212 to 171).....	Nay	307	Sept. 21	S. 2763: To provide for purchase of systems and equipment for passenger motor vehicles over statutory price limitations. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 264 to 42; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea
259	Aug. 6	H.R. 17070: To reorganize the postal system. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 338 to 29, "present" 1).....	Yea	308	Sept. 21	H.R. 14678: To alter provisions for penalties for illegal fishing in territorial waters and contiguous fishing zone of the U.S. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 315 to 0; 2/3 vote required).....	NVF
260	Aug. 6	S. 1933: To establish uniform Federal rail safety standards and guidelines for transporting hazardous materials. On passage. (Passed 359 to 0).....	Yea				

VOTING RECORD OF BURT L. TALCOTT OF THE 12TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

(Yea—for; Nay—against; NVA—not voting, against; NVF—not voting, for; NVPA—not voting, paired against; NVPF—not voting, paired for.)

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote	Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
309	Sept. 21	H.R. 15911: To provide for an increase in rates of pension and dependency and indemnity compensation. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 316 to 0, "present" 1; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea	357	Nov. 18	H. Res. 1225: To provide for the consideration of H.R. 18970 to amend the tariff and trade laws of the U.S. Previous question on closed rule under which the bill was considered. (Failed 189 to 204).....	Nay
310	Sept. 21	H.R. 16710: To authorize loans for mobile homes for veterans. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 297 to 0; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea	358	Nov. 18	H. Res. 1225: Gibbons amendment to permit amendments deleting provisions from the bill. (Failed 192 to 201).....	Yea
311	Sept. 22	H.R. 18127: To make appropriations for Public Works and the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1971. Evins motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment reported by conferees providing \$807,000 in planning funds for the Dickey-Lincoln power project in Maine. (Failed 131 to 230).....	Nay	359	Nov. 18	H. Res. 1225: On passage. (Passed 203 to 187).....	Nay
312	Sept. 23	H. Res. 1220: A resolution citing Arnold S. Johnson for contempt of Congress. On passage. (Passed 337 to 14).....	Yea	361	Nov. 19	H.R. 18970: Collier recommittal motion. (Failed 172 to 207, "present" 3).....	Yea
315	Sept. 24	H.R. 18583: To alter existing drug abuse education programs, prevention, treatment and rehabilitation programs, revising the Federal narcotics laws and penalty structure, and providing additional law enforcement methods. On passage. (Passed 341 to 6, "present" 1).....	NVF	362	Nov. 19	H.R. 18970: On passage. (Passed 215 to 165; "present" 3).....	Nay
317	Sept. 28	S. 2264: To provide authorization for grants for communicable disease control and vaccination assistance. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 292 to 2).....	NVF	365	Nov. 24	H.R. 16785: Occupational Health and Safety Act of 1970. Steiger-Sikes amendment in nature of substitute authorizing a presidentially-appointed board to set standards and an appeals commission to enforce standards. (Passed 220 to 173).....	Yea
318	Sept. 28	S. 1933: To alter existing standards for railroad safety and hazardous material control. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 311 to 0).....	NVF	366	Nov. 24	H.R. 16785: On passage. (Passed 384 to 5, "present" 1).....	Yea
320	Sept. 29	H.R. 17123: To authorize \$19,929,089,000 for defense procurement research and Safeguard antiballistic missile construction for fiscal 1971. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 341 to 11).....	Yea	367	Nov. 24	H.R. 19830: To make appropriations of \$17,709,525,300 for Independent Offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. On passage. (Passed 375 to 10).....	Yea
321	Sept. 29	H.R. 18185: To provide long-term financing for expanded urban mass transportation programs. Boland amendment to reduce aggregate authority to \$3.1 billion from \$5 billion for grants and loans. (Passed 200 to 145).....	Yea	368	Nov. 24	H. Res. 1267: To provide for the consideration of H.R. 19504, Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970. On passage. (Passed 287 to 60).....	Yea
322	Sept. 29	H.R. 18185: On passage. (Passed 328 to 16).....	Yea	371	Nov. 30	H.R. 18884: To permit projects for paid advertising under marketing orders; to provide for potato research; and to provide for the extension of restrictions on imported commodities. Goodling recommittal motion. (Failed 130 to 187).....	Nay
324	Sept. 30	H.R. 18679: To amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to eliminate the requirement for a finding of practical value. On passage. (Passed 346 to 0).....	Yea	373	Dec. 1	H.R. 19333: To create a Securities Investor Protection Corporation and an insurance fund to protect customers against losses due to broker insolvency. On passage. (Passed 359 to 3, "present" 1).....	Yea
325	Sept. 30	H.R. 19444: To provide for guards to accompany aircraft operated by U.S. air carriers in order to prevent hijackings and to raise revenue for that purpose. On passage. (Passed 323 to 17).....	Yea	374	Dec. 1	H.R. 19599: To provide for grants to medical schools and hospitals to assist in establishing departments and programs in the field of family medical practice. On passage. (Passed 346 to 2).....	Yea
326	Oct. 5	H. J. Res. 1388: To provide for continuing appropriations of \$600,000,000 for fiscal 1971. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 284 to 9; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea	376	Dec. 2	H. Res. 1270: To increase telephone, telegraph, and radio-telegraph allowances of Members of the House. On passage. (Passed 187 to 164).....	Nay
327	Oct. 5	S. 1461: To provide for public defender organizations to represent defendants in Federal criminal cases who are financially unable to obtain adequate counsel. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 277 to 21; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea	377	Dec. 2	H. Res. 1271: To provide for the consideration of H.R. 19436 to provide for the establishment of a national urban growth policy and to amend laws relating to housing and urban development. On passage. (Passed 344 to 22).....	Nay
329	Oct. 6	H.R. 14685: To amend the International Travel Act to alter the balance of payments by further promoting travel to the U.S. Staggers motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment to reduce funds by \$500,000. (Passed 254 to 93).....	Yea	381	Dec. 3	H.R. 19436: On passage. (Passed 328 to 30, "present" 1).....	NVF
330	Oct. 6	H.R. 15424: To amend the Merchant Marine Act to create a construction subsidy program to build 300 merchant ships by 1980. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 343 to 4).....	Yea	383	Dec. 3	H. Res. 1147: To alter medical allowances for former Members of the House of Representatives. On passage. (Failed 89 to 192, "present" 1).....	NVA
332	Oct. 7	S. 30: Organized Crime Control Act of 1970. On passage. (Passed 341 to 26).....	Yea	385	Dec. 7	To dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House. (Passed 312 to 28).....	Yea
337	Oct. 8	H.R. 19590: To make appropriations of \$66,806,561,000 for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1971. Riegle recommittal motion. (Failed 46 to 264, "present" 1).....	Yea	387	Dec. 7	H. Res. 1282: To express support for the November 21 military expedition to rescue American prisoners of war incarcerated in North Vietnam. On passage. (Passed 347 to 15, "present" 1).....	Yea
338	Oct. 8	H.R. 19590: On passage. (Passed 274 to 31, "present" 2).....	Yea	389	Dec. 8	H.R. 17755: To appropriate \$2,453,923,605 for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for fiscal 1971. Boland motion to table Yates motion to instruct conferees to agree to Senate amendment to strike \$289.9 million for development of the SST. On passage. (Passed 213 to 175, "present" 1).....	NVA
340	Oct. 13	H.R. 17604: To authorize appropriations of \$1,667,154,000 for military construction for fiscal 1971 and \$33,586,000 in prior year authorizations. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 316 to 20).....	NVF	390	Dec. 8	H. Res. 1290: To provide for the consideration of S. 3070 to provide for the development of novel varieties of sexually reproduced plants. On passage. (Passed 331 to 27).....	Yea
341	Oct. 13	H.R. 18546: Agriculture Act of 1970. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 191 to 145, "present" 1).....	NVPA	392	Dec. 9	H. J. Res. 1413: To provide for a temporary prohibition of railway strikes or lockouts. Staggers amendment: to increase the pay of all employees subject to the resolution's first section by 5 percent effective January 1, 1970, and by 32 cents per hour effective November 1, 1970, which amounts may be changed by agreement. (Passed 203 to 184).....	Nay
347	Oct. 14	H.R. 16408: To authorize \$373,000 for fiscal 1971 for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. On passage. (Passed 304 to 1).....	NVF	393	Dec. 9	H. J. Res. 1413: On passage. (Passed 220 to 167).....	Nay
349	Nov. 16	S. 2455: To authorize appropriations of \$3,400,000 for the Civil Rights Commission. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 272 to 59; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea	394	Dec. 9	H.R. 19911: To provide for supplemental foreign aid authorizations. On passage. (Passed 249 to 102).....	Yea
350	Nov. 16	S. 3785: To authorize educational and home loan assistance to dependents of armed forces personnel missing in action or captured. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 331 to 0; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea	397	Dec. 9	H. J. Res. 1413: Adoption of conference report. (Passed 198 to 131).....	Nay
351	Nov. 16	H.R. 19318: To alter the coordination of family planning services and population research activities of the Federal government. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 298 to 32; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea	399	Dec. 10	H. Res. 1303: To waive points of order against H.R. 19928, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1971. On passage. (Passed 331 to 28).....	Yea
352	Nov. 16	H. J. Res. 1355: To define the war powers of Congress and the President. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 288 to 39, "present" 4; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea	400	Dec. 10	H.R. 19928: To provide \$1,525,365,538 in supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1971. On passage. (Passed 344 to 21, "present" 1).....	Yea
355	Nov. 17	H.R. 19519: Manpower Act of 1970. Scherle recommittal motion to refer to Committee on Education and Labor. (Failed 80 to 275).....	Nay	401	Dec. 10	S. 3867: To authorize \$5 billion for various manpower training programs; to reorganize those programs; and to authorize \$4.5 billion for public service jobs. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 177 to 159).....	Nay
				403	Dec. 11	H. Res. 1296: To consider H.R. 19868 to accelerate estate and gift tax collection and to continue car and communication service excise taxes. On passage. (Passed 242 to 22).....	Yea
				405	Dec. 11	H.R. 13956: To authorize additional appropriations to the Smithsonian Institution. On passage. (Passed 215 to 53, "present" 3).....	Yea

VOTING RECORD OF BURT L. TALCOTT OF THE 12TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

(Yea—for; Nay—against; NVA—not voting, against; NVF—not voting, for; NVPA—not voting, paired against; NVPF—not voting, paired for.)

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote	Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
407	Dec. 14	H. Res. 1306: To assert House privilege to publish an Internal Security Committee report on campus speakers. Stokes motion to lay on table ordering of the previous question. (Failed 55 to 301).....	Nay	435	Dec. 21	H.R. 14233: To exempt .22 caliber rimfire ammunition from recordkeeping requirements of the 1968 Gun Control Act. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 246 to 59; 2/3 vote required).....	Yea
408	Dec. 14	H. Res. 1306: On passage. (Passed 302 to 54).....	Yea	436	Dec. 21	H. Res. 1308: To provide for consideration of H.J. Res. 1146 authorizing \$20 million to defray part of the cost of expanding the U.N. headquarters. On passage. (Passed 189 to 107).....	Yea
409	Dec. 14	H.R. 19885: To provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia. On passage. (Passed 272 to 58).....	Yea	438	Dec. 21	H.J. Res. 1146: Gross motion to recommit with instructions that no funds be appropriated until all U.N. members' delinquent dues and assessments have been paid in full. (Failed 124 to 168).....	Yea
411	Dec. 15	H.R. 17755: To appropriate \$2,608,134,605 for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for fiscal year 1971. On ordering previous question on motion to recommit conference report. (Passed 205 to 185).....	Nay	439	Dec. 21	H.J. Res. 1146: On passage. (Passed 152 to 135).....	Nay
412	Dec. 15	H.R. 17755: Adoption of conference report. (Passed 319 to 71).....	Yea	441	Dec. 21	H.R. 19446: To assist school districts to meet special desegregation problems, and to provide funds to improve education in racially impacted areas. On Perkins motion to resolve into Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. (Passed 147 to 84).....	Yea
413	Dec. 15	H.R. 6114: To provide relief for Elmer M. Grade. On motion to disagree with and ask for conference on Senate amendment providing the Mississippi steamboat Delta Queen a 3-year exemption from existing safety standards until a replica might be built. (Passed 295 to 74, "present" 1).....	Yea	442	Dec. 21	H.R. 19446: On striking enacting clause. (Failed 109 to 130).....	Yea
414	Dec. 16	H.R. 17867: To appropriate \$2,534,310,000 for foreign assistance and related programs for fiscal year 1971. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 199 to 152).....	Nay	443	Dec. 21	H.R. 19446: On passage. (Passed 159 to 77).....	Yea
415	Dec. 16	H.R. 19590: To appropriate \$66,595,937,000 for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1971. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 328 to 30, "present" 2).....	Yea	446	Dec. 22	To dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House. (Passed 278 to 9).....	Yea
416	Dec. 16	H.R. 6778: To amend the Bank Holding Act of 1956 to extend Federal regulation of multibank holding companies to those controlling just one bank. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 366 to 4, "present" 7).....	Yea	447	Dec. 22	H. Res. 1238: A resolution providing staff and office allowances for the Speaker of the House in the Ninety-first Congress after his retirement. On passage. (Passed 218 to 69).....	Nay
418	Dec. 16	H.R. 18582: To amend the 1964 Food Stamp Act. On Foley of Washington substitute amendment as amended by Abbutt of Virginia substitute: To change the committee bill by banning food stamps to strikers, postponing the State sharing provision one year, preventing unspent funds from being available from one year to the next, and making eligible migratory workers who are U.S. citizens. (Failed 172 to 183).....	Yea	448	Dec. 22	H. Res. 1315: To provide for the consideration of H.P. 19953 to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to provide funds to certain railroads to preserve essential rail services. On passage. (Passed 263 to 30, "present" 1).....	Yea
419	Dec. 16	H.R. 18582: On passage. (Passed 290 to 68).....	Nay	449	Dec. 22	H.R. 19953: On passage. (Passed 165 to 121, "present" 2).....	Nay
420	Dec. 17	S. 1181: To amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit projects for paid advertising under marketing orders, to provide for a potato research and promotion program, and to provide for the extension of restrictions on imported raisins, olives, and prunes. On motion to ask for a conference. (Passed 214 to 145).....	Yea	450	Dec. 29	H.R. 14984: To provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians. On concurring in Senate request for the return of the bill. (Passed 235 to 20).....	NVF
421	Dec. 17	S. 2193: To authorize the Secretary of Labor to set industrial health and safety standards; to encourage State participation; to provide for research, information, education and training. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 308 to 60).....	Yea	451	Dec. 29	S. 1181: To amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit projects for paid advertising under marketing orders, to provide for a potato research and promotion program, and to provide for the extension of restrictions on raisins, olives, and prunes. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 159 to 93).....	NVPF
422	Dec. 17	H.R. 17809: To provide a system for fixing and adjusting the pay scales of Federal wage board employees. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 271 to 89).....	Yea	452	Dec. 29	H.R. 19590: To appropriate \$66.6 billion for the Department of Defense. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 234 to 18).....	NVF
426	Dec. 18	To dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House. (Passed 307 to 10).....	Yea	454	Dec. 30	H.R. 18582: To amend the 1964 Food Stamp Act. On ordering previous question on motion to recommit conference report. (Passed 148 to 126, "present" 2).....	NVPF
430	Dec. 18	H.R. 19504: Federal-Aid Highway Act Amendments of 1970. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 319 to 11).....	Yea	455	Dec. 30	S. 4268: To amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to allow for greater expansion of the export trade of the United States, and to exclude Bank receipts and disbursements from the budget of the United States Government. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed 161 to 102; 2/3 vote required).....	NVA
432	Dec. 19	H.R. 19436: To provide for a national urban growth policy emphasizing new community and inner city development; to extend and amend housing and urban development laws. Adoption of conference report. (Passed 168 to 104).....	Nay	457	Dec. 31	H.R. 13000: To implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, and to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration. On motion to suspend rules and agree to conference report. (Passed 183 to 54; 2/3 vote required).....	NVA
433	Dec. 19	S. 578: To include firefighters within Code provisions on retirement of Government employees engaged in certain hazardous professions. On passage. (Passed 158 to 104).....	Nay	458	Dec. 31	H. Res. 1337: To provide for the consideration of H. J. Res. 1421 making continuing Department of Transportation and related agencies appropriations for fiscal 1971. On ordering previous question on agreement. (Passed 145 to 76, "present" 2).....	NVF
				459	Dec. 31	H. J. Res. 1421: On passage. (Passed 180 to 37, "present" 1).....	NVF

THE FUTURE OF THE UNION

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, hardly anyone will deny that President Nixon's state of the Union address has stirred the Congress and the Nation in a positive way.

The feeling of this address has been captured in an editorial published in the January 26, 1971, issue of the Columbia Record newspaper in Columbia, S.C.

Mr. President, this editorial is titled "Nixon's 'Future of the Union'", and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NIXON'S FUTURE OF THE UNION

President Nixon's imaginative address to the Congress and the American people was not so much a State of the Union report as a Future of the Union panorama. His innovative design for the realignment of government would make the Federal bureaucracy more responsible and more responsive to the people's genuine desires and would return, through revenue-sharing, government to the people.

Few will quarrel with some of the less contentious matters: cancer research, environmental protection, improved medical care, economic revival and—even—welfare reform.

But the two major items projected by the President were (1) reform of the gargantuan Federal bureaucracy that has "grown like Topsy," and (2) revenue sharing with states and cities.

Both, if accepted in time, would alter the course of American government and return it in theory to a form more like that sought by the Founding Fathers. It is strange to compare what happened here and in Canada in growth and development of government.

The United States deliberately conceived a document, the Constitution, which was designed to keep local government strong

and the central government weak. Canada, on the other hand, tried to create a strong central government in its Articles of Confederation and weaken provincial government. The reverse has transpired—the U.S. has a strong central government while the provinces often dictate to Ottawa.

Mr. Nixon wants to rearrange all this. And Federal bureaucratic reorganization is inextricably intertwined with revenue-sharing in an attempt to constrain government to deliver those services most desired by the majority at levels most responsive to the people's will. It will not be easy.

"Potomac fever" includes a disposition by veteran Washingtonians to distrust both state and local governments, believing that omniscience rests in the legislative and bureaucratic offices. It does not, of course; but Congressmen and Senators believe the myth.

Power is involved. Congress will not surrender easily its jealously, selfishly guarded jurisdictions. Men ill-equipped and ill-prepared to experiment boldly with faith in the people will impede the two major proposals. They will pose as guardians of the "public trust" even while they display no trust in the public.

Mr. Nixon's proposals are innovative at the precise moment when America requires creative change in government to forge a future union of mutual trust and courage. The President has been imaginative; the Congress must now display the will to be adventurous as the American experiment continues.

THE "AVAILABLE" UNIVERSITY

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues who are seriously concerned about the future of higher education in the United States to read the article by Thomas Sowell which follows. It is a wise analysis of the nature of one of our most important institutions. Thomas Sowell, Ph. D. 1968, is associate professor of economics at the University of California at Los Angeles. The copyrighted article appeared in the University of Chicago magazine, November/December 1970 issue. It follows:

THE "AVAILABLE" UNIVERSITY

(By Thomas Sowell)

One of the odd characters who appears from time to time in "L'il Abner" is "Available" Jones, an enterprising man whose time and talents can be rented for any purpose whatsoever. If you want to impress your girl friend by outdoing someone in sports or repartee, Available Jones can be hired to play the fall guy. Full of pent-up anger and frustration? Get it out of your system by giving Mr. Jones a good, hard kick in the behind, for a modest fee. The analogy with the modern university is all too apparent. But while Available Jones' occupation is seen as something of an oddity, it is often considered reasonable, if not inevitable that universities alone of all institutions must serve the purposes of others. No one expects a gas station to cater to pedestrians, or churches to accommodate atheists, or a bar to make teetotalers feel at home. People go into one of these places precisely because they are in accord with its known purposes. But the university is expected to be "open" (to those unconcerned or contemptuous toward its goals), "relevant" (to the purposes of other institutions and movements), "involved" (in activities for which it has no special fitness), and

"responsive" (to any demand whatsoever)—in short, available.

The apostles of Relevance argue as if the only alternative was a community of cloistered scholars talking only to each other while the suffering of the world goes on outside. This argument goes to the heart of the question whether a university has any intrinsic relevance or whether it must launch expeditions to go out and find relevance, and import it like some rare tropical plant. A look at the agony and progress of man over the centuries might suggest some value in the systematic development of the human mind and a continuing relevance of disciplined and informed thinking, in contrast to the kinds of visceral reactions, heady rhetoric, and grandiose visions which have spread so much blood and debris across the pages of history. The tedious analytical dissection of ideas and problems, far from being a luxury of a leisure class, is a prime necessity for society's survival, much less its technical and social progress. Despite this vital function which lies at the heart of a university's role, it is clear that groups within the university, and sometimes whole universities, have lost their sense of purpose. Partly this is because the university's purpose has been obscured by an overgrowth of additional and often conflicting activities. The recognized importance of the university, which has caused it to be maintained for centuries by societies far poorer than today's, has made it a "hot property" in the hands of modern "operators," and its credentials an impressive backdrop for romantic posturing by adolescents of various ages, including faculty members and administrators.

The university, like every other institution of society, has never existed in a pure form designed to serve its ideal purpose. But it is nevertheless useful to note which of the alien features that have been grafted onto it have helped produce its current maladies. One of these has been the consuming desire to gain additional money, power, and prestige by serving outside interests—i.e., the pursuit of local and transient "relevance" rather than the general and permanent relevance inherent in the search for knowledge and understanding. Vocationalism, corrupt athletics, the establishment of "institutes" for some vested interest, "centers" for things currently making headlines, and "chairs" in some donor's pet idea are obvious examples. Another has been the acceptance of *bigger numbers* as an index of success—enrollments, buildings, faculty, news items, etc. The university has sold itself to the public as a veritable panacea for personal and social problems, playing on the credulous notion that processing everyone through ivy-covered buildings for four years was "education" and therefore "a good thing." Its pretensions have been greatly helped by the fact that even the worst education cannot prevent students from growing four years older in the course of four years, and that it is rare for a young adult not to acquire some elements of maturity and miscellaneous information over such a span of time. Moreover, the university is necessarily a testing ground of sorts—of perseverance, if nothing else—so that employers find college degrees and records to be handy screening devices, regardless of what was actually taught. This in turn means that young people are forced to go to college in economic self-defense. In short, the colleges and universities have been in an ideal position to gain an ever-increasing captive audience. Now they are discovering that the audience can also hold them captive.

While there is justifiable outrage at disruptions and violence on college campuses across the country and around the world, this feeling is no defense of university administrators, who have been far too clever for anyone's good, or of those faculty members who have abdicated responsibility for any-

thing beyond personal ambitions and departmental logrolling. The feeling of outrage is because underneath all the cheap huckstering, the petty intrigues and casual betrayals, there is something vital to the life of the mind and the life of society, which cannot be allowed to be destroyed.

The threat of destruction comes not from the actual physical assaults, disruptions, and turmoil on campus, for there is ultimately ample power to stop all of this, but from the ambivalence, expediency, guilt, and apathy in which it flourishes, and which is willing to buy it off at any price, provided only that convenient payments be arranged in easy (though perpetual) installments. It is symptomatic of the underlying values involved that the possibility of waking up some morning and finding a university building gutted by fire is the great fear; the prospect of waking up some day and finding the whole meaning of the university gutted does not arouse nearly as much concern.

The current struggle on college and university campuses is like some curious storybook battle in which one side has an overwhelming superiority in material resources but the other side possesses a few magic words that can spread confusion and paralysis and its opponents—in this case, "relevance," "black," "youth," and "idealism." While there is ample reason for the university's loss of confidence in its moral position, which is what makes such words effective, the real question is whether the guilty ambivalence of one side and the dogmatic self-righteousness of the other are the ingredients of an intelligent policy for the future.

RELEVANCE—TO WHAT?

So much of the loose talk about relevance assumes that it is something which can be determined *a priori* on the basis of the reactions of students while still studying a subject, rather than an empirical question to be settled after having tested its application in a variety of situations over a period of years. The great rush to be "relevant to the ghetto," for example, means in practice putting together courses and programs that will be favorably received by students from the ghetto or students interested in the ghetto. It does not mean an attempt to put together courses or programs whose *actual results* have proven to be beneficial in solving or ameliorating any major ghetto problem. The most relevant courses in the latter sense might turn out to be dry, tedious studies in medicine, accounting, or law—which is certainly not what the relevance people have in mind. They want to *talk about* the ghetto, or do studies that take them into the ghetto, satisfying their own emotional needs but doing little for the ghetto. If such talk and such studies had any significant value, there have already been enough of both to make the ghetto a paradise on earth. There isn't the slightest reason to expect the coincidence that those things which actually advance black people will simultaneously provide material for college courses which is any more exciting than the study of chemistry, physics, finance, and other dry studies which have helped advance other people.

If the world were in fact as direct and obvious as the relevance argument seems to assume, then of course the whole elaborate and dreary paraphernalia of systematic abstract reasoning would be unnecessary. There would be no need for all the graphs in economics and all the elaborate equations of probability in statistics. Our social problems could be solved by the same kind of direct commonsense which told us, in the natural sciences, that the earth was flat and the sun moved around it. But the underlying assumption of all scholarship is that things look very different after systematic analysis than they do on the surface.

If a university is going to proceed on the basis of the spontaneous appeal of its offerings, then it is going to move in a non-

intellectual (and often anti-intellectual) direction, much like the television industry which academics disdain—including some variant of the ratings (and consequent appeal to the lowest common denominator) and the other obtrusive features of television; flamboyant, irresponsible statements by people having something to sell, glitter rather than substance, and in general a presentation of a world of good guys and bad guys and showdowns and "action" as ways of explaining and dealing with the complexities of life. The search for villains—of whom there is never a shortage—can replace the analysis of causation, if exciting courses with instant appeal are the goal. But if being interesting and exciting is going to be the guiding star of higher education, we must face the fact that mass emotions and mass actions are always going to be more exciting than the lonely process of intellectual development. If we cannot convince students that they must do what is necessary rather than what turns them on, we owe it to everyone to at least make the effort. There is a sizable body of "sophisticated" opinion which operates on the theory that students cannot be reasoned with, but can only be "handled," meaning some judicious blend of partial concessions and fashionable talk. Conceivably they could be right, but to date the clever approach has not been notably successful either.

No sane person wants education to be irrelevant or believes that current educational practices are the ultimate perfection. The real question is—relevant to what? To what the student wants as he sits in the classroom, or to what he will discover he needs, years later after he has gone and probably cannot return? Is building a general intellectual capability irrelevant because it is not *exclusively* relevant to the current headlines and slogans? Is a method of asking questions and testing answers less relevant than a course on how to promote a preconceived goal? In the slopy language of today, opposition to any particular pattern of change is denounced as opposition to change, as such, and extravagant statements are made about the rigidity of the academic curriculum. Actually the opposite charge would have more substance: that American education, down through the years, has spent so much time getting on and off bandwagons that it has had little time for anything else.

If universities in their venality had not tried to appeal to wealthy donors by depicting their role as that of turning out pillars of the status quo—"well rounded" young men in some Y.M.C.A. or Junior Chamber of Commerce sense—then perhaps it would not be so easy for others to think of it as a staging area for revolution. Many young people actually believe that their teachers are trying to fit them into the existing social "system" or "machine," not realizing that most teachers find it hard enough to get them to understand their subject, and perhaps grasps something of the nature of intellectual inquiry in general, without trying to plan their lives and the destiny of society as well.

CAMPUS REVOLUTIONARIES

The Grand Illusion of campus revolutionaries is that the university is a microcosm of society at large, and that their victories there foreshadow their coming success in overthrowing the hated Establishment. The university is in fact unique in a number of ways which explain the revolutionaries' success there, despite their political insignificance nationally (except as a boon to people like Reagan, Yorty, George Wallace and Spiro Agnew). Universities get most of their wealth from outside. College officials can buy peace with other people's money. Professors can buy peace and popularity by eroding standards, at the expense of those conscientious students whose degrees will be devalued, but at no cost to themselves. Success in gaining

concessions under these conditions is no indication of what to expect when it comes to more direct and fundamental challenges in society at large.

Campus revolutionaries sometimes engage in a kind of heads-I-win-tails-you-lose reasoning by which they argue that the very uproar against them shows the fear which they inspire in the Establishment and, by implication, the realism of their plans for revolution. What it really shows is that (1) the news media find that they make a colorful story, and (2) John Q. Public finds them repulsive, doesn't mind saying so, and votes for politicians who say so (a fact not lost on the politicians). The corporations, banks, etc., have no reason to lose a moment's sleep over them. The only kind of revolution student militants can produce in this country is a right-wing revolution, and they would have to get a lot stronger than they are to provoke that.

In the university environment, student, revolutionary leaders are far more realistic than most faculty members about what is really involved in campus struggles. They understand that the name of the game is *power*. "Issues" are a means of mobilizing support and immobilizing opposition. The various sacred "causes" to which student revolutionaries are "committed" are usually not too sacred to be ditched at the earliest convenient moment after a campaign has gotten under way, and completely new demands substituted—demands which go for the jugular of power. As many times as this old melodrama has been played, it might be expected that everyone would begin to follow the plot by now. But words have a heady fascination, especially for those faculty members who cannot be bothered to analyze or who cannot muster the moral courage for making choices.

The usual apology for campus revolutionaries has been that they have "legitimate grievances" and that all other methods have failed. It must be recognized that (1) all unhappy situations are not grievances, that (2) even legitimate grievances do not excuse all acts, and that (3) to say that any institution can be brought to a halt as long as there are legitimate grievances—that is, as long as they are run by human beings—is to say that there can be no institutions. Moreover, rational methods have not "failed" because one party or faction did not get what it wanted. Given that there are always numerous contending groups demanding opposite things, every historical or conceivable system must "fail" by this standard.

None of this denies the need for changes, or even for sweeping changes, in universities. I would suggest, as a start, the abolition of academic tenure, prohibition of consulting fees, the destruction of the teaching assistant system, elimination of varsity athletics, and drastic cutbacks in enrollments. Any academic is bound to have his own list. What is crucial is to recognize that no reforms are so desirable as to be achieved "at all cost," because beyond some point the methods used may not leave anything worth reforming.

A university is an intangible structure of reciprocal commitments and obligations, a hierarchy of skills (which no democratic rhetoric can change), and an atmosphere of learning. It is very easy to cripple or even destroy the intangible reality of education, even though the physical plant remains unscathed and the bureaucratic machine keeps earning undisturbed. This process of destruction is already well under way at a number of institutions and is likely to become general unless university faculties are prepared to abandon their old parlor game of equally deploring this and that, and recognize that we live in a world where choices have to be made, priorities assigned, and responsibility taken.

One of the popular non sequiturs of the day is that universities must be peculiarly bad institutions since they are peculiarly beset with violent protests. The fact that violent protests are peculiarly *acceptable* on university campuses is seldom considered as a factor. If the average factory worker could lock his boss in the office and denounce the foreman as a "fascist pig" with impunity, we might discover that universities have no more grievances than many other institutions. But of course no one expects to grant to ordinary working people the kind of immunity from legal retribution for their actions which is common for college students. It is ironic that this socially and economically privileged group should now be demanding legal privileges (amnesty) as well, in the name of democracy and the masses! That they can put their own boredom with the university in the same category with the sufferings of the poor is a tribute to their gall, but that the rest of us take this seriously is no tribute to us at all.

BLACK EDUCATION

Race taps the depths of man's irrationality as few things can. In this area, intelligent and knowledgeable men say and do things whose illogic and self-defeating consequences would be apparent to them in any other aspect of life. There are no experts in this field, and those who imagine that they have found The Truth are the most untrustworthy guides of all.

Whether black students are brought to the university as part of the general recruitment and admissions procedures or in special programs, there is almost never a clear-cut definition of priorities beyond a nebulous desire to do good, make amends, or improve public relations. There are serious and lasting consequences to not thinking through at the outset whether the goal is to give direct benefits to needy individuals or to invest in individuals in ways designed to maximize the return to the black community and society at large. If the university is trying to make the intellectual investment for which it is peculiarly qualified, it will select the most able black students it can possibly find as its vehicles; if it is trying to play Lady Bountiful, its bias will be toward those who "need help" most, rather than those who can use it best. The second is the dominant approach, not only in universities but in social programs supported by the government and the foundations. They do not try to cultivate the most fertile land, but to make the desert bloom. This is often hotly denied by officials who insist that they are looking for the best black people available—subject, it will usually turn out, to a series of constraints or special emphases which make the original statement meaningless.

Most people are unaware of the extent to which the severe educational problems of black college students are functions of the manner in which they are recruited and selected, rather than simply being the inevitable result of "cultural deprivation." There is no question that the overwhelming bulk of black youth have been given grossly inadequate preparation in the public schools. However, the overwhelming bulk of black youth do not go to college, and while the *proportion* of these youth who are educationally well prepared for college is very low, in *absolute numbers* there are literally tens of thousands of them who are, by all the usual indices—far too many for the top universities to be *forced* to have as many inadequately prepared black students as they do. The fact that standardized examinations may be less reliable for ethnic minorities than for others has been used as a blanket excuse for recruiting and selecting black students on all sorts of non-intellectual criteria, from the ideological to the whimsical. Programs for black people tend to attract more than

their fair share of vague humanitarians and socio-political doctrines seeking to implement some special vision. Not all are as obtuse as the special admissions committee for black students at one Ivy League university who objected to admitting three black applicants with College Board scores in the 700's on grounds that they were probably—God forbid—middle class, and that there were other blacks applying who were more "interesting" cases—but this general kind of thinking is by no means rare. One consequence of this is that, despite the buzz of recruiting activity, there are many black students who belong in the best colleges in the country who have not been reached with the information and financial aid offers that would bring them there, and are languishing at some of the worst colleges in the country. At the same time other black students are in over their heads at the top colleges, struggling—or being maneuvered—toward a degree.

Faculty members are by no means exempt from the paternalism found in recruiting and admissions policies. Some professors grade black students more leniently than they would grade other students, and many hesitate to flunk them, either out of humanitarianism or a desire to avoid "trouble." One cynic said of his black students, "I give 'em all A's and B's; to hell with them." At least he understood the consequences of what he was doing. The double standard of grades and degrees is an open secret on many campuses, and it is only a matter of time before it is an open secret among employers as well. The market can be ruthless in devaluing degrees that do not mean what they say. It should also be apparent to anyone not blinded by his own nobility that it also devalues the student in his own eyes.

The greatest tragedy of the black man in America, after slavery itself, has been the simple fact that his own ability has always been far less important than how he happened to fit in with white people's preconceptions and emotional needs. What specific kind of black person would be fashionable with white people has of course varied considerably over the years and between different groups of white people at a given time. But today's crop of white liberal and radical patrons of the mystique of "blackness" are in no fundamental way different from the old-time white Southerner who would accept any level of irresponsibility and incompetence from a Negro who met his preconceptions (who "knew his place"), and who had only suspicion or resentment for a black man with competence, self-discipline, and capacity for hard work. At the height of the most blatant racial oppression, white Southerners were full of the same romantic notions about the special spiritual qualities and insights of black people which are currently in vogue among the more "enlightened" intellectuals. Nor has this been an exclusively American phenomenon. It was the most unabashed apostle of British imperialism who said, "You're a better man than I am, Gunga Din." The more things change, the more they remain the same.

"Black studies" is one of the signs of our times. After years of history being written as if black did not exist, suddenly their role was recognized, usually after a university building was seized. Suddenly, hastily constructed black studies programs began springing up all over the landscape, like intellectual shanty towns. Few things are more revealing than seeing white faculty members rationalizing and romanticizing the black studies program on a campus where the black students are staying away from it in droves.

CONCLUSIONS

The university created a Frankenstein when it cast itself in the role of panacea for personal and social ills. A feeling has developed that anything worth doing at all is

worth doing at a university. Even our revolutionaries believe that you must go to college in order to make revolution. Some people want to see the university itself go off like a knight on a white horse to slay the dragons of social injustice. A more apt analogy would be a man charging into hell with a pitcher of ice water. The university's resources for direct social action are grossly inadequate to make a dent in the problem. Its greatest contribution would be to turn out people who are intellectually equipped to deal with social problems in ways that produce tangible results rather than symbolic acts. If a university is going to make a real contribution, it must make it as a university, not as a general fix-it shop. A proliferation of Quixotic endeavors may produce more glowing feelings and more good publicity, but it is a waste of specialized resources that can do more in the uses for which they were meant than anywhere else.

Practically every campus has a contingent of faculty members who are not above misappropriating the money, facilities, and good name of their institution for purposes of making themselves feel noble. The more activist and doctrinaire of these faculty members are absolutely impervious to logic and are prepared to explain away any facts. They cannot be persuaded; they can only be counteracted—and this can happen only if the great bulk of the faculty are prepared to come out of their laboratories and studies and sit on admissions committees, meet black students as individuals, and constantly monitor the decisions of administrators who are preoccupied with getting immediate problems off their necks without worrying about long-run consequences (the long run being any time after next week). It is a shame that highly trained people must devote precious time to miscellaneous campus activities, but the alternative is to leave gut decisions up to the operators and the doctrinaires, and we have seen how that has turned out.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, there has been no wiser investment of Federal funds in recent years than the program authorized by the 91st Congress to restore the American merchant marine to its former level of greatness. This program will not only pay rich economic dividends but also greatly strengthen the national security of this country.

The case for rebuilding the American merchant marine has been persuasively set out by James J. Reynolds, president of the American Institute of Merchant Shipping, in a recent New York Journal of Commerce article. I ask unanimous consent that that article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SUBSIDY OF MERCHANT MARINE CALLED SOUND INVESTMENT

(By James J. Reynolds)

In contrast to the 9-to-5, rather humdrum existence associated with everyday living on land, the American merchant marine 24 hours a day knifes it sway through turbulent seas that cover nearly three-quarters of the earth's surface, performing a silent but vital economic and military service to the nation.

Unfortunately, only a limited few, it seems, really understand its critical role or know it is a tremendously active and aggressive industry on which the United States is becoming increasingly dependent in assuring our continued comfort, growth and security.

The shipping industry of late has been under attack from a few, often uninformed, news sources whose critical writers, with their blinders on, take delight in whipping up erroneous, one-sided articles repetitive in their spurious conclusion that the U.S.-flag merchant fleet is not competitive, that the subsidy program has not worked and that the taxpayer gets little return on his dollar.

Well, it is time to set the record straight, to speak up. Not with vituperative remarks, but with facts, the hard facts about what our maritime fleet does for the country, the businessman, and the individual American.

The contributions of the American merchant marine, as measured in terms of national growth and well-being, are most significant and yet little known. The merchant fleet has been: (1) our commercial lifeline to global trade and developer of hundreds of overseas markets for businessmen through trained steamship agents abroad; (2) a major contributor to our economy through significant contributions to the U.S. balance of payments and as an important employer, taxpayer and customer of American goods; (3) a protector of U.S. traders' interests by assuring the availability of adequate, dependable shipping services at fair and reasonable rates and by preventing foreign shipping interests from sending cargo rates sky high; (4) a logistical weapon in our national arsenal which carries all but a fraction of the cargoes to sustain our troops in Vietnam in an effort that represents the longest seafight in our history; (5) a valuable political instrument, as vessels flying the American flag into foreign ports become symbols of both America's strength and her peaceful intentions.

To say the American merchant marine is a vital national asset might be compared to saying we need oxygen to breathe. It has long been a fundamental policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of a merchant marine. This policy was clearly defined in the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, after a century of trial and error in shipping policy.

Of the many facets of the 1936 Act, none have been so widely criticized—and so greatly misunderstood—as its two subsidy provisions. The first of these allows qualified cargo-line companies to receive operating differential subsidy payments which are designed to offset the higher costs of using American labor aboard our ships. This is no mere handout, however, since in return the shipowner must commit himself in a contract to engage in a ship construction program in U.S. shipyards; provide a regular scheduled service between the United States and designated foreign ports; buy supplies and equipment domestically, and employ only citizen seamen.

The second provision, the construction differential subsidy is designed to enable American shipyards to compete with the foreign yards whose labor costs are so much lower than ours. Here again, however, this is not a handout program—it is one that assures the availability of American shipbuilding and repair facilities in the event of a national emergency.

What have these two programs accomplished in the light of today's American merchant marine? The 180 modern ocean-going cargo liners built in American shipyards by the subsidized lines in the past decade or so represent more than a \$1.2 billion investment in private capital. They ply the world trade routes on regular schedules, making well over a thousand voyages annually to all parts of the globe.

The U.S.-flag cargo liner fleet in a word is second to none. Its operators have been in

the forefront in maritime research and development programs. They are the world's maritime leaders in mechanization, in all types of quick acting, pushbutton cargo handling techniques, in safety features, in navigational aids and in developing revolutionary types of ships.

The 1936 Act, as a liner act, was enacted to revitalize American-flag common carrier operations and to build ships to carry liner-type general cargoes approximating 75 per cent of the value of all U.S. ocean-borne trade. The Act has succeeded remarkably well in helping to develop a highly competitive cargo-liner fleet.

Rather than a drain on the taxpayer's pocket, the operating subsidy program shows a return in benefits in billions of dollars. A recently completed two-year study, "The United States Merchant Marine in National Perspective," covering 1958-1967, reveals the American merchant marine during that period contributed \$11.5 billion in quantifiable benefits to the nation at a government cost of \$2.7 billion in vessel operating costs.

These accomplishments, based on balance of payments and national security contributions, represented a net national benefit of \$8.8 billion, or over \$4 in benefits for each dollar of subsidy cost.

The study concludes: "The benefits to the nation of a strong U.S. merchant marine program (\$300 million per annum to build 30 ships with construction differential subsidy) could total almost \$2 billion a year over cost." This represents the kind of savings, or benefits, that our nation undoubtedly could not receive from any other strategic U.S. industry.

Thousands of U.S. employees either directly or indirectly depend on all facets of the maritime industry for a livelihood in terms of shipboard and shoreside employment, shipyard workers and ship construction suppliers from every state.

Since the 1936 Act went into effect, the subsidized lines have paid nearly \$450 million in federal taxes. Without an American merchant marine these revenues would have been substantially reduced and most of the profits on which these taxes were paid would have gone to foreign-flag lines exempt from U.S. taxes. Over a 10-year period the U.S.-flag companies also infused into the national economy over \$1.1 billion in payments for domestic goods and services.

Certain critics have incorrectly pictured a non-competitive American shipping industry and stated that even if 300 high-technology vessels are to be built in a decade under President Nixon's proposed maritime program, the industry probably would be unable to capture a larger percentage of U.S. foreign trade.

Completely ignored is the fact that American ship operators have led the world in possibly the biggest maritime venture of all time—intermodalism. The American merchant marine is playing the dominant role in developing this total transportation concept—a link-up of the various modes—with development of containership and cargo carrier systems to provide the most efficient and least expensive ways for the freight shipper to move his goods from inland points to foreign markets in record time.

Does such advancement portray a lack of competitiveness on shipping's part? Of course not! The businessman and the country will be getting a sizable return on the tax dollar from a 300-ship building program geared to intermodal transportation.

And, I predict, the American Merchant Marine will be carrying between 30 and 50 percent of U.S. foreign trade.

Much has been made of the fact that the entire American merchant marine now carries only between 5 and 6 per cent of U.S. foreign trade. Actually, the lines in the regularly scheduled commercial cargo trades,

carry about 24 per cent of the liner cargo by volume and nearly 30 per cent by value.

But the merchant marine's carriage of U.S. foreign commerce will increase markedly as intermodalism develops and "shipper confidence" results. The increased capacity of high technology ships to be built in the Nixon program, plus a nearly 50 per cent increase in volume of U.S. general cargo available in the next few years, will assure this nation of again becoming a major commercial seapower, to the direct benefit of the freight shipper.

The effectiveness of such a fine fleet will call for the combined effort of American shipping management, labor and management. Already this has been evidenced in the joint support and cooperation to increase exporter utilization of American ships. Of course, other nations are not lying back. They, too, are helping their respective maritime industries build modern merchant fleets; in fact, a recent Maritime Administration study shows that 47 out of 49 major maritime nations are giving government assistance to their shipping and shipbuilding industries.

Critics tend to forget that U.S.-flag shipping has played a major role from the time of the American Revolution to World War II—when American industry built 5,600 cargo vessels that were lifelines to victory. And our fleet was vitally important in the crises of Korea, Suez, Lebanon, Cuba and now Vietnam.

Certain misinformed writers have said that military requirements could be met by building 10 rather than 30 ships a year, as outlined in President Nixon's Maritime Program. Such thinking has been quickly discarded by the President, the White House staff and other knowledgeable government officials as unrealistic and inadequate to cover defense needs.

In recent months, for example, key Defense Department officials have voiced strong support for rebuilding an American-flag merchant marine of at least 30 ships a year or more. Before Admiral Thomas H. Moorer was promoted from Chief of Naval Operations to become Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff he made this clear:

If the Merchant Marine is not completely revitalized to a "position of strength and modernity" the nation will be eliminating a defense arm, a move that would be "tantamount to abandoning seapower as an essential element of our total national power." He did not have in mind building only 10 merchant ships a year to handle the job.

But let's go farther up the defense ladder than even the Chief of Naval Operations. As soon as the President's maritime program went to Congress, Secretary Melvin R. Laird publicly conveyed the Defense Department's "complete support" of Mr. Nixon's 30-ship-a-year program. Mr. Laird immediately let it be known through letters to House and Senate leaders charged with maritime matters "of my pledge that the Department of Defense fully supports the building and maintaining of a strong and viable U.S. merchant marine."

In retrospect, we must consider: Where would this country have been without the hundreds of U.S.-flag merchant ships delivering cargoes to sustain our troops in Vietnam in the past five years? I could cite case after case of foreign-flag ships refusing to carry American combat equipment and supplies to Vietnam. One million tons of cargo were moving monthly to Vietnam, not by air, but by the sea in American ships, admittedly many of them World War II Reserve Fleet rustbuckets that have answered a last call to arms.

But let us not forget that the American-flag lines operating under subsidy contracts, with modern ships built under their replacement programs, had 125 cargoliners actively

engaged in the Vietnam effort, according to the Military Sealift Command. At the same time, they carried on their peacetime function plying the trade routes of the world with the additional vessels in their fleet.

Speaking of the Vietnam War, as the U.S. merchant marine, from 1963-1967, increased carriage of military cargoes by 100 per cent (9.1 million to 18.2 million measurement tons), U.S.-flag shipping capacity was available to the government and rates did not escalate. Without that capacity the government would have been required to pay foreign flag carriers, if available, an additional \$4 billion to ship its military cargo in the past decade. That adds up to a government saving of over \$400 million per year.

Some American merchant marine opponents have minimized the Russian merchant marine build-up, classifying it as "scare talk about Russia outstripping the U.S. at sea."

To set the record straight: Russia's seapower build-up has taken priority over its space program. Their ships visit nearly 900 ports in about 100 countries. Admiral Moorer, in testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee this year, revealed that "another three-quarters of a million deadweight tons of new merchant shipping has been placed in the hands of the Soviet economic and political planners." He added that the Russians will double their merchant fleet in 10 years and that, by 1980, will have "twenty million tons of merchant shipping."

But, more important, the Russians have had the worldly wisdom to realize that without a many-purposed, modern merchant marine their total seapower complex would be a fizzle. Again in the words of Admiral Moorer: "In addition to an expanding Navy, the Soviets' fishing fleet—the world's largest and most modern—their advanced oceanographic program and a growing merchant marine are integrated into a seapower package of expanding influence and importance."

Critics also tend to ignore the fact that the Russians introduced missiles into Cuba by their merchant marine and that between 400 and 450 modern Soviet cargo vessels annually transport war material to Hanoi.

The maritime subsidy program has resulted in a first class cargoliner fleet with a payoff of inestimable benefits to the nation. Other fleet segments, however, must be modernized. The Administration's proposed 300-ship program to rebuild all segments will represent a much needed beginning toward the restoration of our nation as a world shipping leader.

AFDC REFORM PROPOSAL

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the first orders of business of the Congress is to be the social security amendments proposal. In conjunction with this legislation, I received a proposed ADC reform bill from William L. Toth, Poland, Ohio, which I commend to my colleagues:

PROPOSED ADC REFORM BILL

I hereby propose a bill to be submitted to the Congress, to pass into federal law, the following changes in regard to enforcement of court ordered payments of child support funds, encompassing, divorce, separation, court ruled fathers of children born to unwed mothers, common law fathers.

That these funds no longer be doled out on a haphazard voluntary basis, which allows for a 90% or more rate of nonpayment. Due

to this laxity of the cases, an unusual burden is being imposed on the tax payers of any given community. Rather than the rightful, legal, shoulders of the persons proclaimed by the courts. Because of the financial burden placed on a recipient to recall on adjudged before the court for redress.

SECTION I

All funds so awarded, be withheld from pay checks, and to be deposited in the survivors benefit fund (Soc. Sec.) and in turn forwarded, quarterly or semiannually to the welfare office in the state, and county of the recipient, who will in turn, forward a monthly check to the rightful recipient, thus preventing costly court sessions, legal fees, laxity of payments, regardless of the movements, of the payee. By using the office of Soc. Sec. a small administrative increase would be required to implement the law, and put it into immediate effect. A code letter added to a Soc. Sec. number will designate a payee and the amount to be deducted.

SECTION II

Unemployment benefits paid to a payee; to pass into law, that it be a State or Federal offense for a payee to claim such dependents, unless that portion of the benefits be diverted directly to the welfare board for disbursement to the recipient.

SECTION III

Refusal to work clause—to avoid payment. Any person who willfully refuses to gainfully earn a living to avoid payment of such funds, shall be summoned up to the courts, and if found guilty shall be put in jail for 6 months for each offense.

SECTION IV

Self-employed Persons—Persons who are self-employed shall set aside such sum as required by the court along with that persons Soc. Sec. fund to be reported and paid at the same required time as the Soc. Sec. fund.

THE HEALTH CARE CRISIS

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, the problems involved in the health delivery system are receiving increased attention. This development is long overdue. I have resolved to make this one of my paramount legislative priorities.

As insurance commissioner for the State of Connecticut, I strove to lessen medical costs. I attempted to combine the efforts of Blue Cross and Connecticut Medical Service—Blue Shield—into one administrative group. It was estimated that the merger of these two groups would save \$1 million in operations and other costs and would serve to streamline this aspect of the health delivery system. I am now preparing legislation that will further reduce the unacceptable high costs of health care so that all our citizens can receive the highest quality medical care.

Recently in the Hartford Times, two perceptive reporters, James Mason and Jeffrey Daniels, wrote a series of articles on what has come to be called the health care crisis. Their analysis of the situation is perceptive and hard hitting. These articles deserve wide circulation and I am hopeful that my colleagues and the readers of this RECORD will profit from them:

[From the Hartford Times, Jan. 24, 1971]

CAN YOU AFFORD TO BE SICK?

(By James Mason and Jeffrey Daniels)

The cost of medical care here, in the state and across the nation is in an astronomical spiral.

Insurance and medical experts told The Times that the spiral is twisting upward too fast, too far and too furiously.

Fed by a demand for greater service and financed mostly by medical insurance programs that have become an American obsession, the cost of hospital treatment, medicine and doctors is outstripping the economy and emptying the pocketbook.

It costs \$80 a day for a hospital bed in Connecticut. State projections say it will cost \$219 in nine years. In 1964, that same bed cost \$32 a day.

Medical costs soared 14.4 per cent last year, while an inflation-fueled state income level rose a mere 6.2 per cent. The percentage cost per bed last year is nearly double the state's 10-year average.

In raw dollars it costs taxpayers \$81.9 million to pay hospital, clinic and nursing home bills for state patients. Hospitals get \$22.9 million, a 27 per cent hike in a single year.

Connecticut Medical Service (CMS) recently won a 19 per cent increase to consumers. Over the past two years, the major corporations in the state have sustained 30 to 50 cent increases in their employee benefit programs.

Local hospitals, in staccato fashion, are announcing rate hikes. Mt. Sinai last week raised the bed rate \$5 a day to a high of \$85. St. Francis Hospital four months ago raised its charges \$7 for a high of \$77 a day.

Nowhere in the state is there a bed for less than \$55 a day.

The average family last year spent \$324 for health care, including insurance premiums and out-of-pocket medical bills. It was an 11 per cent rise.

Nationally, hospital care rose about 15 per cent. Doctors fees, according to Washington Report on Medicine and Health, rose 9.5 per cent. Connecticut's average increase, says the Hartford County Medical Society, was about 7 per cent.

But even as prices skyrocket, the pinch isn't readily apparent to the consumer. His premiums rose about 7 per cent last year, but the real increases are hidden.

It looks like the old Blue Cross policy picks up the tab. Or the Medicare, the Medicaid, or the state. Maybe even the average man's employer. But that \$85 a day for a hospital bed seems too remote in the insurance-ordered society.

But someone is paying. The operation may appear like a chain letter where no one gets caught, but it is not so.

Taxpayers pay up to 35 per cent of a hospital's bills in federal and state payment programs. Some family plans, moreover, may lose coverage as rising prices undermine the policy protection.

The effects, mostly brought on by extreme price increases, are being felt. Connecticut will feel the CMS pinch when the fee for state employee benefits (just increased) will mean nearly \$1 million in extra insurance costs.

The state now pays out an average of \$88 a day per bed to the state's 35 non-profit hospitals that take state patients.

The medical establishment, termed an industry in its own right, is under pressure for reform that could mean a British-like national medical system or similar private-run programs.

Liberals in the Congress are now backing a national health insurance program sponsored by Massachusetts Sen. Edward M. Kennedy. The plan would provide complete medical care for all Americans and fix standards for doctors and hospitals.

President Nixon, in his State of the Union address Friday night, underlined his admin-

istration's commitment that every American even if he cannot afford medical care, receive treatment.

Details of his program were scanty, and will presumably be explained in a later message to Congress. The President called for a \$100 million program to find a cancer cure and for major outlays to help medical schools.

Still, as Congress and the President make pronouncements and envision programs to lighten the burden, costs continue to escalate.

Where is the blame for the increased costs, the astronomical price now placed on becoming ill.

The roots of the problem are entwined and intermeshed in the medical establishment—that complex of hospitals, insurance firms, doctors and medical suppliers.

"It's a jury rig system," said Dr. Max Goldstein, new president of the Hartford County Medical Society. Reform is required in the entire system, he suggests, as blame touches all parts.

State overseers of the hospitals, like the Hospital Cost Commission, see the nonprofit institutions in Connecticut as massive, poorly run operations, overstuffed and badly managed.

Edward Karnasiewicz, the commission's executive director, believes the hospitals do duplicate services, are all encumbered with paperwork and do not review their own operations because a combination of tax regulations and insurance companies that do not check on hospital administration.

"There is no incentive to keep costs down," he said. "If costs rise, just raise the announced (bed) charge." What happens, he said, is the system—state, federal and private insurance—merely increases the payments.

The insurance system, say the doctors and the state officials, force people to enter the hospital even if treatment can be performed in a doctor's office.

Example: A head cut requiring stitches may cost \$10 at the doctor's office. But many insurance plans don't cover it. So the patient would have to pay.

But if he goes to the emergency room at the hospital, Blue Cross picks up the tab—a bill that may mean \$20 to the hospital and \$10 for a doctor. Money is wasted, said Dr. Andrew J. Canzonetti, outgoing president of the Hartford Medical Society. Time, and the hospital's efficiency, is also compromised.

To the hospital, major cost factors include equipment and personnel. Years ago each patient required 1½ staff members. Now, says the Connecticut Hospital Association, the average is three staff members for each patient.

Wages in hospitals have been the major factor in the increased cost of medical care. Local hospitals estimated the annual budget has a 70 per cent cost for labor. At St. Francis Hospital, the figure is 68 per cent.

In 1956, St. Francis paid workers \$1 an hour, a salary hospital administrator Sister Mary Madeline called generous compared to what some hospitals were paying at that time.

Up to four years ago, many hospitals had 48-hour work weeks and no overtime. Federal legislation, however, forced changes, reducing the work week, mandating overtime. All these changes compounded, the administrators say, the simultaneous increases in wages.

Two local hospitals, now pay lower-echelon employees \$2.30 to \$2.50 an hour. As little as four years ago, the average was \$1.60.

"Until very recently," said Mt. Sinai Hospital Administrator Dr. Donald Bernstein, "the hospital industry functioned at the expense of the people who worked there. Employees subsidized the (low) cost of care."

Unionization, a factor peculiar for its absence in the hospital industry, is now on the increase. St. Francis still has no union, but years-long struggles over unionization have rubbed off, leaving wage increases.

Doctors in the state report overhead in

their practices has climbed faster than their fee schedules. One Connecticut physician said his premium for malpractice insurance jumped from \$200 to \$1,200 in two years.

Every hospital in the state, the hospital association says, has a major building program. And according to a spokesman for the New Haven-based association, it costs about \$65,000 per hospital bed to expand a hospital.

Other costs, particularly supplies and equipment, are also at the root of price hikes for the hospitals. Some hospitals are pooling, but even so, the hospital association, reported that the bill for sutures for several hospitals came to \$1.5 million. At St. Francis, supply costs rose 27 per cent in 14 years.

At Mt. Sinai, as other hospitals, the cost of security forces is a factor. Particularly a problem for the urban hospital, some administrators estimate security costs at \$2 of the price of a bed per day. Some physicians, however, say there is too much security.

As various built-in, and unavoidable factors have pushed hospital care costs upward, long established habits, traditions some call them, have come under scrutiny as the money wasters.

The state believes that if nursing schools were separated from the non-profit hospitals, a clean \$6 million a year could be saved, while allowing the state—with broader population base—to finance the nurse training.

Dr. Goldstein, of the medical society, estimates that education costs range from 5 to 20 per cent of a hospital's per bed cost.

The physical plant of the state's 34 hospitals is also questioned by some. Would it be better—more efficient in the long run—to go into completely new buildings, rather than duplicate vital services while adding to archaic basic hospitals. Most of the state hospitals, officials agree, are more than 50 years old.

Might not physicians' overhead be lowered, and patient service strengthened, by starting more group practices, team doctoring and the like? Some physicians are suggesting mass use of para-professionals to aid doctors in their office work.

Should Connecticut move in the direction of pre-paid medical plans like the New Haven Community Medical Plan Inc., which provides virtually unlimited patient and outpatient services, including physical examinations?

Are the boards and staffs of the leading Connecticut insurance companies—Blue Cross and CMS—as aggressive as they might be about pressing for cost-saving reform of the hospital system?

Former State Insurance Commissioner William R. Cotter, now First District Congressman, said in 1969, "I . . . think that in (Blue Cross') capacity as probably the single most important factor in the support of the hospitals in the state they could exact a little more influence and pressure on the hospitals to keep expenses down."

Major portions of the boards of both CMS and Blue Cross are also the same people who are intimately involved in the medical establishment.

[From the Hartford Times, Jan. 24, 1971]

THE HOSPITAL—SAVER OF LIVES, CENTER OF SOARING COST

(By James N. Mason, Jr. and Jeffrey Daniels)

The hospital is the key element in curing our ills; it is also the basic cause of the high cost of getting well.

Last year some 361,572 Connecticut residents were admitted to the state's 34 highly specialized centers of healing, with an average stay of eight days each.

The sick, with a great deal of financial help from insurance companies and public health programs, spent more than \$300 million for that hospital care.

Nationally, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare says the hospital, by itself, accounted for 43 percent of the medical

bill in 1969. It is, in the main, responsible for the doubling of the cost of medical care in 10 years.

The cost of the hospital bed in Connecticut has increased twofold in the last six years. In some cases, hospitals in the state are charging more than three times the average of \$32 a day in 1964.

In the last 13 months alone, three major Hartford area hospitals announced bed per day increases. One hospital, Mt. Sinai, has had two increases, raising the price of a bed \$12 a day.

The increased costs, for the most part, have overshadowed the hospitals' treatment of record numbers of patients, their efforts to meeting expanding demands for health care and the equally expensive demands of modern treatment.

The hospitals do have staggering labor bills, some as much as 70 percent of the budget, with annual salary increases reaching 20 percent.

Hospital administrators are quick to remind the public, with some justification, that their facilities are open 24 hours a day and must be called on to supply quality service.

Still, the doctors, patients and public servants who deal most closely with the hospitals are the most vociferous critics. They point accusing fingers at the state's voluntary, non-profit institutions as the money-wasters that drive up the cost of medical care.

Some charges are the same, some are new, but all are more cogent as costs go higher. The key criticisms are:

Duplication of services by hospitals that have become self-serving "empires" of medical care.

Inefficient operation, often caused by tradition-bound procedures that do not relate to modern care.

The hospital as a powerful institution of the community, with considerable influence to resist reform.

The charges, made by professionals and laymen alike, are strong. Moreover, some of the very problems attacked have been caused by the same people who are blaming the hospitals.

The doctor-critics, like leaders of the Hartford County Medical Society, blame specific operations like the educational programs, the emergency rooms, the routine hospital procedures.

The state, through its Hospital Cost Commission, has published reports ad infinitum demonstrating that hospitals are poorly-run businesses.

A specific example: Hospitals are resisting, say the state and medical societies, efforts to introduce a new type of procedure called "progressive medical care."

In brief, it is a program where after the "crisis" period in an illness is over, the patient is shifted to less intense, and less costly, types of treatment.

"The hospital," said Dr. Andrew J. Canzonetti, "should have a back door leading to a motel." What Canzonetti, a surgeon and outgoing president of the county medical society, described was that after surgery, many patients should be moved because they can almost care for themselves.

Edward Karnarsiewicz, executive director of the state's Hospital Cost Commission, was more specific.

"A patient comes into the hospital," said Karnarsiewicz. "He gets a room at \$85 a day; that's where he stays until discharged."

(The cost commission, by law, is responsible for setting rates the state will pay the 34 non-profit hospitals when they treat state patients. The rate procedure carries with it some scrutiny of general hospital operations.)

Two years ago, U.S. Sen. Abraham A. Ribicoff told convalescent home officials in Connecticut the same thing. The senator said too often hospitals beds costing \$40 to \$100 a day are occupied by persons requiring care costing half as much.

There are arguments against the progressive medical care, which is not being completely tried, according to hospital association spokesmen, in any hospital in the state. (Hartford and Manchester hospitals reportedly have programs they call progressive care, but which are greatly modified).

Dr. Donald Bernstein of Mt. Sinai was one of several administrators who doubted that moving the patient saved money—what with transportation, changes in nurses, altered schedules and other hidden costs.

Sister Mary Madeline of St. Francis Hospital, Hartford, talked about the so-called progressive or intermediary care.

"We don't have extended care facilities," she said of her 625-bed hospital, "(but) I don't know if intermediary care would affect costs."

A two-sided argument over hospital care is the familiar emergency room, a 24-hour crisis-oriented service that has changed over the years.

Use of the emergency room has grown. At Hartford Hospital, the state's second largest facility, calls have doubled since 1960, from 27,000 to 55,000 last year.

Basic to the problem here, is the increased use of the emergency room as an extension of the doctor's office. It is the expensive way doctors have relieved themselves of those famous house calls our grandmother used to tell us about.

"We've created that monster called the emergency room," conceded the outgoing head of the Hartford County Medical Society, Dr. Canzonetti.

But the medical insurance programs, he added, have not helped. Often, because of limited insurance coverage, it is the only type of care that can be covered under a contract.

Some hospitals, like St. Francis and New Britain, have full-time emergency room doctors—not staff physicians "forced" to do service. Some facilities now have "auxiliary emergency units" for people with not-so urgent emergencies. But it all costs money.

The hospitals have also been hit hard for waste by duplication. "They are little empires built in terms of Parkinson's law (for every person employed, there is a job to fill the time)," one doctor said of the hospitals.

Because of hospital trustee attitudes, hospitals that have explored combined services, have in many cases kept doing things alone.

Dr. Max Goldstein, incoming president of the Hartford County Medical Society, blames what he terms "empire building" by non-medical trustees for much overlap in services.

Several area hospitals each have kidney teams, with what Goldstein describes as "expensive people and expensive equipment."

Part of the duplication is caused by a time-honored system where doctors "belong" to particular hospitals, with privileges only at the institutions where they are accepted.

It has produced, conceded Goldstein, hospitals that must have those duplicated services because each doctor wants them available. But the system that virtually prohibits a doctor from using any hospital, says Goldstein, is one engineered by the hospital boards.

Why isn't the system broken? Joseph Gordon, executive director of the Hartford County Medical Society, a local arm of the state medical society, put it bluntly.

"The doctors won't use tactics generally used by the public," he said. Job actions have been hinted, said one doctor, but the physicians just never get tough.

A tradition—and an expensive one—is the tying of the nurse—doctor—and continuing education facilities to the hospital.

At some hospitals, experts estimate, 5 per cent or more of the per bed charges are for education.

Hospitals, or at least some administrators, say the best nurses are those trained at hospital-nursing schools that are joined.

But one administrator said the state could take over the nurse education, if it "assured us" of quality training. Part of this changed attitude is more than costs. Recently it has been tougher for some schools to recruit and keep students.

The Hospital Cost Commission has put educational costs for nurses alone at \$6 million annually. Dr. Goldstein, speaking as president of the County Medical Society, believes the sick population in the state should not have to bear the major costs of educating nurses, doctors and other professionals.

In its last report to the commission, the staff of the Hospital Cost Commission outlined the same philosophy. They would like to see the education programs transferred to state financing and control, a move that could lower hospital costs.

"Educational programs for nursing personnel and other technical skills," said the report, "(should) be removed from the hospital setting and be provided in the state school system . . . as a means of reducing direct cost to the sick patient."

[From the Hartford Times, Jan. 26, 1971]

MEDICAL "BLUES" SHELTERED

(By James N. Mason, Jr., and Jeffrey Daniels)

Can Connecticut Medical Service (Blue Shield) work aggressively for cost-saving medical reforms when 50 per cent of its board are doctors?

Can Connecticut Blue Cross, whose board's 15-members include seven hospital trustees, work aggressively against higher hospital costs?

Could these two nonprofit institutions, which claim the lion's share of health insurance protection in Connecticut, operate more effectively as a merged, single organization?

These are among questions raised inside and outside the state's sprawling medical industry as leaders of government, business, and consumers grope for answers to the steep rise of health costs.

CMS, with 1.3 million members, and Blue Cross, with 1.5 million, bridle at the suggestion that they aren't doing all that their limited swat will permit in the effort to reduce costs. As hospital administrators and physicians are quick to point out, "the Blues" have no right to meddle in the affairs of private institutions.

But former State Senator and Majority Leader Edward Marcus is among critics who feel greater state government influence is in order for these two tax-sheltered insurers which have such heavy impact on Connecticut citizens.

He sponsored an unsuccessful bill in 1969 which would have given the Governor partial appointive powers on the CMS and Blue Cross boards.

"Even though all the members of these boards are public-spirited citizens, I felt it was important for the Governor to have some appointive privileges," said Marcus. "The boards of any institution run the danger of becoming inbred. New members are usually suggested by management and reflect management's point of view."

Except for the 1969 two per cent tax on premiums, Blue Cross and CMS operate tax-free as nonprofit companies. The exemptions include tax-free status for buildings housing their offices in New Haven.

Besides the eight physicians on the CMS board, most of whom are medical staff officers in hospitals of their communities, the CMS board includes eight lay representatives: The CMS legal counsel, two utility company executives, chief executives of two small industrial firms, a retired executive of Pitney-Bowes, Inc., a savings bank executive, and a labor union official.

A Blue Cross spokesman stressed that there are no paid hospital administrators on its board. But seven of the 15 lay representatives

hold trusteeships or higher posts on hospital boards.

The board includes the Blue Cross legal counsel, a physician, two utility company employees, two labor leaders, two department store executives, an executive of New Departure Hyatt Division of General Motors, a Yale University official, a newspaper publisher, stock broker, an executive of Scovill Manufacturing Co., and a state officer Gerald Lamb, appointed when he was state treasurer.

When CMS sets new rates, it consults its medical advisory committee, composed entirely of physicians. The final rate schedule, prepared for state Insurance Department consideration, is approved by CMS board—loaded with physicians.

Similarly, any use of the considerable financial leverage which Blue Cross might use to induce cost-saving reforms must first be approved by a board whose members include many hospital trustees.

Nevertheless, CMS and Blue Cross, insist that their records point to many efforts and achievements toward medical cost control.

On the question of merger, Blue Cross has favored it, but CMS balked, supported by physicians who claimed merger would lead to meddling in their profession.

Some doctors warned a legislative committee in 1969 that they would withdraw from CMS participation if the merger succeeded. Former State Insurance Commissioner William R. Cotter (now a U.S. Representative) tried unsuccessfully that year to get legislative approval of a merger plan for the two groups. He said it would permit savings of at least \$1 million in operations and other factors, and would permit greater coordination of efforts to control costs.

Blue Cross favored the idea but CMS, bolstered by the physicians, opposed it and succeeded in burying it. A similar merger proposal was killed in 1967.

Blue Cross and CMS split the bill on an \$80,000 consultant's evaluation of merger possibilities in 1968. When the report was published in 1969, it shied away from specific recommendations. Blue Cross continued to favor merger and Cotter said the report merely strengthened his conviction that merger made good sense.

Despite the charges of hospital-doctor domination, "the Blues" contend they are doing all that is legally possible or politically realistic to induce cost control without courting rebellion of the largely autonomous private hospitals and physicians.

"We feel we're doing more than anybody else to influence lower costs," said John Kennedy, vice president for marketing at Blue Cross.

He cited these developments of recent years which were either initiated or actively supported by Blue Cross.

Elimination of duplicated benefits. It is no longer possible for a Blue Cross subscriber, who is also a member of another health benefit plan, to receive benefits from both for the same service. Blue Cross saved about \$2 million in 1970 from this new policy, which was sanctioned by the 1969 General Assembly.

A cost saving incentive program. Hospitals have been accused of operating too loosely under open-ended financial practices. Blue Cross now offers a two per cent incentive bonus to hospitals which set a realistic budget and then stick to it.

Merit rating of Blue Cross groups. This helped spread medical costs more equitably among the state's employer groups. By legislative authority, Blue Cross now rates larger groups according to each one's "experience."

Data collection to evaluate hospital bed use. Blue Cross compiles data to determine if too much use is given to hospitals by some doctors, or possibly by staff practice.

Pilot projects in home care. In New Britain, Blue Cross is supporting a program aimed at getting patients out of high cost intensive care hospital beds and back to their

homes as quickly as possible. But this can happen only if visiting nurses or other medical personnel can give proper attention to convalescents after they get home.

Encouraging "preadmission testing." Blue Cross is urging physicians to send ambulatory patients to hospitals for lab tests in advance of actual bed confinement. This frequently cuts one or two days off of total hospital confinement.

Consulting and other aid to community groups interested in health programs. Blue Cross, recognizing growing interest in prepay outpatient health plans, is working with a neighborhood clinic in New Haven toward possible dovetailing of hospital services with out-patient prepay services.

Support of the Connecticut Hospital Planning Commission. Blue Cross will impose a 5 per cent penalty on its reimbursements to any hospital which undertakes a building project of more than \$250,000 without prior approval of the Connecticut Hospital Planning Commission.

Support of Public Act 693 which gave muscle to the Planning Commission. Hospitals will now be denied accreditation needed for any state and federal funds if they undertake expansion projects without commission approval.

Eugene Whittaker, director of communications for CMS, says the company's standard fee schedule for doctors under its full-payment Century Plan of benefits is a major factor in holding down physicians' fees.

Of the state's 3,700 physicians, about 1,800 are members of the Century Plan, meaning that they charge no more than the CMS maximum for various medical services. For instance, the CMS Century Plan rate for an appendectomy is \$250. (It was \$200 before the rate boost this year.)

Member physicians agree to charge only this amount. Nonmember physicians may charge their patients what they choose, but CMS will pay only the \$250 and the patient must pay any difference out of his own pocket.

[From the Hartford Times, Jan. 27, 1971]

HOSPITAL "WATCHDOG" HAS NO BARK

(By James N. Mason, Jr. and Jeffrey Daniels)

The state's Council on Hospitals was created as a watchdog over rising hospital costs, but in the 15-month existence of the unit it has "passed" some 45 rate increases without a murmur.

Left with no funds to hire a staff, and stacked with a five-member board dominated by hospital industry representatives, the council is a good example of Connecticut's weak control over the 34 non-profit, volunteer hospitals in the state.

It was not without truth, then, when a Connecticut Hospital Association spokesman said recently, "We haven't seen much activity in the Council on Hospitals."

It was the way the hospital lobbies planned it when they created the council in 1969 by act of the legislature. According to medical sources, it was the way the hospitals blunted efforts to control the industry, while providing some kind of facade of regulation.

Even as the hospitals say they are fighting a rough battle against increasing costs, they are winning a tougher struggle: Keeping the hospitals out of state control.

It has been a seesaw struggle with both side—state vs. industry—battling to move the regulation question off dead center.

Even now, two legislative committees are due to report on fact-finding searches in high medical costs. At least three bills have been filed to strengthen state control over the hospitals.

But with hospital per bed charges running about \$80 a day in the state, the two state agencies that regulate hospitals say they have little control over rising costs.

The state's Hospital Cost Commission, a section under the budget division, sets rates every 21 months for hospitals which treat state welfare and mental patients. But, despite control over some \$22.9 million in annual funds to the hospitals, the commission's executive director says his control over costs is limited.

"Indirectly," said Edward S. Karnasiewicz, "we can do something to help out (hospital) costs, but it is a spin-off to private patients.

The Hospital Association believes the best agent for making hospitals more efficient are those "knowledgeable" in the field; those who run the hospitals.

Allen Herkimer, whose Connecticut Hospital Research and Education Foundation is a federally-funded arm of the Hospital Association, is working on ways to cut hospital costs by budgeting method changes.

But efforts by the hospitals to keep out state government scrutiny and control of hospital budgets and affairs has been effective.

It is no secret, both within the hospital industry and in the closely aligned doctors' groups, that The Hospital Cost Commission, particularly Karnasiewicz, has been a thorn in the hospital's side.

In 1969, legislation was introduced that would have eliminated his job and redesigned and enlarged the Cost Commission, now made up of four key state commissioners.

Falling at this, the Council on Hospitals put under the State Health Department, was created. A \$50,000 budget request was denied by the Legislature and the commission's make-up was ordered to provide ample industry representation.

The council's purpose, according to the law, was to review all rate increases by the 34 hospitals and issue investigative reports, and recommendations on the proposed rate hike.

The Council has been busy, according to its chairman, Health Commissioner Franklin M. Foote, but most of its work has not been in cost analysis or review of rising costs.

It has never scheduled a hearing on the more than 45 rate hikes. The Council has never, says the Hospital Cost Commission, asked for technical assistance on rate cases.

"We've been handicapped because of lack of money," said Foote. "We don't even have a stenographer. We don't have a cent."

Doctors who were asked about the Council said they had not expected too much from it, particularly because the legislation provided for two direct representatives from the hospital industry.

Some state officials privately say they would like to see more "consumer" or lay representation on the Council.

Members of the Council include Dr. Christie McCloud, chief pathologist at Middletown Hospital; Dr. Isidore S. Geetter, former director of Mt. Sinai Hospital and the Connecticut Hospital Association representative; Francis P. Dellafera, president of the Connecticut Extended Care Facilities Association (nursing homes); Mrs. Annarie P. Cazal, a layman, and George Pipkin, layman and executive director of Hill Neighborhood House, Bridgeport.

The Council, according to Foote, has been investigating over-all hospital planning and has streamlined reporting procedures for hospitals seeking approval of rate increases.

While the track record in the Council has not evidenced vigorous review of the hospital cost spiral, actions taken by the hospitals in the state concerning expansion and state-established rates has been even less encouraging.

Despite the scheduling of two days of hearings in Bridgeport and carrying out what Dr. Foote termed intensive investigation, the Council has been unable to stop expansion of the Park City Hospital's maternity wing.

According to law, the Council is to review all expansion or renovation projects by hospitals where the cost exceeds \$250,000. At stake here is state accreditation for handling Medicare, Medicaid and welfare cases (this amounts to about 30 per cent of a hospital's annual revenue).

Park City, however decided to build a 100-unit maternity wing. The plans were carried out despite surveys by the Council in Bridgeport demonstrating that occupancy rates at the three volunteer hospitals was only 50 or 60 per cent.

While the need for the maternity wing was severely questioned, the wing is under construction and the attorney general has ruled, said Foote, that Park City Hospital had begun work before the Council's power took effect.

In a second, more recent, incident, a \$300,000 renovation of the surgical wing of University-McCook Hospital has been approved and bonded, bids let and construction started without Council approval. The vote is scheduled for Feb. 18 on the now under construction project. Officials say it was an oversight.

If the Council has had trouble in controlling hospital activity, the Hospital Cost Commission has its own troubles.

The Commission staff complains it is overworked, while the Hospital Association accuses the Commission employees of being cost analysts who know figure but little about how a hospital works.

"It's an easy thing to criticize hospital costs," said Robert Waterson public relations man for the Hospital Association. "(But) we have the responsibility for dealing with people's lives."

The Commission, in its annual report, consistently chastises the hospitals for inefficiency (though the Commission has no control here) and last year it made an attempt to impose its will on the hospitals.

The law says the Hospital Cost Commission must establish rates for all hospitals that treat state-sponsored patients. The commission must choose the "lower cost" between what the hospitals list as their "public charge" and what they claim as actual costs for service.

The commission, instead, chose to establish what it termed a "reasonable rate" for certain clinical and emergency room services in the hospitals. The commission did not accept, on face value, the hospital data.

The hospitals went to court in two cases. Superior Court judges ruled that the state, under present law, could not say what a reasonable cost should be, but could only pick the lower cost from those provided by the hospitals.

In the two cases the rates were increased, sending rates up in many of the 34 hospitals. It cost the state taxpayers an additional \$256,370 in a 21-month period. This was in addition to the approximately \$80 million already budgeted to pay for state patients.

The struggle goes on. One of three bills now before the Legislature would give the State Cost Commission power to determine its rates on "reasonable rate." This would give the commission power to review hospital procedures to establish efficiency.

Another evidence of the push-pull relationship is in a bill introduced by Rep. Morris N. Cohen (D-Bloomfield).

Cohen's bill would strengthen the Hospital Cost Commission, giving it authority to investigate and evaluate patient charges for all hospitals.

The bill also would empower the Commission staff to investigate the financial resources of the hospitals and review their stated needs for special equipment.

The legislation, in short, would attempt to put back most of the power taken away from the Commission by the 1969 Legislature and add to it.

The chance of passage? Sources close to the industry, including people within the state government, are not too optimistic.

[From the Hartford Times, Jan. 28, 1971]

MDs DRAFT PAY-BY-MONTH PLAN

(By James N. Mason, Jr., and Jeffrey Daniels)

A new health insurance plan, good for virtually all medical services in a doctor's office, is under study by the Hartford County Medical Association and could become a demonstration program for other communities.

Association officials are quick to stress that this idea is still very young and its outcome uncertain, but if it reaches fruition, they say it could be another answer to the medical cost spiral and could remove the financial uncertainties of thousands of Hartford area families.

The proposal is essentially a pre-pay outpatient plan, but the doctors shy away from this term, which has usually been identified with group clinics staffed by salaried physicians—as in the Kaiser Plan on the West Coast of the New Haven Community Medical Plan in this state.

The plan, if one can be formulated which will satisfy a majority of the association's 1,200 member physicians, would safeguard the medical profession's much-cherished fee-for-service system, which has come under attack from medical reform advocates.

The fee system, say critics, offers little incentive for physicians to control cost of treatment. The longer the treatment, the greater the physicians income.

But, this liability would probably be eliminated under a pre-pay plan covering Hartford physicians. Fees would tend to be standardized for all outpatient services, much as they are now in services covered by Connecticut Medical Service and other private health plans whose benefits mainly extend to treatment in hospitals.

Subscribers to an association plan would continue to select their family doctors from hundreds of member-physicians. They would continue to be treated in doctors' offices located throughout the area (as opposed to traveling some distances if pre-paid health services were offered in clinics). They would pay a standard monthly premium in exchange for guaranteed out-patient medical services as needed.

As tentatively conceived today, a non-profit corporation would be established to handle premium collections and reimbursements to physicians for services to their patient-subscribers.

The resulting centralization of billing and operating costs would presumably help hold down the rising overhead costs reported by physicians.

"Peer review"—scrutiny of medical charges by medical professionals—would guard against unnecessary costs that could otherwise push premiums up. And the physicians would have strong incentive to keep the premiums as low as possible, especially in light of growing consumer consciousness and public complaints toward rising costs.

Dr. Andrew J. Canzonetti, association president, said the association has the blessing of the Connecticut Medical Society in its study of a possible outpatient plan.

The state medical society vigorously opposed legislation in 1967 which led to the outpatient program sponsored by Yale Medical School and the New Haven Labor Council in that city.

But the plan was seen by the medical society as creating a government-subsidized competition with private practitioners in New Haven.

Dr. Canzonetti said one factor which may make a local pre-pay plan palatable to private physicians is the fact that fees for fed-

erally-financed Medicare have already been standardized and subjected to peer review.

Also, physicians enrolled in Connecticut Medical Service consent to charge standard fees established by the state medical society.

Fees used to be fairly secret. Doctors frequently had little idea of what their colleagues charged for the same types of treatment, says Joseph Gordon, executive director of the County Medical Association; but Medicare has changed that.

The physicians' program would be designed to dovetail with hospital insurance plans and could also accommodate existing medical insurance plans and federal-state welfare coverage, Dr. Canzonetti said.

Built into the plan could be options for regular physical examinations and other preventive medicine in order to detect physical ailments for early treatment before they became far more expensive, and debilitating, for the patient, say the doctors.

The medical association has no time table for creating their proposal, but fast-moving events nationally and possibly in the state could be a spur for action.

The idea of a local outpatient insurance plan comes at a time when many proposals are being presented to Congress for overhauling the present, flabby, medical industry.

From the doctors' point of view, the most frightening of these is Sen. Kennedy's Health Security Bill, which has the backing of the AFL-CIO labor unions and the United Automobile Workers among other liberal forces.

This measure would make the federal government the overseer of all health services. Physicians and hospitals fear it would cut deeply into their historic autonomy.

But, they also realize that unless they take initiative now to deal with high costs and deficiencies in the health system, advocates of government control will have a stronger case.

[From the Hartford Times, Jan. 29, 1971]

CONGRESS MAY WRITE THE RX

(By James N. Mason, Jr. and Jeffrey Daniels)

The crisis over the high cost of medical care—indeed, the experts now label it an emergency—has achieved star billing in a rapid spiral that is only matched by the escalating costs.

There have been, for years, various proposals seeking to modify the nation's fractionalized health care system.

But health care, and its cost, was a problem much like pollution. It was there but it could never quite be termed a "crisis."

Suddenly, however, there are now no less than 20 proposals to reform health. There are at least eight major programs now facing Congressional scrutiny. The President has set aside a separate message to Congress to deal with health.

The problem of high health costs is simply an issue whose time has come. Five years ago, the problem of health care was a nagging headache. Now, like its environmental counterpart, health care cost is a full-scale crisis demanding immediate attention.

Where is that attention coming from? Who is focusing on the necessary changes in a health system that has been described as "jury-rigged?"

A glance at the proposals making the Washington circuit shows the plans have several common themes:

Most plans emphasize significant changes in the present health care system; major reform is forecast.

Most of the proposals have come from organizations with a direct interest in the \$60 billion a year medical industry.

Virtually every proposal before Congress comes from persons or organizations that must share the blame for the present cost crisis.

Some proposals want to enlarge the Medicare-Medicaid system, others want to encompass it in far-reaching national programs. Still a third segment wants to eliminate the existing federal programs altogether.

The labor-initiated programs are suggesting a totally nationalized health system. These plans, still far from winning acceptance, have already had their effects on the others.

Generally, the hospital industry wants one that will leave their sector intact. The doctors' proposal would retain the basic freedom of the doctor. The insurance firms' program would guarantee the continued need for private insurers.

All the programs attempt to deal, in some way, with the vast numbers of Americans the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare says are not being adequately treated.

As the lobbyists for the programs attempt to win support in the Congress, the plans may be modified. The final solution, if one comes this year, may be an amalgam of several plans.

The major proposals, for the present, look like this:

HUMAN SECURITY BILL

Sponsored by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy and Rep. Martha Griffiths, this bill is the creation of the Committee of 100, spearheaded in 1969-70 by the late Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers. The Reuther-Kennedy package was merged this year with the very similar Griffiths bill, which was developed by the AFL-CIO.

Federal government would take over all financing of health care, establishing regional offices which would negotiate rates with doctors and hospitals.

It would wipe out the private health insurance industry and the present structure of group health plans used by most Americans to cover their health bills.

Group practice plans (in which several physicians of varying specialties practice together and coordinate care of patients) would be encouraged.

All Americans would be entitled to total medical care which would be financed by a 3.5 per cent tax on employers' payrolls and one per cent levied on individual income up to \$15,000. Federal funds raised through existing sources would pay the rest.

Estimates range from \$53 billion to \$77 billion on what the cost of full implementation of this plan would be. In the Kennedy-Griffiths bill reintroduced this week, a gradual phase-in is proposed which would require less initially.

Consumers would be in the majority on local health-care-policy boards which might sharply contrast with most of today's hospital boards. These tend to limit representation to prominent business and civic leaders.

AMERIPLAN

Proposed by the American Hospital Association, it would link hospital care with new health-care corporations in which eligible individuals could receive all outpatient services, which would be financed by the federal government.

Eligible persons also would be protected for catastrophic illness—payment for hospitalization and other needs when personal hospital insurance benefits had expired.

To be eligible for services of the health-care corporation and the catastrophic services, however, individuals would have to purchase "basic benefits" from a private insurer.

These basic benefits would be prescribed by the federal government. AHA has suggested up to 90 days of hospital care, 30 days in less intensive care beds, and 90 days in a nursing home.

A spokesman for the insurance industry fears that private insurers would gradually

be squeezed out of this system as the health care corporations, which would contract with hospitals for services, became stronger entities.

Under the AHA plan, poor people unable to afford private health insurance, would be covered by the federal government. Consequently, they would have full rights with other citizens to use the health care corporations.

Physicians under this system could continue under a fee for service system or participate as salaried members of clinics. AHA proposes a variety of compensation options for physicians but fees would be standardized under contracts with the health care corporations.

MEDICREDIT

Proposed by the American Medical Association, this plan would let individuals choose their own health coverage and receive tax credits in proportion to income. Credits would range from 10 per cent of hospital costs to 100 per cent, the latter being for poor people unable to afford any part of their medical payments.

The physicians would depend on peer review for cost and quality control, but the basic system for delivering health services would not change.

Estimated federal cost: \$16 billion.

HEALTHCARE

Proposed by the Health Insurance Association of America which includes the major insurance companies of Hartford where thousands work in health insurance jobs.

This system would basically preserve the present delivery system but would strengthen controls on physicians' fees as part of an extension of insurance benefits for outpatient services. Most insurance benefits today are tied to hospitalization.

Companies complain that inability to control outpatient costs under the fee system have discouraged liberal coverage of outpatient services including preventive medicine.

But this position would change under the HIAA plan where preventive medicine and pre-payment for virtually all health services would be proposed.

Insurers would insist on stronger professional guidelines and peer review to control outpatient costs. They also would want legislative support to assure sound budget policies by hospitals and authority to appeal when hospital budgets became excessive.

Heavy stress would be placed on switching from hospital emphasis to ambulatory care to avoid wasteful use of hospital beds.

The HIAA plan also proposes financial incentives for medical school graduates to serve in areas lacking adequate medical services. Older physicians might be offered financial incentives to move to these areas.

Group insurance, which is a major share of the private health insurance business, would be safeguarded with tax incentives for employers to meet voluntary minimum standards prescribed by the federal government. Full compliance would mean 100 per cent tax deduction. Lesser plans would qualify for only 50 per cent deduction.

Individuals also would continue to buy private insurance. Poor people would be insured through a pool of insurance companies in each state, subsidized by up to 90 per cent by the federal government.

Estimated cost of this program would be about \$650 million.

NIXON PLAN

Still only generally spelled out, President Nixon's proposal would provide family health insurance for the poor and near-poor to replace Medicaid and offer preventive medicine as well as hospital and surgical care.

It also would provide government-financed catastrophic insurance for all Americans covering 80 per cent of medical bills over \$2,000. Estimated cost of the Nixon plan: \$2.3 billion.

[From the Hartford Times, Jan. 30, 1971]

HOSPITALS FIGHT BACK AGAINST COST SPIRAL (By James N. Mason, Jr., and Jeffrey Daniels)

Hospitals—the main butt of criticism over rising medical expenses—are beginning to fight back, against both the costs and the critics.

In Connecticut, where the 34 non-profit, volunteer hospitals provide all acute medical care, the administrators, planners and hospital partisans say they are taking action—not just watching the cost spiral eat into the medical dollar.

The hospitals, clearly, are on the defensive as public agencies, state and Federal, begin to take a jaundiced eye at hospital costs that keep rising.

The Connecticut Hospital Association concedes that the battle against rising costs isn't being won easily, but the battle is being waged.

Hospitals have hired systems engineers to study operational efficiency. There are 13 hospitals in the state under direct contract with one such firm now. Savings of \$1.2 million already have been documented.

Blue Cross and the federal government—which both share major costs of paying for medical care—have sponsored a \$677,000 four-year study program to reform hospital budgets and get hospitals to live within those budgets.

Twenty-three hospitals are now voluntarily participating in joint purchasing agreements, contracts that put the hospitals in the higher-discount bracket when they buy supplies.

Comprehensive planning is going on, with a Hospital Planning Commission, Inc., financed by the member hospitals. The commission, based in New Haven, has already created some waves, say the hospital spokesmen, with recommendations that are sometimes not popular.

Administrators continually point at the ominous labor portion of the budget—a 70 percent item that no hospital seems able to cut.

Last year the industry spent \$270 million on salaries, while \$180 million went for all the rest. Turnover in personnel, moreover, reaches as high as 50 per cent in some hospitals.

The problem, say the hospital spokesmen, has meant extensive retraining and now, because of a new state law in effect since Jan. 1, the hospitals will have to pay unemployment insurance for those leaving hospital employ.

The hospital association, the primary group that stands up for the hospitals, says the employment insurance alone will cost another \$3.5 million annually across the state.

Hospitals say they have redistributed personnel and improved efficiency, but basically labour costs continue to be the primary cause of high costs. So the industry seems to be concentrating cost cutting in the other parts of the hospital budget.

In another sidelight, hospital people become incensed at critics who blame hospitals for rising emergency room and clinical costs.

These problems, the hospitals say with legitimacy, were created as doctors made the emergency room the "secon office" and as public programs sent people who couldn't pay to the clinics.

Some hospitals across the state, particularly the big five, have sizable uncollectable bills. The details are not discussed in mixed company, but uncollectables are a significant problem for the large facilities.

In specific areas, cost cutting has been successful, reports the Hospital Association.

Twenty-three hospitals, working with Ernest Bauer, a purchasing agent attached to the hospital association, have joined in purchasing the necessary supplies of sutures and liquid oxygen—two high quantity items in the supply budget.

The hospitals, Bauer reports, achieved an 11 per cent discount on a \$1.2 million order. Savings annually are projected at \$33,565 for the hospitals. In liquid oxygen purchases, Bauer estimates the facilities will save about \$340,000 over five years.

The experiment in budgeting has, thus far, had 18 state hospitals trading information in an effort to increase efficiency. They have also been working with a systems engineering firm, Community Systems Foundation, Ann Arbor, Mich. This firm has also contracted with 13 hospitals to do individual studies.

The bonus for efficient budgeting has been provided by Blue Cross. According to Allen Herkimer, head of the budget project, if a hospital can keep its cost 2 per cent below its budget, it can keep that profit to pump back into the hospital. Blue Cross has agreed not to deduct it from its payments to the hospitals for services under its policies.

The second phase of the budgeting project will be to cut personnel costs by reviewing hospital procedures.

According to Clyde McCollum, project director of the systems foundation, the hospitals so far have only asked for studies on particular operations in the hospitals (laboratory, transport systems, etc.).

The hospitals, he said, have not asked for studies on the hospital with a view toward overall care procedure in the total renovation of the present health delivery system.

While hospital association representatives quickly admit that cost increases must slow down and that hospitals want to keep costs down, the comparison with neighboring states, they say, shows Connecticut is doing a fairly good job.

Dennis May, finance director for the hospital association (he checks the hospitals' books annually) believes a key factor in keeping Connecticut's cost below other states in the northeast (especially New York, Massachusetts and Rhode Island) has been due to a declining length of stay in hospitals here.

The average stay last year was 8.1 days, compared with a high of 10.9 in New York. Connecticut was 24th highest, nationally May said, but Massachusetts and Rhode Island had 8.9 day averages.

What length of stay means, economically, is that more people can be treated in a year if they stay for a shorter time. Also, the shortening of stay reduces the cost to the patient.

May estimated that if the length of the hospital stay in Connecticut matched neighboring Massachusetts and Rhode Island, hospital expenses last year would have been \$22 million higher than the \$450 million they were.

Occupancy rate in Connecticut hospitals is also high: An average of 82.6 per cent last year. May says it means the use of space is efficient, that bed shortages, a crisis a number of years ago, is less than before. (Some hospitals, like St. Francis in Hartford, are still reporting a five-month wait for some surgery, however.)

The high per day cost of a hospital bed in Connecticut, 5th in the nation, is blamed partly to high incomes here and the rising per capita income in the state (it is the nation's highest).

But May said the cost of a bed per day is higher in Rhode Island, New York and Massachusetts. The northerly neighbor, in fact, has the highest bed rate per day in the nation.

[From the Hartford Times, Jan. 31, 1971]

HOW TO HALT RUNAWAY COSTS

(By James N. Mason, Jr. and Jeffrey Daniels)

Connecticut's spiraling medical-hospital costs can be braked, experts in the field believe. Here are several key recommendations most agree could do the job:

Better hospital planning.
Improved services for treating and preventing illnesses before people need expensive hospital care.

A bigger and louder consumer voice in medical agencies now dominated by medical forces.

Less dependence on high cost hospital beds by building "progressive care" units where patients not needing intensive care can occupy beds with lower staff requirements.

Better distribution of medical personnel including training of more "para-professional" assistants to relieve physicians of time-consuming routine talks.

In most areas, the medical establishment has begun in recent years to take action. Opinions differ sharply whether physicians, hospitals, insurers and government have moved fast enough, and with the kind of vigor needed to put tight reins on medical costs.

Planning, for instance, has been initiated by private groups, financed mostly by the medical establishment and dependent not on what the public believes it needs, but what hospitals and doctors want to provide—and how.

Dr. Max R. Goldstein, incoming president of the Hartford County Medical Association (HCMA), believes the present rate of hospital construction could lead to a huge oversupply of costly hospital beds within five years.

The reason: The pattern of growth is based on existing hospital operation, on current methods of dealing with sick, treating them and keeping them in hospitals.

If the system changes dramatically—by reforming hospital operation as some critics desire—there will be surplus beds.

Two imminent health developments could throw present hospital expansion programs into serious question, suggests Dr. Goldstein. One is the pressure for improved programs to treat people outside hospitals, catching their maladies before they become serious enough for hospital care. Most of the reform proposals before Congress stress this emphasis on outpatient care.

The other is called "progressive care" hospital service. Instead of putting all patients in the beds requiring the most intensive—and expensive—staffing, they are placed in progressively less expensive units. Some might be in an intermediate care wing or floor requiring fewer nurses. Others might be in motel-like accommodations where patients are ambulatory but not yet well enough to go home. So far hospitals have been slow to embrace this approach.

But if outpatient service is strengthened and more "progressive care" facilities are built, the hundreds of intensive care beds being built or planned for today will cause an over-supply, suggests Dr. Goldstein.

The design requirements for hospitals make it impractical, or at least very expensive, to later convert intensive care beds to progressive care beds, he says.

In the area of hospital planning, the public is confronted with a tangled picture. How do the taxpayers sort out the conglomeration of agencies that includes the State Comprehensive Health Planning Council, the State Advisory Council for Hospital Survey and Construction, the Connecticut Hospital Planning Commission, Inc., the State Council on Hospitals, the Greater Hartford Health Planning Council, Inc., and others?

All these agencies have some voice, direct or indirect, in planning for hospitals and other health facilities. Some are heavily dominated or actually the creations of the medical interests they are supposed to be regulating.

The hospitals fear too much government control. What seems apparent, some observers say, is not so much the need for more control but rather a clear-cut control from agencies properly staffed and properly represented by the taxpayers instead of being controlled by medical industry interests.

Another avenue to more reasonable medical costs, the experts say, is clearly in the improvement of outpatient services and preventive medicine.

Far-thinking physicians among the members of the Hartford County Medical Association appear to be nudging their colleagues toward a pre-pay program for services in doctors' offices.

Everybody seems to agree that the most promising route to medical cost control is to keep people well. The HCMA idea (if the doctors really come through with it) and other pre-pay plans would make it a lot easier for people to take periodic physical examinations.

The prospects of paying \$30 or more for a routine physical even once a year tends to make many people of moderate means postpone it. Sometimes, while they delay it for months or years—until the car is paid off or the kitchen is done over—the seeds of destructive disease germinate.

Under pre-pay plans, the patient can take his periodic physical, his flu shots, and other preventive medicine without feeling it in the pocketbook.

The Community Health Center Plan in New Haven, sponsored by the Greater New Haven Labor Council, is this state's first pre-pay medical program and may pave the way for others.

Connecticut General Insurance Corp., anxious to carve out a position in the brave new medical world of tomorrow, has been a partner in the pre-pay medical program serving the new city of Columbia, Md.

Another avenue of cost control is more diligence by taxpayers and consumers.

The voice of the consumer seems rarely to be heard in the state's medical establishment.

This was clearly evident in December when the State Insurance Department held a public hearing on Connecticut Medical Service's (CMS) request for a boost on rates for its Century Plan.

The CMS witnesses presented their case. Several independent physicians spoke in favor of boosts.

No witness questioned or contested the CMS application.

A representative of the state personnel department (whose 36,000 members make up CMS' biggest group plan) testified that the proposed rate boost would cost the state about \$1 million, but he did not speak for or against it. (Ultimately, the Insurance Department reduced several of the requested increases.)

The medical consumer appears to be insulated from the medical cost spiral by his health insurance. Only when lingering illness eats up benefits does he get hit with the impact.

But the state's employers do feel it. The rate boosts on group health plans bite directly into company profits.

Yet there is no business-oriented monitor on health costs similar to the highly respected Connecticut Public Expenditure Council which is a business-financed research bureau on state and local financial matters.

Former State Sen. Edward Marcus suggests that the governor should have appointive powers on CMS and Blue Cross boards which presently have heavy representation from the medical establishment.

Another avenue of cost-saving would be to reform some federal and state administered programs that doctors and hospitals say are pushing up costs.

Two in particular stand out.

Hospitals have criticized the state's Hospital Cost Commission because it bases its rate for treating state patients by taking the hospital's public charge for the lowest price room in the hospital. Officials complain that if a bed costs \$40, while most in the hospital are ranging from \$55 to \$85 a day, the com-

mission uses the lowest bed rate, then cuts from that to get the state rate.

The federal government, moreover, is forcing doctors to send patients into hospitals instead of nursing homes.

One physician tells a story of a woman who after leaving the hospital was sent home to be cared for by relatives. The care proved too much for the family.

In order to get the woman into a nursing home, with the Medicare money she deserved, the doctor had to lie, and put the woman back in the hospital.

The law, says this physician, mandates that federal aid only be provided for patients who go from hospitals to nursing home directly. The patient, moreover, must spend three days in a hospital. The cost: About \$200 to \$250 of federal money, plus the waste of a hospital bed for three days.

One problem which complicates hospital finances is the dependency on high bed occupancy to remain solvent, says Dr. Goldstein. Studies show that empty intensive care beds cost as much as \$8,000 a year to maintain.

Staffing and other fixed costs persist even when many beds are empty.

Consequently, hospitals sabotage their financial well-being by any measures which shorten occupancy of intensive care beds, he says.

Only by developing progressive care facilities on high occupancy to balance the budget, he says.

The present supply and use of medical manpower is frequently criticized. Doctors say that if they had more "assistant doctors" or para-professionals and legal authority to use them, they could treat more patients at lower cost.

Highly trained nurses are often used as clerks processing the myriad of forms forced on hospitals for public and private reimbursement agencies.

It has been suggested that the community hospitals should encourage careers in various medical technical specialties which would permit better use of the most highly trained medical manpower.

The medical industry cites progress in all these problem areas. Possibly this year with at least a half-dozen serious proposals for medical reform facing Congress, the chances for voluntary overhaul inside the industry is greater than ever before.

OF DREAMS AND THINGS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in the state of the Union address, President Nixon in his opening lines said:

Now we are ready for the lift of the driving dream.

Although I find even in reviewing the written presentation a studied avoidance of either description or direction for such drive and little inspiration for the said dream, the rhetorical phrase did bring to mind some thoughts we trust will be found relevant.

Speaking of dreams the Irish poet, Arthur O'Shaughnessy wrote:

For each age is a dream that is dying
Or one that is coming to birth.

Our view is that, given the accelerated pace of this period which compresses time, we are the uncomfortable occu-

pants of an age when concurrently the old dream is dying and the new dream's aborning. The old dream of America is dying hard. Its death throes are traumatic and the fact of demise is neither gracefully accepted nor willingly entertained. The new dream is agonizingly aborning. Like a breech delivery, its appearance is slow and painful with its distinct attending trauma.

The passing of the old and the issuance of the new assail us alike with separate storms of pain and violence. With the walling at the wake mixing with anguished screams from the delivery room, the emotionally charged twin events assault us in a manner which transcends at time our tolerance; they challenge the thresholds of bearable suffering; they threaten the society which seeks to survive the turmoil.

The events of death and birth are usually calculated to bring those mutually affected together. In most societies this would be predictable; however, in the context of American society today and its dying old dream and its arriving new and "driving dream", we wonder if the situation described by Alexis de Tocqueville is not more accurately the case. He, in describing the condition most likely to erode national unity, wrote that when members of a nation "each of them, living apart, is a stranger to the fate of all the rest; when his children and his private friends constitute to him the whole of mankind; when, as for the rest of his fellow citizens, he is close to them but sees them not, he touches them, but feels them not" such a citizen, he concludes, has already "lost his country."

Just such aggravating circumstances compound the troubles of our times. Instead of the unity which assuages grief at time of death, we feel apart and mourn alone. Instead of the oneness which reduces fear and enhances the joy of new birth, we are alienated and the burden of fear and pain is unshared. The sense of loss over the passing old dream is inordinately increased, and troubled doubt over the birth of the new dream is paramount.

Why fear acknowledging the passing of an old dream? An old coat, comfortable and familiar, but no longer able to protect its wearer from the elements, is discarded and replaced by a new one. The old coat served its purpose and had its time and is fondly remembered. But it is no longer useful. Old dreams, too, can be fondly remembered, for they, too, have had their time. But like old coats, dreams must be discarded when they are worn and no longer useful.

A mature person accepts change. He remembers the past but is not subservient to it. A mature nation honors its past but does not allow it to dictate its future. I've been told that what one dreams is often a clue to his maturity. What does our collective dream suggest? If a society's dream is amenable to analysis, our diagnosis perhaps might be one of a national immaturity characterized by an excessive distrust of the future while desperately clinging to a past which long ago died but remains unburied.

For those who would be helpful leaders for our America, the message is clear.

We must as a nation, as we must as individuals, approach the death bed with some sense of willing grace. It is neither useful nor healthy to resurrect dreams whose age has passed. However much we have been committed to the old dream of America, the evidence of its passing is too strong to be safely ignored. Let us get on with the burial, so that, like the mature people we should be, we can appropriately honor our past without being unduly burdened by it.

The pace of modern times has made some dreams obsolete upon birth. Although this is particularly painful, even the newest ideals must be in context with their immediate times if they are to be useful and survive.

Mr. President, if you offer us the lifting spirit of a "driving dream", please make it part of today. And please do not commit us too firmly, for what is important today may be unimportant tomorrow.

Tell us you understand that the dream you have is one that recognizes an America changing daily. Tell us we have a leadership comfortable and rational in an environment of change, and unafraid to admit that even old dreams die and new ones must be born.

Today, Mr. President, we need a vision we can clearly see and whose value we can understand. We need an ideal firmly grounded in the realities of the present, an ideal that generates our participation, so that we are not "strangers to the fate of all the rest" but partners in the weaving of that fate.

Today, America is in the middle of burying an old dream and gaining a new one. Only a President can lift us from our solitary grief and articulate those new ideals which fuse a nation's purpose. You have alluded to the "driving dream", Mr. President, and the Nation needs to know what it is that we may be brought together again.

BLACK PROGRESS IS HAPPENING, TOO

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edwin Harwood, an assistant professor in the department of anthropology and sociology at Rice University, Houston, Tex., and the Wall Street Journal, have performed a notable public service by calling our attention to the significant progress being made in this country by black Americans.

In a penetrating article called, "Black Progress Is Happening, Too," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal yesterday, Mr. Harwood very carefully documented the fact that while serious needs continue to plague our minority groups, it is a mistake to fail to realize that our vast numbers of black Americans have made enormous progress in all of their social endeavors.

I welcome Mr. Harwood's study because it confirms what I have said on many occasions—that too often, when

discussing problems of America, we fail to see the forest for the trees.

There are the sociologists who spend so much time lamenting our weaknesses as a nation that they fail to see our strengths.

We are the first nation to develop a middle-income black society. While I agree that progress to date may not be moving as fast as some wish, the fact remains that it is moving, and that we are progressing in opening up new opportunities for minority groups in America.

I am willing to support programs to accelerate this progress, but I believe that Dr. Harwood offers an excellent "way station" to measure the degree of progress already made by black Americans.

Mr. Harwood's article follows:

BLACK PROGRESS IS HAPPENING, TOO

(By Edwin Harwood)

Considering what many radical social scientists have been writing about black Americans, and how the American public is consistently overexposed to pitifully small cadres of black extremists by the news media, one could hardly expect even educated Americans to know the most elementary fact about Black America: Its rapidly growing working and lower-middle classes. This black silent majority shares with its white counterpart many of the same jobs and the life-style accompanying those jobs. It also shares the same anxieties over good schools and homes in neighborhoods free of crime.

Last November I took my family to view the Thanksgiving Parade in downtown Houston because the parade's celebrated guests were the Sesame Street actors my young daughter adores. What caught my interest was not just the easy intermingling of white and Negro families, the similarity in their dress, comportment and enthusiasm for the event, but the fact that not a few Negro families arrived in late-model cars bearing American flag decals.

Read what my young radical colleagues in sociology have been writing over the past decade and you would not see this. Through a flood of angry books and articles on "black rage," "ghetto revolts" and "internal colonialism" (by white police in black neighborhoods), they have fashioned an image of the Negro that is about as much to be believed as the early 19th century accounts of preliterate peoples that white missionaries brought back to Europe's reading public. Naturally the radicals would have anyone who will only listen take seriously their claim to be "telling it like it is." Fortunately for race relations most of what they write circulates only amongst themselves. It certainly has no impact on the masses, white or black. Unfortunately, there is a newer breed of journalist and "with it" cleric who, following the chic in activist fashion, have helped propagate the intellectuals' fantasies of racial Armageddon among their educated audiences.

What is happening? In terms of jobs, it is the Negro gal Friday, the medical technician, receptionist, telephone operator, registered nurse and welfare and recreational worker; the cement finisher, pipe fitter, welder, truck driver, architect and draftsman—not the Mississippi sharecropper whose wagon and mules go out on loan to a civil rights' expedition up North, or the bootblack who is fast vanishing from the barbershops across the nation.

EMPLOYMENT SHIFTS AND INCOME

Between 1957 and 1969, Negro farm workers declined by more than half a million. During the same 12-year span, private household workers fell by almost 300,000 and non-farm laborers, the least skilled blue-collar

workers, by about 100,000. These are the lowest-paying jobs according to the Census Bureau. But these shifts did not mean massive unemployment, because Negro unemployment followed the national trend downward throughout the 1960s at the same rate as the white trend in unemployment.

Proof of the growth of a sizable Negro lower-middle class can be gauged by income statistics published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In 1957, only 10% of all Negro families earned \$8,000 or more (in 1968 dollars), but by 1968, Negroes earning \$8,000 or more had increased to 32%. (In the North and West, families in this bracket were 43% of the total Negro population.)

The rhetoric of racial polarization suggests a gulf between whites and blacks in economic terms that the facts fail to support. Throughout the 1960s, Negroes were closing the income gap. In 1960, their median income was slightly more than half the white median income. By the end of the decade it had increased to almost two-thirds the white median income.

Negroes had, relative to white, made disproportionately greater gains in all the top job categories, from skilled blue-collar jobs to professional occupations. Between 1957 and 1969, Negro clerical workers more than doubled from 400,000 to over 1 million; Negro craftsmen and foremen increased from 380,000 to 700,000; managers, officials and proprietors from 140,000 to 250,000 and professionals from 250,000 to 700,000.

Though much has been written about the barriers to Negro entry into the skilled crafts, the facts tell a different story. In 1957, Negroes were only about 4.3% of the nation's craftsmen and foremen. By 1969, they were nearly 7%. To reach parity with the white labor force Negroes would have to reach roughly 11% in all job categories. That they will achieve parity in the skilled blue-collar jobs in the near future seems certain at their present rate of increase.

We should have expected Negroes to gain on whites for two reasons: They had so far to go in catching up to begin with, and much larger numbers of younger better-educated Negroes were entering the labor force for the first time during the '60s.

ATTITUDES AND FACTS

As early as 1964, Negroes interviewed in a survey directed by sociologist Gary T. Marx were asked: "Do you think things are getting better or worse for Negroes in this country?" In his book, "Protest and Prejudice," Marx reports that 8 out of every 10 respondents said "better" and gave economic improvement or more dignity as the reason. Thus Negro attitudes were in line with the objective fact of swift gains in jobs and a closing of the income gap between whites and blacks. And though no civil rights leader could admit it, heavy military spending during the '60s was a major cause of the sharp decline in Negro unemployment throughout that decade.

The facts were there for the irate and the aggrieved to look at. But too many social scientists had no interest in facts gathered from surveys—certainly not in any findings at odds with their rhetoric of stagnation and irremedial poverty, of expanding pockets of ghetto despair and a widening gulf between blacks and whites.

The irony of what some social researchers have been reporting about Black America is not just the evident fact of bias in whom they choose to study and listen to but its effect in reinforcing popular stereotypes and white resistance to integration. Time magazine can be glib and tell us that the Black Panthers' belligerency "has enabled all blacks to walk a little taller" (Jan. 11, 1971) and yet fail to see the mischief of this. Because, if black revolution is just around the corner, then what white family is going to want blacks, in whose every face they are conditioned to see hate, just around their corner?

One reason the ears of educated Americans have been turned by social critics to complaints of police brutality, for example, is that the available "spokesmen" in a slum tend to be the younger unattached males and the newer cadres of radical community organizers. The latter have taken a natural antagonism that exists between "the fuzz" and action-prone adolescents and auctioned it off to the more serious bidders of the New Politics.

In his book, "The Airtight Cage," Joseph Lyford remarks at how surprised he was to learn that residents in the low-income neighborhood he studied in New York City were upset by the public disorder and crime, and had little enthusiasm to spare for the issue of police brutality or a civilian review board. Lyford came to this finding simply, by having John Kraft Inc. conduct a survey to insure that all categories of residents would be heard from, those working and raising families and not just those who, free of this regimen of the adult working-class, were available for the kinds of activities that provoke the police.

"STREET CORNER" RESEARCH

Distorted accounts of what slum residents think and feel arose partly because social researchers have chosen to study the slum by means of direct observation—which we sometimes call "street corner" research. It is true that the researcher using this approach sees more action at close range. Yet "street corner" studies have bias built into them. They fail precisely at getting that which the sample survey does best: A representative sampling of a community's population and therewith a representative picture of the sentiments and characteristics of all its members. Street corner observers can get to know only a limited number of people; moreover, only those people who will make themselves available for the heavy exchange of conversation vital to the researcher's task will be studied. The sad fact is that today the most accessible members of low-income neighborhoods tend to be the least well controlled and least respectable members, or the youths who have been freed for life on the streets by our greater affluence. (A half-century ago, many would have gone to work in their early teens to support a widowed mother and younger brothers and sisters.)

The continued emphasis scholars give to the Negro male's economic handicaps, often joined by a corollary belief that Negro women enjoyed a superior position in the urban labor market, is perhaps the cruelest and most damaging stereotype of all. It persists even as other prejudices have fallen because scholars who are thought to know the facts continue to pay lip service to it. In an article we are preparing for "The Public Interest," Claire Hodge, a government labor economist, and I have examined the historical record from the decennial censuses and other studies of black communities and find nothing to support the notion that somehow economic roles were reversed in the case of Negroes, giving the woman special advantages relative to the Negro man during good times or bad. If, as some sociologists have put it crudely, the Negro male was "emasculated," it was not by anything happening in the labor market but only by the long lease of life given this particular stereotype by liberal white scholars.

Looking at the caricatured portraits of Black America that scholars and social critics outside the academy have drawn, we may wonder if good judgment and sagacity necessarily follow from intellectual accomplishments. For the picture of Black America that has emerged is not only one in which most Negroes would have difficulty recognizing themselves, but one that is more likely to hinder than help the difficult work still remaining to be done in achieving a fully integrated society.

SPEAKER CARL ALBERT: A GIANT IN ABILITY AND LEADERSHIP

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Parade magazine recently published an excellent article about our distinguished Speaker.

This article portrays his warmth and dedication and because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in our recently elected Speaker, I insert the article in the RECORD as follows:

SPEAKER CARL ALBERT: THE LITTLE GIANT EVERYBODY LOVES

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The first time Carl Albert set foot on the House floor—five feet, four inches and 120 pounds of freshman Congressman in a blue serge suit—he was mistaken for a Capitol page. A veteran Republican member handed him a batch of papers and told him to take them to his office, which Albert obediently did.

That was 24 years ago. Certainly few who saw the shy little redhead from the Oklahoma hills, as he was sworn in alongside the likes of Congressmen John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon, would have suspected he would someday be the most powerful man in the House. But this month Carl Albert, son of a poor coal miner, was made Speaker of the House by his Democratic colleagues.

The key to Albert's success is his extraordinary popularity. It is nearly impossible to find anyone with an unkind word for him. Why is Albert so well liked? "When I first came to Congress," the friendly, still freckle-faced Oklahoman told Parade, "I made it a point to be on the floor all the time I could. I learned the rules of the House, who the members were, how they voted, what they talked about, their problems. I try to know all the members."

Such is Albert's knowledge of the House and its members that the late President Kennedy once said: "No matter who tells me what will happen to a piece of legislation, if it differs from what Carl Albert says, I believe Carl. I've never known him to be more than six votes off on any bill."

As Majority Leader under John McCormack, Albert went along loyally with the aging Speaker's passive leadership, but those close to Albert are convinced he will be an aggressive leader. They believe he will stand up to the autocratic House committee chairmen who have been defying the will of the majority. Even the sanctified seniority system itself may be in for some revamping. As Rep. Tom Steed, Albert's close friend and fellow Oklahoman, puts it: "If people make the mistake of thinking because Carl's such an innately nice guy, he hasn't got any steel in him, they're in for the surprise of their lives."

AN EARLY RISER

Carl Albert's day begins about 6:30 a.m. when he rises in the uptown apartment where he and his wife Mary and 16-year-old son David live. Their daughter Mary Frances, 21, attends Rice Institute in Texas.

Albert is usually the first one in his office. He sorts the mail and picks out anything requiring his immediate attention. Most of the morning is consumed handling the affairs of his constituents, responding to correspondence and conferring with members. By noon, he is on the House floor where he remains most of the day. He seldom can get away from the Capitol before 7 p.m. Then he and Mrs. Albert often must attend as many as five receptions in an evening.

Among House members of both parties, Albert is considerably impeccably honest, enormously bright, capable, and thoughtful to the point of being a worrywart.

THINGS TO WORRY ABOUT

Recalls Tom Steed: "Many years ago, it was in the spring and Carl had just heard that he'd have no opposition in the next election. I was sitting on the floor with Bill Stigler, who represented another part of Oklahoma. We were saying how nice it was for Carl that he had won elections without opposition. Just then we saw him and I said to Bill that, despite the goods news, I'd bet a cup of coffee that Carl would be worrying about something. He took me up on it and we beckoned Carl over and said how wonderful we thought the news was. 'I know it looks that way,' he said. 'But my name won't be on the ballot this time and did you ever think what that might do to me two years from now.' Well, Bill and I went off the floor laughing and Carl followed us into the cloakroom and he got mad when he heard about our bet and wouldn't drink coffee with us."

If Albert's worrying is legendary, his sense of rectitude is another trademark. His scrupulous honesty has sometimes made it necessary for him to borrow money when campaign expenses left him short. He refuses to accept large political donations, even from such respectable sources as organized labor.

Albert's friendship with Tom Steed goes back to the day when he took part in a high school speech contest which Steed covered for the school paper. The place was McAlester, Okla.; the time the early 1920's. "It was during an assembly," Steed recalls. "In those days oratory was called 'declaiming' and Carl was supposed to declaim extemporaneously. There was no loudspeaker on the assembly stage and he came out there, just a damned midget. He started giving this oration and damned near knocked the plaster off the walls."

Albert attended the University of Oklahoma, where he won a number of prizes for his speaking. One award enabled him to travel to England. He saw Oxford University and decided he wanted to go there. His grades were excellent and earned him a Phi Beta Kappa key. But he needed to excel in some sport to win the coveted Rhodes Scholarship to Oxford. Too small for most sports, Albert went out for wrestling, in which he would be matched with a man his size. "He became a pretty darned good wrestler. I understand," says Steed. "I never saw him but the guys told me that he was just a tiger—a ferocious wrestler."

"THIS ONE IS MINE"

Albert won the scholarship and spent three years at Oxford. He studied law and earned two law degrees, which got him a spot in the Judge Advocate General's office in Washington when he enlisted in the Army shortly after Pearl Harbor. One of the office clerks was a tiny, 20-year-old girl from Columbia, S.C., named Mary Harmon. "So help me," she recalls, "there was not another single man in that department. When Carl walked in I told the other girls, 'Now, you can just stand back and stop drooling because this one is mine. He's just my size.'"

They were married in August, 1942, and a few months later, Captain Albert left for the Pacific. He served 2½ years and was awarded a Bronze Star. After the war, the couple moved to McAlester, and Albert shortly announced for Congress. He won the race by a few hundred votes. Thereafter he won all of his races by as much as 90 percent of the vote. "If it falls below 90 percent," says Steed, "Carl starts worrying."

Whatever changes Carl Albert seeks in the House seem certain to be evolutionary, not revolutionary. For he has deep respect for the House and its traditions. "I think the House is the greatest institution in the coun-

try," he says. "But I don't think it's fully understood. I think there are things that could be done to improve the image of the House. Its problems are more intense than they were before. We must keep our mechanisms up to date. The seniority system is as good a method as anyone has come up with, but it must not be able to thwart the will of the House."

THE PERSONAL TOUCH

Whatever kind of Speaker the 62-year-old Albert turns out to be, it is doubtful he will abandon the political style that has made him so popular. It is an intensely personal style, relying on friendship, mutual respect and persuasion, not political pressure to convince other members to see things his way. "Carl assumes that if you get elected to the Congress, you're bound to have some sense," says Steed. "So he's always nice to a member when the member has to go against him. The next time the member will think, 'Well, here's a vote I can help old Carl out on.'" The guessing in Washington is that Carl Albert will never lack members to help him out in the legislative pinches.

LET US END THE DRAFT AND GET OUR SERVICEMEN OFF THE WELFARE ROLLS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Mrs. Smith, recently criticized the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "for permitting 25 States to refuse AFDC to children where the father is serving his country and being paid such a low wage for it that his family has become impoverished." In a related development, the Army Times reported that Defense officials have made a rough estimate that 50,000 servicemen qualify for food stamps.

What is the logic of a system which takes productive young men out of the civilian economy and pays them wages that are so low they are forced to choose between welfare and poverty?

The President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Force has recommended pay increases averaging 50 percent for first-term enlisted men and 28 percent for first-term officers. The Commission declared that these pay raises were justified not only in terms of ending the draft, but also on the grounds of equity. It is imperative that we enact the recommendations of the Commission to establish a volunteer force, and to lift our men in uniform out of poverty. I commend these items from the Navy Times and the Army Times to the attention of my colleagues:

SEN. SMITH RAPS 21 STATES FOR MILITARY KIN NEGLECT

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Margaret Chase Smith (R., Maine) is demanding to know why 21 states give no welfare payments to military families under the government's chief relief program. Aid For Dependent Children.

In a letter to Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Elliot Richardson, Sen. Smith also points out that AFDC payments in two states (Maine and Idaho) go only to families of servicemen who have been drafted and in

two others (Iowa and Vermont) limit the aid to draftees or men who enlisted to avoid the draft.

Mrs. Smith points out that the purpose of the AFDC program is to aid families whose fathers are absent from home and asks "Aren't these men absent from home?"

"What good reason is there," she asks Richardson, "for permitting 25 states to refuse AFDC to children where the father is serving his country and being paid such a low wage for it that his family has become impoverished."

AFDC payments in August averaged \$185.05. They vary by state. The states pay some and the federal government adds to it, based on a sliding scale. Mississippi paid the lowest amount in August, \$46.85, and Hawaii paid the most \$277.85.

The states giving no aid to families with dependent children because of the "continued absence of the serviceman" are: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

COMMISSARY REPORT: FOOD STAMP USE NEARS \$250,000

WASHINGTON.—Army commissaries accepted nearly \$250,000 in food stamps in the first three months in which the stores were permitted to redeem them.

Army stores in the U.S. started accepting the Department of Agriculture food stamps July 1, 1970.

In a report submitted to a House Armed Services Exchange and Commissary Subcommittee, the Army said that in the first quarter of FY 1971 (July, August and September 1970) "the value of food stamps redeemed in Army commissary stores was \$238,000, which amounts to .2 of one percent of total sales for the quarter."

Officials estimated that more than 14,600 food stamp transactions were conducted in the three month period.

"This initial response appears relatively slight but increased activity is expected as the program progresses," the report said.

Department of Agriculture records are said to be "too unwieldy" to furnish figures on the number of military families participating in the food stamp plan. Officials said that as a "rough estimate," 50,000 men in uniform are eligible for food stamps. That's three to four times some earlier estimates.

In addition, the Army said that "only an estimate of the number of military participants in the program is available because issuance of the identification cards and maintenance of records are controlled by supervisory field offices of the USDA."

BEST VOICE FOR AGRICULTURE

HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, in his recent innovative state of the Union address, President Nixon, in a most positive and affirmative tone, suggested that—

A sweeping reorganization of the Executive Branch is needed if the Government is to keep up with the times and with the needs of the people. . . . The time has come to match our structure to our purposes—to look with a fresh eye, to organize the government by conscious, comprehensive design to meet the new needs of a new era.

As pointed out in a recent editorial in

the Lincoln, Nebr., Evening Journal, the President's suggested change is aimed at realigning the Federal bureaucracy to broad functions of government. Without a question of a doubt the President's reorganization plan so far as it affects agriculture will be carefully and thoughtfully scrutinized by rural interests. And this is as it should be.

In this editorial, it is concluded that it might very well be more effective to consider agricultural and rural matters as part of the whole structure of government rather than to expect agriculture to be faithfully served through the narrow attention it now receives. I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

BEST VOICE FOR AGRICULTURE

It is natural that spokesmen for farm interests would immediately bristle at the idea of eliminating the U.S. department of agriculture and distributing its operations among four new departments, as proposed by President Nixon in his State of the Union message.

These farm leaders are sincere in their determination not to dilute further the influence of agriculture on the federal government and not to permit additional deterioration of the farm economy.

At this point, though, it might be contended that the reshaping of the cabinet could expand the federal concern for rural America and give agriculture more clout in national councils than presently is the case.

This contention begins with the premise that agriculture is a pretty lonely voice in Washington right now; farmers have not gained their rightful share of the national affluence under the existing setup. In short, the system being defended by the farm spokesmen has been no great shakes for the farmer.

It is possible that one reason for this is that federal concern for agriculture presently is concentrated in a single bureau—the department of agriculture. And the department of agriculture is so clearly intended to be an advocate of farm interests that it lacks some credibility, as well as contact into other elements of the government.

The President's suggested change is aimed at realigning the federal bureaucracy according to broad functions of government. As it is now, the departments seem to be divided more by vested interests—one for agriculture, one for labor, one for business (commerce) and so on.

In such a breakdown, agriculture is at a natural disadvantage by having such a small constituency across the nation.

Under Mr. Nixon's reorganization plan, agriculture concerns logically would be distributed among all four new departments: price support and crop control programs in the department of economic development; rural development in the department of community development; conservation and ecology matters in the department of natural resources; rural poverty and social problems in the department of human resources.

Insofar as the problems of rural America are legitimate—and we are confident that for the most part they are entirely legitimate—they might be expressed with a broader and more believable voice through these several departments.

It is widely claimed, by agricultural spokesmen as well as others, that the problems of rural America are interwoven with the problems of urban America; that the remedy for both lies in a redistribution of the population away from big city congestion and back to rural expanses.

If this is true, it might be more effective to consider such matters as part of the whole structure of government than to expect agriculture to be served through the narrow attention it now receives.

THE JEWEL OF SECRECY

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of this country have every reason to ask why a cloak of secrecy has been thrown over the testimony which Albert B. Parvin gave the Securities and Exchange Commission concerning his dealings with Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

In an article in the Chicago Sun-Times of January 31, 1971, Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, one of the Nation's outstanding newsmen, pulls together information concerning Parvin, the Parvin Foundation, and its dealings with Douglas—dealings that ought to be the subject of an immediate and thorough investigation by an appropriate committee of Congress. It should no longer be possible to sweep the Parvin-Douglas dealings under the nearest rug and then throw a cloak of secrecy over them.

The article follows:

PARVIN'S DOUGLAS TESTIMONY KEPT SECRET
(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON.—Albert B. Parvin has insisted that secrecy cloak 97 pages of the testimony he gave before the Securities and Exchange Commission on his dealings with Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

The testimony deals with operations of the Parvin Foundation, which he established in 1961 and which paid Douglas \$12,000 a year as president until his resignation a year ago. SEC lawyers have permitted the testimony to remain secret rather than become involved in delays that they say would only stall the fraud action brought in connection with the manipulation of Parvin Dohrmann stock.

But the secrecy Parvin has succeeded in having imposed only deepens the mystery around the whole Parvin-Douglas relationship, for there is already enough information on the public record of the SEC to demonstrate that Parvin was not "just another businessman."

The defenders of Douglas have contended that Parvin was "just a businessman" or "an interior decorator" and have discounted the general allegations in Congress that Parvin was a front man for a group of Mafia figures in Las Vegas (Nev.) gambling casinos.

Over the last nine years, Douglas has been paid more than \$100,000 from the Parvin Foundation. The foundation was started in 1960 after Parvin sold the Flamingo Hotel and Casino to Morris Lansburg for \$10 million. A "finder's fee" of \$200,000 was paid to Meyer Lansky, a Florida gambling figure who has been identified in many hearings as the Mafia's money man. The agreement for Lansky to receive the \$200,000 "fee" in the sale was signed by Parvin and Lansky on May 12, 1960.

AGREEMENT WITH LANSKY DESCRIBED

The agreement called for Lansky to collect \$25,000 a year from the Flamingo for eight years, and the \$2 million received by Parvin above his original investment went into the Parvin Foundation.

The sale of the Flamingo didn't mean Parvin was getting out of Las Vegas gambling activities. His Parvin Dohrmann firm, bought the Fremont Hotel and Casino in 1965 and has broadened its base in Las Vegas gambling since then with the purchase of the Stardust and the Aladdin hotels. He has done some negotiating on the possibility of buying the Riviera.

In testimony, Parvin has admitted he wasn't a corporate officer who kept at arm's length from the gambling operations. He related that two of his employees, Edward Levinson and Edward Torres, gave him nightly reports on operations at the casinos and hotel. Levinson was a business partner of Robert G. (Bobby) Baker, former secretary to the Senate Democrats, in the Serv-U Vending Co. and in other enterprises involving Fred B. Black Jr., a Washington representative for North American Aviation. Baker has begun a jail term of one to three years for conviction on charges of income tax evasion, conspiracy and larceny.

Parvin has stated under oath that he personally told Levinson that Levinson could no longer work at the Fremont after being indicted on federal income tax charges involving skimming of money from the top of the gambling winnings. A story in Life magazine has identified Levinson as one who delivered cash to Lansky in Florida for transmission to Swiss bank accounts. This action reportedly made Levinson vulnerable in the eyes of the Nevada Gaming Commission, which regulates gambling in that state.

Parvin admitted under oath that Torres was also under indictment on the same Internal Revenue charge involving the skimming at the night club. However, Parvin said he did not take action to separate Torres from the Fremont operations.

Parvin said Torres was such an efficient manager of the Fremont that Parvin reluctantly agreed to modify an employment contract to let Torres buy a piece of the Riviera. Parvin said he made the deal with Torres because negotiations for the purchase of the Aladdin were then on and Parvin was eager to have Torres available to manage that business also.

Torres, who was also a partner with Baker in Serv-U Vending, testified that he never had met Baker but bought his interest in the vending company through Levinson and knew nothing of the details of the other principals. Levinson took the 5th Amendment before the Senate Rules Committee on his dealings with Baker and Serv-U and other contracts.

Torres and Levinson have contended that their casino interests have been purchased with straight bank loans, but there never has been any deep inquiry into how these loans were arranged. Nor has there been any more than superficial inquiry into the source of the funds that Parvin used to buy the Flamingo in the period after it was opened by Bugsy Siegel. Siegel died in a hail of bullets in his Hollywood home, and his successor also was shot to death a short time after bowing out of the Flamingo in the mid-1950s.

SUCH INTERESTING PEOPLE

Certainly, the record shows at this stage that Parvin was in an interesting business

and had known many interesting Las Vegas types in the 25 years since he went west from Chicago to sell his interior decorating services in Las Vegas.

His link with Douglas started in 1960 after he read Douglas' book, "America Challenged." Parvin said the book inspired him to start the Albert Parvin Foundation as a vehicle to promote the thinking and writing of Douglas. Within a few months, the arrangement had the two on an "Al" and "Bill" relationship.

More of the life and relationship of "Bill" Douglas and "Al" Parvin is certain to be pulled into the open in the months ahead as the House of Representatives heats up the second round of its attempt to impeach Douglas.

The thrust this year by the Douglas critics will be to get access to the secret SEC testimony by Parvin or get Parvin himself to testify in an open hearing. They complain that, in clearing Douglas of any wrongdoing during the last session, the committee headed by Sen. Emanuel Celler (D-N.Y.) didn't call either Douglas or Parvin to testify. The critics want to change that this time.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT
INCREASE NEEDED NOW

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I insert in the RECORD, part II of the article entitled "Private and Public Retirement Pensions: Findings From the 1968 Survey of the Aged," by Walter W. Kolodrubetz.

The article follows:

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

PENSIONS OF THE RETIRED

In 1967, retirement benefits were being received by 90 percent of the aged units. Almost 12.3 million aged units were drawing "regular" OASDHI benefits—that is, benefits to which they were entitled under the regular insured-status provisions of the Social Security Act. In the aggregate, 2.5 million aged beneficiary units, or about 20 percent of the regular OASDHI beneficiary units, received another retirement benefit and two-thirds of these were paid from private plans (table 2). One half-million aged units who were not receiving OASDHI benefits did receive other public pensions.

TABLE 2.—SOURCE OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR OASDHI BENEFICIARIES¹ AND NONBENEFICIARIES²: AGED UNITS WITH MONEY INCOME FROM SPECIFIED SOURCES, 1967

Source of retirement benefit	All units	Married couples	Nonmarried persons		
			Total	Men	Women
Number of units (in thousands).....	14,332	5,531	8,801	2,173	6,628
Number with—					
OASDHI and—					
No other pension.....	9,791	3,438	6,353	1,476	4,876
Private group pension ³	1,614	1,009	605	287	317
Other public pension.....	868	392	476	128	348
Railroad retirement.....	206	101	105	32	73
Government or military retirement.....	654	296	358	92	266
Public pension other than OASDHI.....	509	166	343	109	234
Railroad retirement.....	319	115	204	72	132
Government or military retirement.....	193	55	138	36	102
No retirement benefit.....	1,550	525	1,025	172	853

¹ Excludes beneficiaries who received their 1st benefit in February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age 72" beneficiaries; also excludes a small number of units reporting private pensions but no OASDHI benefits, as well as some who did not report on private pension receipt.

² Excludes a small number of units who did not report on private pension receipt.

³ Includes a small number of units reporting both a private and another public pension.

One million beneficiary couples and 600,000 nonmarried beneficiaries were also receiving private pension payments.⁴ The proportion was lower for the nonmarried—15 percent for nonmarried men and 6 percent for nonmarried women, compared with 21 percent for the couples. This lower proportion for the nonmarried reflects, in part, the fact that married couples potentially have two persons reporting a specified income source. The much lower proportion of women receiving such private pension payments is a function of, among other factors, the relative lack of survivor protection in private-pension plans, the low incidence of private pension plans in industries where women are typically employed, and the irregular pattern of their labor-force attachment.

In the aggregate, 10 percent of the couples and about 10 percent of nonmarried persons received public pension payments other than OASDHI in 1967. About three-fourths of these couples and three-fifths of the nonmarried were also receiving OASDHI benefits and therefore getting two public pensions. The remainder received only another public pension other than OASDHI.

When the social security program was first established, many types of employment were not covered. Among the excluded groups were government employees. Since that time many State and local government employees and military personnel, who already had their own staff retirement systems, have had OASDHI coverage extended to their work. As a result, most of the other public pension

TABLE 3.—SIZE OF OASDHI BENEFITS FOR OASDHI BENEFICIARIES¹: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF AGED UNITS BY SIZE OF OASDHI INCOME, 1967

OASDHI income	All units	couples	Nonmarried persons		
			Total	Men	Women
Number (in thousands):					
Total with OASDHI income.....	12,447	4,913	7,534	1,028	5,606
Reporting on OASDHI income.....	12,360	4,866	7,494	1,915	5,579
Percent of units.....	100	100	100	100	100
\$1 to \$499.....	5	3	6	3	7
\$500 to \$749.....	21	8	29	22	32
\$750 to \$999.....	18	10	22	17	24
\$1,000 to \$1,249.....	20	11	25	22	26
\$1,250 to \$1,499.....	13	14	13	26	9
\$1,500 to \$1,749.....	8	12	4	10	2
\$1,750 to \$1,999.....	5	12			
\$2,000 to \$2,249.....	7	17	(?)	(?)	
\$2,250 to \$2,449.....	3	9			
\$2,500 or more.....	1	3			
Median OASDHI income.....	\$1,091	\$1,557	\$906	\$1,080	\$859

¹ Excludes beneficiaries who received their 1st benefit in February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age 72".

² 0.5 percent or less.

programs—like private pensions—are viewed as supplementary to the OASDHI program.⁵

Other public pension programs—the Federal Government civilian systems and those State and local plans not covered by OASDHI, for example—are intended to provide comprehensive retirement protection outside the OASDHI system. Nevertheless, persons covered under these programs frequently obtain OASDHI coverage through other jobs and receive two public pensions when they retire. Railroad workers have their own special program—separate from OASDHI. It is possible, however, to qualify for benefits under both programs.

As a result, about 55 percent of the couples receiving railroad retirement benefits and 15 percent of those receiving governmental retirement benefits are not receiving OASDHI benefits. Among nonmarried persons, the proportion of persons with railroad retirement or government pensions and no OASDHI were higher—65 percent and 30 percent, respectively.

Since retirement programs are the single most important permanent source of income and provide the basic support for the majority of the aged population, investigation of levels of pension benefits is important in evaluating their respective roles in income

⁴ The estimates of private-plan pensioners from the 1968 Survey differ from the Social Security Administration annual estimates, chiefly because the Survey relates to the population aged 65 and over and the other estimates include persons under age 65. In addition, the Survey estimates are in terms of aged units and the global estimates are a count of individuals.

⁵ See Joseph Krislov, *State and Local Government Systems . . . 1965* (Research Report No. 15), Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics, 1966.

The different levels of social security benefits and other pensions reflect the widely differing characteristics of the programs. Until the 1968 Survey information became available, there was little disaggregated data on the relative levels of private and public retirement benefits.

NEW SINGING GROUP IS "SOMETHING SPECIAL"

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the 23d Congressional District of California it is my pleasure to call attention to the accomplishments of two of my constituents, members of the younger generation who are making their mark in the musical world with a sound that is "something special," and with unique freshness and talent. The brother and sister singing team, Richard and Karen, of the Carpenters make their home with their parents, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Carpenter, in Downey, Calif. Although a busy schedule of bookings and an impressive list of show business honors attest to their success, they found time just recently to return to Long Beach State College, where both had studied, to perform in a free concert to raise money for the music department of the school. It was a

boost to the music department, and to the students as well.

It is a personal privilege to direct attention to the achievements of young people like these, who are, I believe, more representative of the average young American than the disorderly, disruptive few who have been cornering the headlines in recent years.

CREDIBILITY IS LACKING IN NIXON BUDGET

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the 1972 budget proposal that President Nixon presented to the Congress last week is seriously lacking in credibility. In it, the President dubiously promises "a new balance of responsibility and power in America" and a move toward a "full employment budget."

While the stated goals of the budget message certainly sound noble, one wonders about the questionable premises on which they are based. To achieve what President Nixon proposes to do, the 1971 economy would have to respond from its present depressed state to experience a phenomenal record growth, enough to raise the gross national product by \$88 billion to \$1.065 trillion. When the President's previous record of forecasting the national economy is considered, the simple practicality of such a budget proposal is in serious doubt. For instance, after he and his economic advisers predicted progress for the economy last year, there was no real growth at all in the gross national product, corporate profits dropped \$7 billion below the President's estimate, unemployment rose above forecasts, and the predicted surplus of \$1.3 billion for fiscal year 1971 turned into an \$18.6 billion deficit.

The President's consistent refusal to actively restrain wage and price increases makes unlikely his promise for firm control of inflation. Unless the President takes strong steps now to put the lid on wages and prices, "the greatest economic test of the postwar era" may well lead to an even bigger budget deficit than the tremendous one that the administration is already planning. It will also mean that the new budget will surely give rise to a new round of inflation that will make last year's pale by comparison.

This week, the respected business and financial editor of the Washington Post, Hobart Rowen, commented on the considerable lack of credibility in the President's budget.

I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues:

CREDIBILITY IS LACKING IN NIXON BUDGET
(By Hobart Rowen)

To be blunt about it, almost nobody believes President Nixon's budget except the high officials who put it together—and it's probable that even some of them have their doubts.

The skepticism is keyed to two observations:

(1.) Mr. Nixon's forecasting record turns out to be very bad. Neither he nor his economic advisers foresaw the extent of 1970's economic downturn. Thus, corporate profits skidded (\$7 billion below the President's year-ago estimate), unemployment jumped, spending had to be jacked up—and his promised \$1.3 billion surplus for fiscal 1971 turned into an \$18.6-billion deficit.

(2.) Even more important, an extraordinary jump in economic activity—12 per cent from the end of 1970 to the end of 1971—is the basic underpinning for the fiscal 1972 budget. Inside and outside of the government, this is labeled a pipe-dream perhaps impossible to achieve.

Why would Mr. Nixon have estimated boom-style growth in the 1971 economy, enough to raise the Gross National Product by \$88 billion to \$1.065 trillion?

Those who look sourly on the budget suggest that this was the only way in which Mr. Nixon could forecast a substantial declining trend in his budget deficits.

As compared with that massive \$18.6-billion glob of red ink, the fiscal 1972 deficit is put at "only" \$11.6 billion.

Moreover, the election results appeared to convince Mr. Nixon that unemployment for the next two years deserved to be ranked as the nation's No. 1 problem. Revenue-sharing, viewed as a quick shot in the arm, became the dominant theme of the budget, with the annual rate of spending (starting Oct. 1) stepped up from the earlier goal of \$2.5 billion to \$5 billion.

More ardently than before, in other words, Mr. Nixon set his sights on getting back to a full employment "zone" of 4.0 to 4.5 per cent. This meant pulling out all the stops.

The question, as some observers put it, is "whether we can get from here to there."

In briefing reporters on the budget, White House aide George Shultz and Treasury Secretary Charles E. Walker stubbornly refused to estimate the impact on the deficit if the economy should in fact run closer to the "consensus" forecast of \$1.045 to \$1.050 trillion for GNP this calendar year.

Outsiders, not so reticent to do the necessary arithmetic, calculate that the deficit in such a situation would increase some \$7 or \$8 billion for fiscal 1972, to the vicinity of \$18 or \$19 billion.

What mystifies analysts outside of government circles is why the administration had to go "so far out." By running the calendar 1971 total to \$1.065 trillion, up 9 per cent for the 1970 figure, administration economists are saying that they believe the economy will be running at a rate by the end of 1971 a full \$35 billion over most of the estimates in the business and banking world.

A comparison of the administration's economic assumptions (and the deficit projected) with the typical forecasts outside the administration shows the following:

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1971

[In billions of dollars]

Description	Official budget estimate	Outside "Consensus" estimate
Gross national product.....	1,065	1,045-50
Personal income.....	868	855
Corporate profits before taxes.....	98	90
Deficit (for fiscal 1972).....	11.6	18-19

Official spokesmen for the administration point out that outside economists have no monopoly on wisdom, and argue that the "model-building exercise" producing forecasts by conventional methods tends to underestimate the real strength of the economy. They insist, also, that if there is a proper "mix" of fiscal and monetary policies, the gov-

ernment will be giving more of an expansionary thrust to the economy than outside critics are willing to believe.

It is, of course, almost a ritual for any administration to paint a rosy picture, and say that everything is going to be all right, especially after a difficult and disappointing year like 1970.

It may be recalled that an enthusiastic Kennedy Administration in January, 1962, also predicted a 9 per cent rise in GNP (which at that time amounted to only \$50 billion, not \$88 billion) and had to settle, when all the returns were in, for a 7 per cent gain when business investment failed to perk along as expected.

One hopes that Mr. Nixon's optimism will turn out, in fact, to be contagious. But the curious thing in today's picture is that no one, in explaining the budget, has been able to point to the expansionary forces that would provide the extra \$15 to \$20 billion in GNP over the consensus forecast. Perhaps the forthcoming report of the Council of Economic Advisers will be more explicit. High officials so far have been falling back on the "mystery" of the American economy, an innate ability to outperform the crystal-ball gazers.

Maybe so. Maybe one can rely on Mr. Nixon's assurance that the new budget, with its "full employment concept," is really a self-fulfilling prophecy. In any event, one way to check up on who turns out to be more nearly right—Mr. Nixon or the critics—is to cut out the little "Economic Assumptions" table above and, like a Brooklyn Dodger fan, wait until next year.

SENIOR CITIZENS NEED RELIEF

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the plight of our senior citizens living on fixed incomes in America demands that social security reform legislation be given top priority consideration by the 92d Congress.

The measure now being considered by the House Ways and Means Committee falls far short of what is required if we are to meet our obligations to the elderly.

Therefore, in a letter to Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS, I have outlined some of the strengthening provisions of my own bill, H.R. 1734. I believe many of my colleagues will find this letter of interest:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 3, 1971.
Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MILLS: The 91st Congress' failure to complete action on the Social Security Amendments of 1970 was a grave disappointment to millions of senior citizens throughout America. As a result of this inaction, our elderly have been forced to do without many necessities of life.

My own Eighth Congressional District of Florida embraces a large percentage of senior citizens. Therefore, I am acutely aware of the urgent need for Social Security reform legislation as a top-priority issue for the 92nd Congress.

During 10 years as Florida State Senator, I pushed for many measures benefiting senior citizens. I intend to continue this interest at the Federal level.

Your Committee has now begun consideration in Executive Session of H.R. 1, the Social Security and Family Assistance Amendment of 1971. This proposal, I feel, falls far short of what is required.

First, the Committee bill proposes to increase the outside earnings limitation from \$1,680 to \$2,000. My bill, H.R. 1734, would increase the limitation to \$2,400—a figure far more in line with the inflationary trend which has hit hardest at those living on fixed incomes. Therefore, I strongly urge the Committee to increase the limitation to at least \$2,400 a year.

Second, my bill would continue full benefits to seniors who marry or remarry after age 55. This provision is not in the Committee bill. Without it, may elderly cannot marry since to do so the wife must give up a portion of her meager Social Security benefits.

Last, the Committee bill does not provide for cost-of-living increases in benefits. This provision is essential. The cost-of-living has skyrocketed while Social Security benefits have remained essentially the same.

Our seniors are entitled to the security of knowing that when living costs go up, so do their benefits. Why must they wait in anguish while each Congress debates whether or not they are entitled to a new increase—an increase that seldom, if ever, comes close to off-setting the effects of an inflationary economy?

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful your Committee will give serious consideration to my recommendations to improve pending Social Security reform legislation. We must enact a strong and effective bill to provide our senior citizens with needed relief. They are entitled to no less.

With best wishes and personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,
C. W. BILL YOUNG,
Member of Congress.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's plans for full employment are simply not feasible under our present international trade policy.

Any hope for full employment falls flat when you survey the job opportunities being sacrificed in the wave of the antiquated free-trade theory that is slowly making this Nation dependent.

Take the recent action of the steel importers, who raised their prices in accord with those of U.S. steelmakers to maintain, not only their 10 to 20 percent competitive price advantage, but also their obsolete and exorbitant price advantage.

Foreign goods are priced at profiteering amounts based upon what our market will bear, rather than upon their costs of production. In every line of foreign production sold in the U.S. market, the sales and marketing programs of the foreign—especially the Japanese—importers are as much a declaration of war on American jobs and industry, as a military attack itself.

When the Nixon administration embarked on its economic course to lull the economy, I warned that it was a plan

doomed to failure. Inflation historically comes from too much money and not enough produce.

In this inflationary situation we find high wages, and a low domestic supply of shelf goods; but the shelves are loaded down with foreign products from workers who do not purchase in our marketplace, pay no taxes, utilize none of our services, but who take jobs from U.S. workers.

In the near future, my committee will report bills dealing with minimum wages and maximum hours, welfare and pension plan requirements, and a report on the actual impact of imports on American employment. We demand a minimum standard of working conditions for U.S. workers and bar the shipment of American-made goods across State lines that are not produced under our statutory labor standards, but we allow products from all over the world to pour over our borders when they have been produced at wages ranging from one-third to one-twentieth of our mandated minimum wage.

We now propose to pay family maintenance for a family of four or more, hundreds, and in some cases, thousands of dollars more than a full-time worker can earn under the minimum wage law.

Congress is faced with a dilemma that cannot be wished away. The higher we mandate minimum wages, and the more we increase taxes to compensate trade-displaced workers, the more foreign workers will invade our Nation by way of low-waged products.

Mr. Speaker, I estimate the cost to the U.S. job economy at a minimum of 1.5 million full-time jobs and an uncountable number of part-time jobs and the minimum annual cost to taxpayers at over \$6 billion. Simply put, when a foreign product takes a percentage of the U.S. market in any product line, the U.S. labor required to produce that percentage, unless equalized by foreign exports of like volume, means so many American jobs lost.

A case in point is glass. One plant in my district alone wiped out by the trade war left 650 unemployed with more being added and being paid trade relief out of our taxes, while shops are overflowing with foreign glass.

Another serious situation is developing in the specialty steel industry, with most of our producers being forced to reduce employment and, in many cases, seek foreign contracts to produce for their U.S. market. There is, of course, always the other alternative—go out of business. We may survive for a while on foreign products in some lines of production, but never in the field of specialty and tool steel. One of our first lines of defense is the tool steel industry.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot progress during peacetime, and we will not survive in wartime, at our present production level in this and other strategic industries. We must admit before it is too late, that we are at war, and the soldiers are our workers who are being disarmed by unemployment. They are unable to fight back and are the real prisoners or war-

THE MYSTERIOUS INVASION OF LAOS—AN IMPEDIMENT TO WITHDRAWAL

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the events surrounding the war in Indochina have recently escalated to the point of outrage. I am appalled by the conduct of the administration concerning the alleged invasion into Laos. I say "alleged" because our Government refuses to comment on whether or not there has been such an invasion, despite the fact that the reports of allied activity in that country have already appeared in the Japanese and Soviet press. Thus, we are in the anomalous position of relying upon Soviet speeches and Japanese reporters for information about the activities of our own Government.

It may occasionally be necessary for the Government to request the press to refrain from reporting items that would jeopardize the safety of our troops, for example, when premature release of information would preclude the possibility of surprising the enemy. However, since reports have appeared in other countries, I fail to see how the element of surprise or the safety of our troops could be jeopardized if our news media were to comment on a previously reported action which has already taken place or which is at least in the process of occurring.

The freedom of our press is one of our most sacred freedoms—a freedom which is one of our strongest bulwarks against dictatorial government. The power of the Government to intimidate the press, through express or implied threats of revocation of accreditation in Vietnam, must not be used in a cavalier fashion. The Government is apparently still using this threat in Vietnam to prevent reporters there from informing the American public about the developing activity in Laos. Moreover, within the United States, Government officials, such as Secretary of Defense Laird, are refusing to comment on the situation. This conduct not only threatens to open the very credibility gap which Mr. Laird pledged to avoid and thus contributes to a loss of confidence in the Government, but also represents a threat to our most basic liberties.

Beyond the question of the Government's treatment of the news media in this situation is the question of the advisability of an invasion into Laos, assuming it has occurred, is occurring, or is contemplated.

Presumably, such an attack would be justified as necessary to interdict North Vietnamese supply lines so that a North Vietnamese buildup would not threaten the further withdrawal of American troops. This justification reminds me of the justification for the incursion last year into Cambodia; presumably, it could be used to justify an incursion into North Vietnam, China, the Soviet Union, Thailand, and, in fact, virtually any other

country in the world. Just as the President's budget announces that—

In 1972, we will increase our spending for defense to carry out the Nation's strategy for peace.

So we will no doubt be told again that—

It is necessary to widen and intensify the war in Indochina in order to end it.

Mr. Speaker, this policy is folly. It is evident that the Chief Executive and those advisers who enjoy the confidence of the President are again seeking that great Communist headquarters in the sky. They are still seeking a means whereby we can have our cake and eat it too—a means whereby we can perpetuate a free government in Saigon and still withdraw our troops. Since even a successful incursion into Laos would only force the North Vietnamese to move their supply lines further west, I say that this policy will not work.

The obvious goal of the administration is to establish a free government in Saigon which will endure in our absence. There are several means available to the administration to accomplish this goal, including an attempt to so strengthen the Saigon regime that it would be able to survive any North Vietnamese attack. Another method would be to so weaken the North Vietnamese that they would be unable to mount an attack.

Obviously, the incursion into Laos is an attempt to pursue the latter course of action. But any attempt to do this involves a further widening of the war, first into Cambodia, then into Laos. The inevitable result of this policy, assuming the administration intends to abide by the congressional prohibition against sending American troops into Cambodia and Laos, will be to spread South Vietnamese troops so thin that the ability of the South Vietnamese to defend themselves will be gravely impaired. Thus, the result of the current apparent policy will be to force us to either retain our troops in South Vietnam indefinitely—while the South Vietnamese pursue the North Vietnamese all over Indochina—or to abandon our "goal" of leaving a strong free government in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the correct course of action is clear. The American people want the U.S. Government to withdraw as soon as possible. The middle of 1971 is hardly soon enough; certainly the end of 1971 is the outside limit. What we should do between now and then is to devote our resources to training South Vietnamese troops to defend themselves instead of engaging in wild goose chases all over Southeast Asia. If, after this training, if after \$104 billion and 44,000 American lives, the Saigon Government is not able to defend itself by that time, so be it.

Mr. Speaker, time and time again, the American people have said to our government "end the war." While the administration has succeeded in dampening the most vocal and public expressions of this desire, this does not mean that the wish for complete disengagement by the end of this year is not there; indeed, according to the latest

Gallup poll it is stronger than ever—increasing from 55 percent in September to 73 percent by mid-January—it is being frustrated by the failure of the Government to heed it. The frustration is there, perhaps more silent but no less intense, eating at the fabric of our society, destroying its cohesion. When will our leaders learn? When will they ever learn?

LEONARD RATNER HONORED ON HIS 75TH BIRTHDAY FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE GREATER CLEVELAND COMMUNITY

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure to recognize officially the tribute being paid to one of the most distinguished citizens of our community and the Nation, Mr. Leonard Ratner. Mr. Ratner will soon celebrate his 75th birthday anniversary. The entire Greater Cleveland community will honor Mr. Ratner for his untiring and exemplary commitment to our community and its people and to his beloved State of Israel and the Jewish community.

It is indeed difficult to recount the number of instances when Leonard has quietly and effectively moved to assist the downtrodden and to spur achievement among those in our community and abroad who have themselves lacked the resources necessary to allow such accomplishments otherwise.

Leonard has always lived modestly. Yet, without doubt, he and his family probably conduct the most extensive program of philanthropy in our fortunate city.

Mr. Ratner has never sought the limelight sometimes associated with benefaction. He has continually shied away from special honor and tribute even though he is the person so well deserving of the highest praise. Yet it is Leonard who is so unstinting in his support of vital community service efforts. It is always Leonard upon whom others in our community depend for guidance and leadership in the extensive support of the State of Israel and in Jewish educational and cultural activities in our Great Cleveland Jewish community.

No greater tribute can be paid to any person than will be paid to Leonard Ratner on February 10 when we in the Cleveland community will join with Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE in a great celebration at the Hotel Sheraton-Cleveland planned by the Cleveland Jewish Community Federation. The many coveted awards already bestowed upon this fine human being are second only to his devotion to his incredibly talented family and the untold thousands of Americans, Israelis, and refugees who have benefited from Leonard's kindness and commitment. To the Max and Albert Ratners, Millers, Shafrans, Zehmans, and to Dora Sukenik, I extend my heartiest

congratulations on this splendid occasion and to Leonard my best wishes for continued good health and much "Nachas" for all of your good deeds, your untold "Mitzvot."

POW'S—HUMANE TREATMENT AND EARLY RELEASE

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a resolution regarding the humane treatment and early release of American POW's in North Vietnam.

This resolution is similar to one which I sponsored in the last Congress, a resolution that received the overwhelming support of the House membership. In my view, however, it is not enough for the last Congress to have taken a position on this issue; this Congress must do likewise.

The essence of the resolution I am sponsoring today calls upon North Vietnam to comply with the terms of the Geneva Convention which it signed in 1957. In observance of their international agreement, the North Vietnamese and their puppet arm, the National Liberation Front, should have already promptly: First, identified all their prisoners; second, permitted impartial inspection of their POW camps; third, released seriously injured or sick prisoners; and, fourth, permitted the free exchange of mail between prisoners and their families.

As we are all painfully aware, however, North Vietnam has reneged on its international commitments and has refused to comply with even basic demands of humanity and decency. As a consequence, American prisoners are undernourished. They are denied access to adequate medical care, kept in solitary confinement for long periods of time, prohibited from communicating with their families and loved ones, and often used as guinea pigs for trumped-up propaganda charges. As if these inhumane practices are not enough to shock the conscience and arouse the ire of all but the unfeeling, American prisoners who have escaped or been released by the Communists have told grisly stories of torture, brainwashing and even murder being committed by their captors.

To stop these reprehensible practices from being continued is a top priority goal. Congress can do its part by voicing a clear, strong, and unified position on this issue.

The resolution I am sponsoring today will comprise part of the total effort; the resolution establishing a "National Week of Concern for American Prisoners of War/Missing In Action" sponsored on the opening day of this Congress will comprise still another.

I urge my colleagues to promptly approve both these proposals. As elected representatives of the American people, it is our duty to take the lead in focusing

public and official opinion on this vital issue. Fellow Americans are rotting in Asian prisons; we must do our utmost to get them out.

HANFORD REACTOR SHUTDOWN PROTEST GROWS

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I placed in the RECORD a statement calling for the President to withdraw his order for the immediate shutdown of "N" reactor at Hanford. I also pointed out some of the problems that will be created if the President's order is carried out and the two reactors are indeed, deactivated. Since that time a massive letter-writing campaign has developed, with thousands of letters from individual citizens, from organizations, from local governmental agencies and large and small industrial corporations writing to the President requesting that he reverse his decision with respect to closing down one or both of these reactors.

President George Meany of the AFL-CIO wrote as follows:

The AFL-CIO is shocked by your precipitate decision to deactivate the two Hanford Plutonium Reactors. The immediate effect will be a major economic blow to a region already hard hit by unemployment. The direct and collateral unemployment resulting from this decision will total 7,500, an annual payroll loss of \$95 million.

I therefore urge you most strongly to cancel your deactivation order and stop all activities now underway. If the United States has adopted a policy of no longer producing plutonium, it must provide for an orderly transition period to cushion its effect on jobs and the economy.

Mr. A. Lars Nelson, master of the Washington State Grange, stated, in part:

The President's incredible action in terminating Hanford at this time is incomprehensible in view of the national fuel shortage which very nearly reached crisis proportions this winter and which did cause California utilities to cut off the sale of surplus power to the Pacific Northwest early last fall because of oil shortages.

We in the Pacific Northwest have spent years fighting for and developing the hydroelectric generation of power, and through years of patient negotiation have built up the Bonneville grid system and nuclear plant scheduling to provide for the orderly melding in of thermo-nuclear power to give us a stable, clear, coherent, long-range energy policy. What will happen to it under the President's directive could be disastrous.

Today more than 10,000 letters will be mailed from the tricity area of Washington directly to the President appealing to him to reverse his decision.

Everywhere I turn Members of Congress and experts in the field of electric power production, nuclear energy, and industrial development are stunned by the President's action, referring to it as unbelievable and totally inconsistent with our Nation's need for electric power.

Several interesting facts have come to light which describe the incredible nature of the decision to deactivate "N" reactor and deprive the West of 800,000 kilowatts of electric power. I cite only two of these: First, it has been authoritatively estimated that the Bonneville Power Administration will be required to pay \$20 million each year to replace the electricity lost by the deactivation of "N" reactor; and, second, it would require the burning of 8 million barrels of oil each year to replace the electric power lost if "N" reactor is deactivated.

Mr. Speaker, this is a truly unbelievable course that the President is following. I again call upon him to withdraw his order for the immediate shutdown and deactivation of "N" reactor.

FOUR MILE RUN

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, despite misreading of the budget and resultant cries of alarm in my congressional district, I have been assured by the White House and the Bureau of Management that \$170,000 for the Four Mile Run flood control project, so long delayed in Arlandria, Va., is in the President's budget and will be made available to the Corps of Engineers on July 1.

The misunderstanding is understandable, and is due to the fact that some budget watchers do not know that once Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for a project and the executive branch has, for whatever reason, delayed spending the funds, all preconstruction money carried over from one fiscal year to the next is lumped together and shown as a credit or cash on hand item rather than as a line item in the budget.

But we are wasting our time emoting about \$170,000. I have been virtually assured by the administration that the Four Mile Run project will proceed as of July 1. The problem now, and it should be of far more concern to those who want to see this project completed, is that in order to complete this preconstruction planning project and get a flood control project underway, the Corps of Engineers will need a total of \$1,200,000 to be spent over the next 3 years, only \$170,000 of which has thus far been guaranteed them.

I intend to press once again for a minimum of \$400,000 additional money for fiscal year 1972, to be included in the next Corps of Engineers request to Congress, and to impress upon this administration the urgency which has thus far been overlooked.

It is high time we all recognized that human suffering such as the people of Arlandria, Va., have faced over the past 20 years, should be alleviated before we move on to more grand schemes to correct the ills of the world. It is impossible

for me to understand how we can spend, spend, spend for every conceivable do-gooder program and force these good people who have started over year after year, flood after flood, to wait for relief in the name of economy.

"JOB CORPS—NOW!"

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial recently appeared in the St. Louis Argus detailing the efforts to establish a Job Corps center—residential manpower training center—in St. Louis and the resistance which has built up against such a center. The article points up the fact that three sites have been selected and that local racism has led to the veto of two of the sites, with the third now awaiting approval. It is imperative that the Governor approve the site now, for if he does not the funds for such an important project will expire in the next few months.

For those of us who are familiar with the Job Corps program, we know that this is the last opportunity these disadvantaged youth will be given to advance themselves. The program offers vocational training necessary to give them a start in life. Take away this last chance and they will surely be dropouts for the rest of their lives.

However, some of the local residents would deny these youth their last glimmer of hope. And their objections are based on nothing more than a lack of knowledge and the use of scare tactics. This editorial states that—

With a sensible program of teaching and training with rules that are enforced in other locals where Job Corps is in operation, the police departments report that juvenile delinquency is 75 percent less for the students than for non-students in the area. How can St. Louisans refuse such an opportunity for their young.

I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues this most informative editorial:

"JOB CORPS—Now!"

For almost two years the Department of Labor in Washington, D.C. has been attempting to establish a training center in St. Louis but has been frustrated by local objections, most of which have been based upon lack of knowledge and purpose of the center. As a result, the young for whom it was designed will be deprived of a life-time opportunity for, if a decision is not reached within the next few months as to the site, the funds will expire. Common sense must prevail.

To begin with, we ought to describe "Job Corps" in the simplest language since there does appear to be confusion in the minds of the objectors. Basically, Job Corps is a federally funded program which does not cost the local or state government any additional taxes. Its purpose is to give vocational and office training to young men and women—primarily school drop-outs—an opportunity to learn a gainful and useful trade or ability so that they can acquire a meaningful job and purpose in life.

In this area the Job Corps is proposing to

give 250 young men good, clean, comfortable, living accommodations, proper meals and a proper diet, medical care, dentistry, training in a variety of work programs from the health field to office work, to mechanics, and, in addition, enough pocket money to take care of their daily necessities. They will be under the complete control of advisers who will reside with them giving them counseling and advice at all times. The same will be true of 100 young women with the exception that they will be provided with transportation to and from their homes. They will not reside on the premises. This is the simple formula of Job Corps. At the end of six months to one year's training they should be ready for a good job and be able to look at the world in a proper light. All students will be drawn from the five counties from around St. Louis and this differs totally from the former Job Corps concept at the old Missouri Baptist Hospital where girls from all over the country were accepted with all of the attendant problems that such students were involved.

In 1968, the Department of Labor sent in a team to investigate possible Job Corps sites—42 were examined and inspected. Most did not measure up to standards and were dropped but all were thoroughly investigated. Two buildings and sites owned by the Catholic Order exceeded the limitations of Job Corps and could not be accepted. A site was located, highly acceptable, meeting all the criteria, at Sportsmen's Inn at Bridgeton. Governor Hearnes approved the site and a contract was entered into by the owner and the Labor Department. A motel which was in operation and was closed and turned over to the Job Corps, and, at this point, white racism raised its ugly head—the Governor was pressured into vetoing the site. This action caused everyone concerned, most of all our young people, to suffer a serious loss. The program was unnecessarily delayed. Our Governor's answer was to find a location in St. Louis and he would approve. One was found at the newly constructed property at DeBallvere and Delmar. At this point an oral agreement was reached between the owner and the Labor Department with opening scheduled for February, 1971. Hope was once again held out to deprived young people of our community. Yet, again racism, this time black as well as white compelled the Governor to veto the site. Now, a third acceptable location has been found—The Fairgrounds Manor property. It is large enough, accessible for transportation, suitable for ample indoor as well as outdoor recreation, in the immediate area, and ready for occupancy to serve the deprived young people. But, again, objections are being heard by way of negative petitions being circulated in the area. Could this be black racism—is it possible that blacks would deprive their own from bettering themselves and their lives. This must not happen. St. Louis must have a Job Corps Center—now.

Since the objections are probably based on a lack of knowledge, let us clarify exactly what a Job Corps Center is, and we speak of the Job Corps as operated by the Labor Department rather than the Office of Economic Opportunity which was the director of the Old Job Corps.

1. All students will be local and drawn from St. Louis and St. Louis Counties.
2. All students will be thoroughly checked for temperament and abilities and desires. Trouble-makers will not be accepted.
3. All students will abide by specific rules and regulations—violations will lead to dismissal.
4. All students will be provided with trained and qualified counselors.
5. Only young men will be housed on the premises.
6. All girls will live at home and will be provided transportation to and from the school.

With a sensible program of teaching and training with rules that are enforced in other locales where Job Corps is in operation, the police department reports that juvenile delinquency is 75% less for the students than for non-students in the area. How can St. Louisans refuse such an opportunity for their young.

Our Civil Rights Act gives all of us freedom but freedom without hope is indeed sinful. The Civil Rights Act did not mean for one to sit on the steps without a job or without hope of a job. Our young people who will be helped are drop-outs. This in itself is a bad name to begin with. It casts a shadow on those who left school for a variety of reasons; some to help their families for economic reasons, some who could not master the academic work. For these, Job Corps is the great hope. It boiled down to a simple statement. Does St. Louis have a Job Corps or do we build more jails? The answer is up to those who are opposing—the decision is theirs.

In addition to the young people who will be helped, 120 jobs are being created in the area for those qualified to assist in this training. The present federal funding is in excess of 3 million dollars for the next 18 months and, if the center proves successful, it can be an on-going St. Louis institution well into the future. There is every reason for its success. The entire community should take great pride in the help it can give to our young deprived people by demanding the creation of a Job Corps in this area NOW—tomorrow may be too late.

DR. KONECCI HEADS INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, recognizing the complexity of many of the problems in all fields which face us today, many colleges have developed interdisciplinary courses—courses which take a single issue and approach it from all relevant disciplines of thought.

To teach such a course requires a team of qualified professors, or it takes one man who is well versed in many fields. Men capable of handling an interdisciplinary course by themselves obviously are rare creatures—and one of the best is Dr. Eugene B. Konecci of the University of Texas.

Dr. Konecci came to the University from the Executive Office of the President, the Space Council, in December 1966, and was named Kleberg professor in January 1967. He has just been reappointed to his 5th year in the Kleberg chair. I applaud that reappointment.

He holds a unique triprofessorship: professor of management in the College of Business Administration at the University of Texas at Austin, professor of aerospace engineering in the College of Engineering, and professor of Bioengineering at the San Antonio Medical School.

From this launching pad he has explored the widespread fields of identification and stimulation of new emerging industries; management of health care systems; marine sciences and related resources; environmental control, includ-

ing pollution and waste management; and, most important, food technology.

Working with graduate students, teaching regular courses, heading several experimental seminar courses, and spearheading several conferences, Dr. Konecci has in his 4 completed years as Kleberg professor filled four volumes with his activities and sent many young students out into the world with a better handle on the problems we face and what can be done about them.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Dr. Konecci and the other highly qualified men around our country, nationally renowned or unknown to us, who are spearheading these programs of untold benefit to their schools, their States, and their Nation.

IMPACT OF SPECIALTY STEEL IMPORTS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the addresses of Roger S. Ahlbrandt, president of Allegheny Ludlum Industries, Inc., and Joseph P. Molony, vice president of the United Steelworkers of America, before the union-management specialty steel imports conference in Washington, D.C., on Wednesday, February 3, 1971.

The impact of specialty steel imports is a serious threat to our U.S. steel industry, affecting both management and labor, and I call the attention of my colleagues to both of these excellent statements:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH P. MOLONY

On behalf of the United Steelworkers of America, I wish to express my very real pleasure that this important meeting of representatives of government, of management, and of labor has come to pass.

It is high time that we concentrate our thoughts on the problems that beset the specialty steel industry due to a rising surge of imports. This is not a problem affecting management and workers alone; it truly affects the general well-being and future security of the entire nation. What is more, we meet not only to discuss a critical problem but also to plan practical means by which we hope to alleviate it.

For all of the reasons so dramatically portrayed by Mr. Ahlbrandt, we must now see to it that a rule of reason is made to apply with respect to the importation of specialty steel.

Three years ago, by a continuous, hard and cooperative effort we secured an initial voluntary agreement to restrain the quantity of steel pouring across our borders. We have learned, however, that our victory in achieving a more orderly protection of the American market overall in terms of steel tonnages now must be refined. Reasonable limitations on steel imports on a product-by-product basis now must be secured.

IMPORTS AND JOBS

The rising torrent of specialty steel pouring into this country threatens the investment of stockholders and the jobs of managers and workers alike. Unless checked, these imports actually threaten the ability of many American communities to exist.

It is particularly noteworthy that the plants of most of the specialty steel companies represented here today by managers and union members who are seeking relief from a destructive deluge of imports are not located in large metropolitan areas. Most, in fact, operate in, and provide the major sources of employment in, smaller cities located in a score of states across the nation.

It is hardly an exaggeration to say, therefore, that if the specialty steel industry does not receive redress from imports the existence of a substantial number of these American communities will, in fact, be in jeopardy.

While the loss of a stockholder's investment as a consequence of unfair competition is gracious, the loss of a job to the worker is often tragic.

But worst of all is the job loss that may occur because of a plant closing in a one-industry town. In these circumstances the finding of alternate employment is impossible without leaving home, and often well nigh impossible for the older worker even if he does.

What is more, because of the higher labor intensive nature of the specialty steel industry in relation to basic steel, the job loss is particularly greater wherever production declines. Thus, the tragedy for labor arising from imports is further compounded.

COMPETITION AND LABOR EXPLOITATION

I wish to make it abundantly clear that the desirability of competition within the steel industry and all others is not in dispute as far as the United Steelworkers of America is concerned. Business competition—both between domestic firms and from abroad—is desirable indeed as long as it adheres to fair rules of the game.

But, for over 100 years the American labor movement has sought to elevate the character of competition between domestic business firms by seeking to eliminate labor exploitation as the basis of competition. In this effort we have had a substantial measure of success.

While within our own borders, capital and commodities move freely in the American market-place and buyers and sellers compete, the concept of free and fair competition properly has been modified by certain safeguards created in behalf of labor and other public purposes.

Years ago, Congressional passage of the Clayton and the National Labor Relations Acts established collective bargaining as both a legal and preferred American practice. With the aid of these sanctions, American unions have sought and have substantially achieved comparable wage agreements with competing employers, whether the competition is local, regional, or national in scope.

Furthermore, the wages and conditions of work at competing non-union establishments—where they still exist—often tend to approximate those achieved by collective bargaining.

At the same time, the effort to achieve fairer competition in the United States through collective bargaining has been supplemented by special legislative efforts tied to the same objective. Federal minimum wage standards, social insurance benefits and other social welfare measures, all tend to equalize the labor costs which all American employers must bear.

As a consequence, thus, of our effort to obtain standards of decency for Americans who work for wages and salaries, business competition among American producers is based less and less upon the exploitation of labor. Instead, increasingly it is based on management's superior ability to improve technology, develop better managerial skills and produce a more saleable product for the American market-place.

It is precisely because of this more enlightened concept of fair competition that American workers have achieved the highest standards any workers have ever known.

Now, let it be clearly understood that the United Steelworkers of America seeks no shut-off of trade with other nations. Quite the contrary, we wish to maximize the genuine benefits of foreign trade. But this requires trade policies that will not unfairly penalize American business enterprises and those who work for them.

FREE TRADE—A DOGMATIC APPROACH

Unfortunately, there still are some Americans who view any imports—no matter of what kind and regardless of the unfortunate consequences for some of their neighbors and the nation—as, somehow, inevitably desirable. The mere fact that imports can be sold in the American market-place at a cheaper price is viewed to prove the righteousness of something the textbooks call "The Doctrine of Comparative Advantage."

This doctrine, I am told, argues that since all nations are endowed with special gifts of nature and special skills, trade between nations is simply a happy and enlightened process of sharing each other's "comparative advantages."

Now, it is true that some countries are endowed by nature with an extraordinary ability to provide coffee, cocoa, and pineapples and certain minerals which we badly need and want to share. What is more, some nations have that special skill—like the Scotch for the making of whiskey, for example, and we want to share their comparative advantages in this matter, too.

I submit, however, that when it comes to manufactured imports from overseas the major comparative advantage enjoyed by foreign firms, including those producing steel products—is the advantage of cheap labor, various forms of government subsidies, and a sparsity of consumer and environmental protective requirements.

Until recently, it was optimistically assumed that most of our imports would continue to be the essentially non-competitive foodstuffs, crude materials, or other products our economy needs. On the other hand, it was assumed that America's superiority in technology would more than compensate for our higher labor standards and, thereby, our competitive cost advantage in manufactured products would be maintained.

The facts of life, however, were not in accord with those hopeful expectations. During the course of the 1960's it became evident that our formerly war-shattered trade competitors—particularly, but not exclusively, Germany and Japan, had made a startling industrial recovery. In fact, in one industry after another technological advances overseas have canceled out the advantages which we once enjoyed.

In addition, while other nations were not only taking monumental strides forward in industrial proficiency, their governments also were pursuing trade policies restricting imports while subsidizing exports—carefully designed to protect their own vital national interests. At the same time that the overseas industries were driving down their cost of production through technology and government subsidies, our own industry was being required to meet ever higher standards of product safety, environmental protection, and occupational safety. The recently passed amendments to the Clean Air Act and the Williams-Danaher Occupational Health and Safety Act will place added burdens upon the steel industry. These are burdens we all want to bear because we are concerned about the quality of life in our communities and in our plants. But, surely we must recognize the disadvantages that these domestic requirements place upon American producers who compete with foreign producers who are subject to no such stringent obligations. Indeed, how absurd is a recent advertisement which I saw in which the importer proclaimed: "Fight Air Pollution: Import Steel."

Notwithstanding, in this country the view still widely persists that the freer our mar-

kets are to foreign traders, somehow the fairer will be the trade and the better off we all will be. Yes, these well meaning people concede that occasionally plants may be forced to close as a consequence of foreign imports and workers will be forced to seek new livelihoods. In these cases, trade adjustment assistance will provide adequate aid—they cheerfully proclaim.

While some aid in these tragic circumstances is certainly better than none, we insist that it should not and must not be the trade policy of the United States to ignore the liquidation of American jobs. American workers, already suffering the considerable burden of adjusting to domestic technological change and to a hopefully diminishing domestic defense establishment, cannot lightly contemplate a further compounding of their problems because of displacement due to a high level of imports.

As I mentioned, an imported ton of specialty steel which displaces a domestic ton of specialty steel disemploys six to eight times more steelworkers than a comparable ton of imported carbon or basic steel. It is a little wonder then that we are gravely concerned over the import situation which is evolving. The market penetrations frighten us. The penetrations from 1966 to 1970 have increased—

In total stainless from 13.4% to 21.2%;

In tool steel from 12.8% to 16.9%;

In stainless cold rolled sheets from 20.1% to 34.4%;

In stainless wire rod from 42% to 67.1%;

In stainless wire from 21.6% to 53%;

In stainless bars from 3.4% to 14.6%.

That certainly doesn't sound like the Litany of the Saints. It should be readily apparent, therefore, that the specialty steel industry and its workers need—and are entitled to—the aid of their government in the protection of their legitimate interests.

OBJECTIVES

We intend to pursue that objective in a number of ways, and we hope your presence in Washington, the fact that this meeting is being held, and your conversations later today with Congressmen will further our cause. And a cause, indeed, it is because we are convinced that our employment opportunities are being jeopardized by an unrealistic adherence to the dogma of freer trade. We seek, therefore, the following:

1. A firm adherence to the allowable limits under the voluntary agreements. This is the last year of the 3-year agreement and there is no reason that, despite the violations of the last two years, it cannot be vigorously implemented in its third year. We exhort the State Department, through whom the letters of intent were transmitted, to exercise their extensive persuasive powers in conveying to the participating European and Japanese companies the necessity for good-faith adherence to the voluntary restrictions. As the year progresses, there should certainly be protestations from the Commerce Department, who is monitoring the agreements, if the quarterly levels of imports are not consistent with the annual objectives.

Now let me be precisely clear as to what I mean by adequate implementation—or enforcement, if you like. When the voluntary agreements were entered into by the participating companies, they agreed to roll back the 1969 tonnage by approximately 22% from the 1968 levels. In other words, from 18 million tons to 14 million tons. And this would be done by taking into consideration the then existing product mix. The language of the Japanese agreement stipulates: "During this period the Japanese steel companies will try not to change greatly the production mix and pattern of distribution of trade as compared with the present." The agreements further mandated that imports would not increase more than 5% over the rolled-back levels.

In specialty steel these requirements were violated. The roll-back never did occur, although the overall roll-back in total tonnage to 14 million tons in 1969 was approximately achieved. But the overall tonnage limitation provided no relief to specialty steel. I consider this to be a basic breach of understanding.

Furthermore, the 5% improvement factor has also been violated in a number of categories in addition to the lack of the roll-back.

Certainly, these discrepancies must be corrected in the final year of the agreement. In other words, we would anticipate that the roll-backs be applied to this year's imports and we so urge the government officials to measure specialty steel imports accordingly.

It is the nature of this special problem of product mix in the current agreement's implementation which must be explained on Capitol Hill.

2. We are also seeking an extension of the voluntary agreement for another two years. The original bills which we supported in Congress called for a 5-year orderly trade balance. We are not opposed to voluntary trade arrangements. However, just as the contents of any collective bargaining agreement must be improved and refined so we are asking for changes in the voluntary steel quota agreements. We would alert those who are participants in formulating any new arrangements that specific language be devised to balance imports in a categorical fashion so that no new misunderstanding arises with regard to the product mix.

We are also disturbed by the 5% improvement factor and seek a more realistic multiplier in relation to the growth of the domestic market.

While it is not the primary concern of this conference, I should mention that the increased imports on the West Coast should also be corrected, especially since the signees agreed not to disarrange the geographic pattern of entry.

3. The intensity of our legislative activity will be conditioned upon the progress towards obtaining an extension of the voluntary agreements. Voluntary quotas or legislative quotas will bring about the same balanced or orderly trade relationship. We do support, however, legislative quotas. A bill incorporating the formula of the voluntary agreements is being drawn up. We will be required to accelerate our legislative activity for its passage in direct proportion to the inability to develop a voluntary arrangement. We will, nevertheless, not restrain our legislative solicitation since the Congress does provide impetus to executive action and especially since both the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee declared:

"Accordingly, it is the sentiment of the Committee that the administration should endeavor to have these voluntary undertakings extended and improved. . . . It is the Committee's view that specialty steels should be included within the terms of these voluntary agreements."

Although these comments may be readily apparent to all of you, unfortunately, my friends, they are not yet evident to a sufficient number of the members of the Administration and the Congress, to the mass media, and to the public generally.

Therefore, while you are here in Washington, it is of tremendous importance that you meet personally with your representatives in both houses of Congress and with representatives of the Administration and convey to them the urgency of the problems we have been discussing here.

Upon your return home, I hope you will continue to communicate with these officials. In addition, it is vital that you seek the support of your whole community with respect to the impending crisis which well may en-

sue. And to assist you in this work, we hope to provide you with additional factual material from time to time.

Finally, I believe that it is essential that the representatives of the specialty steel industry—its management and union—maintain a close working relationship until this challenge to our survival has been met. I am confident that with hard work we can and we will succeed.

STATEMENT OF ROGER S. AHLBRANDT

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

It is a privilege to be here; and I want to thank the United Steelworkers of America and the American Iron and Steel Institute for the opportunity.

I want also to express my appreciation for their attendance to representatives from the Administration and Congress and to the men and women from the news media.

We from union and management are here today because we share a grave concern about an economic problem that affects the national security and the jobs of many thousands in an important segment of the steel industry in America; and which reflects government policy, past and present, in the area of fair international trade. Further, this exploration of the import problem as it affects the specialty steel industry in our country may serve as a catalytic agent to spotlight this situation in steel, specifically, and in American industry, generally.

The impact of imports on the specialty steel industry is, by any standard, the most serious and immediate threat to producers of tool and stainless steels, low alloys specialty steels, and specialty tubular products.

This problem has worsened steadily for more than 10 years, with its consequent severe impact on the marketplace and the price of specialty steels; on volume—in an already depressed American market; on earnings for 1970—which universally have made poor reading in recent days; and, last but not at all least, on employment.

If significant relief is not immediately forthcoming, we will begin to see cutbacks in vital programs, more unemployment, and experience business failures in our industry. Such dislocation in a vital industry cannot conceivably be in the national interest.

The products that concern us in the specialty steel industry include stainless steels, tool steels, high temperature metals, and refractory, reactive, electrical, and electronic metals. I am also including in this category pressure and mechanical tubing of carbon, alloy and stainless steel. I will limit my comments to these specialty products for which domestic and international trade statistics are collected and published by the Department of Commerce and the American Iron and Steel Institute.

While our union friends, who work with these products daily, know them and their characteristics, I believe it appropriate here to state further that these specialty products are designed and produced for use in extreme environments requiring exceptional hardness, toughness, tensile strength, resistance to heat, resistance to corrosion and abrasion, or some combination of these qualities. They contain substantial amounts of expensive and critical alloys such as chromium, nickel, molybdenum, titanium, columbium, tungsten, vanadium, cobalt, and other elements which help provide their unique characteristics.

Because of their special properties and alloy content, specialty steels are difficult and costly to manufacture. In 1969, and we believe the figures would hold for 1970, the producers of tool and stainless steels in this country accounted for only 1.1% of net industry shipments of steel mill products. Their products, however, generated approximately 7% of total steel industry dollar volume. Domestic manufacturers of specialty

tubing in 1969 produced 1.6% of net industry shipments which, in turn, represented 4.5% of industry dollar volume.

Most specialty steel is melted in electric arc or vacuum melting furnaces, or rolled and shaped on special steel mill equipment which is designed and powered for processing of high alloys. Because of the sophisticated nature of our products, however, these processes take a higher degree of technology and considerably more time in our mills than in the mills making basic carbon steels. The number of man-hours required to produce a ton of specialty steels, on the average, totals about six to eight times that required for comparable products of carbon steel. Labor costs account for about 40% of every sales dollar in the specialty steel industry and, depending upon the specific product, labor cost will range from \$350 to \$4000 per ton of product. That is the basic reason why foreign manufacturers can and do consistently undersell American producers by 15% to 20%, not only in world markets, but right here in the United States.

Our competitive position in the world is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that imports have taken over 20% of the over-all U.S. market for specialty steels—with much greater percentage penetration in certain specific product lines—while we are unable to sell our products in volume abroad.

The plain fact is that steel technology and availability today is sufficiently world-wide that the basis for competition in all but a very few exotic steels is price—and price alone.

We have been told that there are several avenues for relief open to us in specialty steel and we would be pleased to see non-tariff barriers eliminated; to see anti-dumping, counter-vailing duty, and adjustment procedures streamlined and stepped up. In the area of critical raw materials supply, we are happy to cooperate with the President's National Industrial Materials Commission in its study and forecast of national requirements. There are many proposals here in Washington which would help us—if we would but live to see them!

But imports of foreign tool and stainless steel mill products now have taken over 20% and imported carbon and alloy pressure tubing has seized 15% of the American market. There is truly nothing in sight to prevent their continued and rapid growth.

To show how rapid this growth has been in the immediate past, I will now present some brief, specific figures concerning individual products and product lines. In the excellent publication of the American Iron and Steel Institute, "Steel Imports—a National Concern", which is available for each of you here today, there appear Tables 1S through 12S which document the rapid growth of specialty steel imports. I would like to refer today to supplementary charts which demonstrate the dangerous levels which specialty steel imports reached through November of 1970. Let me point out some of the more shocking of these figures:

Chart 1 shows that imports of stainless steels to the United States have increased every year, rising from 79,000 net tons in 1964 to approximately 182,000 net tons in 1969.

This compares with total U.S. shipments of stainless of 771,000 net tons in 1964 and 909,000 net tons in 1969. The year 1964 is used because it is the first in which adequate import statistics were available for specialty steel products. At the end of 11 months of 1970, stainless steel market penetration by imports is at an all-time high of 21.2%—one fifth of our market gone.

Throughout this period, imports of stainless steel mill products increased at an average annual rate of 18.1%, while the rate of growth for domestic shipments was only 3.4%. In those six years, domestic apparent consumption of stainless steel increased 276,

000 tons. Stainless steel imports captured 103,000 tons, or 37.2% of the growth in our domestic market.

As Jack Stewart of Cyclops pointed out in a recent presentation to news media, there is another most serious aspect of this problem not evident in the figures. This is the fact that a major part of our market served by foreign producers is in the prime, high-volume (at least to us), "bread and butter products". Without these products to help keep our mills rolling, Mr. Stewart pointed out that meaningful planning, research dollars, capital equipment dollars, and service dollars are hard to justify. I agree heartily with his statement that "the stainless steel industry cannot survive on small-volume stainless leftovers."

Chart 2 shows that tool steel imports rose dramatically from 9,080 net tons to roughly 15,250 net tons during the 1964-69 period. This average annual growth rate of 10.9% contrasts sharply with the growth rate in domestic tool steel shipments of 2.2% annually. Market penetration by imports also increased steadily, from 8.3% in 1964 to a high of 16.9% at the end of 11 months of 1970.

Domestic apparent consumption of tool steel increased from about 109,000 tons in 1964 to about 126,000 tons in 1969, an increase of 15.8%. Imports captured 6,000 tons, or over 35%, of this growth in the American market.

And here the casualties are real. John Newlin, of Carpenter Technology, told news media late last year that at least five companies had either discontinued tool steel production or had gone out of business altogether. Those affected were: the Henry Disston Company, Philadelphia; Vulcan Crucible Steel Company, Alliquippa; Midvale Steel Company, Philadelphia; Firth Sterling Steel Company, McKees Rocks, Pa; and Heller Brothers Company, Newark. He also said that most of the tool steel producers that have survived are either companies like his, Carpenter, which produce other profitable materials—or those which have become parts of multi-product companies in which the tool steel operation is not the major component. And while he did not blame imports alone for this attrition, he did state that imports were a significant factor in the changes that came about.

In many product lines, the situation is considerably worse than the over-all figures would indicate. The charts that follow (Charts 3 through 7) show that imports have penetrated our domestic markets to a drastic degree. For cold rolled sheets, the penetration is 34.1%.

For stainless steel wire rods, the import figure is 67.1%.

For stainless steel wire—53%.

For stainless bars it is 14.6% and stainless plates it is 15.8% and while these percentage figures are lower than those for rods and wire, they are in themselves substantial—and growing.

Now let us look at the import situation as it affects specialty steel tubing.

There are four of the family of specialty steel tubing which are being hurt badly now; a fifth is fast reaching the point of being hurt; and a sixth starts showing signs of injury—with portents of things to come.

1. Seamless stainless and heat resisting tubular products: total current domestic production is about 18 thousand tons per year; imports in 1970: about 6400 tons. This is over 35% of domestic production.

2. Seamless alloy pressure type tubular products: total current domestic production is about 55,000 tons per year; imports in 1970: about 12,000 tons, representing 22% of domestic production; and it has been increasing yearly.

3. Seamless carbon steel pressure tubing: domestic production is about 100,000 tons per year; until the tariff schedule was re-

vised beginning in 1971, there had been no way of measuring the imports of this product. Based on market intelligence, however, imports for boiler tubing alone reached 25 to 30%, and growing.

4. Welded carbon steel pressure tubing: total domestic production is about 100,000 tons per year. Again, here is a product for which imports could not be measured until 1971—but market intelligence indicates that in boiler tubing alone imports are 30 to 40% of domestic production, and growing.

Imports are taking some 16% of the domestic market for welded stainless steel tubular products; in seamless alloy steel bearing tubing, imports in 1970 were 16.5 thousand tons, versus a domestic production of 250 thousand tons—and growing very fast.

We are indebted for this information to Paul Carlson of Babcock and Wilcox, who also appeared before the recent news media presentation. The papers of Jack Stewart, John Newlin, and Paul Carlson on that occasion are available in this room at the end of this Conference.

It is difficult to show graphically the Country of Origin for each product, as Charts 8 and 9 indicate—but Japan is responsible for 57.6% of all stainless steel imports; and Sweden heads the list in tool steels, with 33.7% of the American market.

It cannot be over-stated that one-fifth of the specialty steel market in America has been lost to imports from manufacturers who can make steel abroad, ship it up to 10,000 miles, pay duty on it, and continually undercut American producers' prices by amounts up to 20%. And this differential is maintained whether prices in America are decreased or increased!

There is our problem.

It is immediate and it must be dealt with promptly, no matter what measures may ultimately be adopted to equalize conditions of fair trade.

We have not hesitated to tell about the difficulties we in the specialty steel industry have experienced with the Voluntary Limitation Arrangement assumed by the Japanese and West European steel producers in January 1969. Ironically, these limitations, designed to relieve import pressures on ALL American steel producers, have worked to the severe detriment of American specialty steel producers and the employees of those firms.

In specialty steel, the figures show that foreign specialty steel producers have not complied with the provisions of the Voluntary Limitation Arrangement but have actually sharply increased imports of stainless steel, tool steel, and other specialties. Instead of declining, as they should have done under the Voluntary Arrangement, imports of stainless steel in 1970 increased 32% and tool steel 81% above the Voluntary Limitation Arrangement levels. In stainless, imports from Japan in 1970 showed more than a 54% increase over the Voluntary levels and 24% over the comparable 11 months of 1969. In tool steel, Japan was 77% above the Voluntary arrangement in 1970, while the Common Market was 86% above and all others 81%.

The foregoing charts and data illustrate two flaws in the Voluntary Limitation Arrangement as it applies to specialty steels. First, some of the major foreign producers of specialty steel products are not participating in the Voluntary program. Last year, more than 50% of stainless steel imports to the U.S. and three-fourths of tool steel imports came from countries outside the Voluntary Limitation Arrangement. Second, even the signatories have entirely disregarded their stated intent not to disturb the historical product mix and geographical distribution patterns on which the program is based.

Some may say that a few thousand tons of

stainless steel do not make a ripple in 14 million tons of total steel imports. But that kind of a relatively small quantity can wipe out the entire market of one of America's smaller specialty mills. In the tool steel area, where five tons is a big order, 500 tons of high speed tool steel wire can have a crippling and demoralizing effect on the market place and to the small companies in this industry.

As to geographic distribution, in stainless steel we have seen a significant shift in import focus to the Pacific and Gulf Coast ports. In tool steels, the shift has been to the Atlantic Coast for high speed tool steels, and to the Pacific Coast for alloy tool steels. Any such shifts greatly intensify the local effects of increased imports and contribute further to market imbalance and dislocation.

We reach three basic conclusions with respect to the importance of specialty steels to the United States of America:

1. Our national security starts with our ability to maintain a strong industrial base and a civilian economy marked by growth, both in peacetime and in a period of national emergency;

2. Specialty steels, as I have described them here today, are an indispensable industrial material; and

3. Therefore, this nation must maintain an adequate level of self-sufficiency in specialty steels, not only in production and supply capability, but also in a contemporary reservoir of Research technology, skilled management, and a skilled and experienced labor force.

In short, the national security requirements of the United States are best met by providing an economic climate in which the domestic specialty steel industry will continue to grow and expand.

The producers of tool and stainless steels, and other specialties, are the low-volume, high-value part of the steel industry. Their product is as essential to America's economy as energy; jobs in this industry are as vital and as important as in any other sector of the economy.

The companies in specialty steel have now lost over 20% of their domestic markets to imports, with which they cannot compete adequately because of the foreign wage rate advantage and other national barriers and policies which are not afforded to industry here in the United States.

Immediate relief, I repeat, is necessary for this industry today—not in two or three months, or years.

Mr. Joseph P. Molony, International Vice President of the Steelworkers Union, will tell you in a few moments in what areas such immediate relief must be forthcoming.

For the long term, however, the United States must recognize that industrialized nations of the free world—and those of the Russian bloc, and China—pursue policies of protecting their home industries and of providing incentives and subsidies for exports, for the purpose of maximizing employment there, getting more foreign exchange (meaning American dollars), creating new industries, and for other national purposes.

This means that we here in America must obtain greater understanding of the problem between labor, government, and industry—such as we are attempting in this Conference today. Only by knowing what needs to be done can we demand that it be done—and done quickly.

New national policies in America include other government actions which I hope labor will support, in its own best interests: tax incentives for capital equipment expenditures, low interest loans for both capital and export, perhaps value-added taxes, and—if necessary—handling taxes for foreign goods coming into this country.

The specialty steel industry, frankly, and any individual company in it (no matter how relatively large), cannot fight foreign imports by itself—not if it is expected to meet, single-handedly, foreign-backed industry,

especially with economic policies as now administered in the United States.

The profit pinch resulting from the impact of foreign specialty steel imports is endangering the very existence of several good, small companies in our industry. In several cases, this danger involves entire communities—good, small, typically American communities in which the specialty steel firm may be the town's economic back-bone.

Let's look at the immediate results of the impact of foreign imports in the specialty steel markets of America:

The jobs of many of the 52,000 Steelworkers employed in the specialty steel industry are in jeopardy.

The market for several important specialty steel producers lies in virtual chaos.

Planning for capital investment and growth is almost impossible. Not long ago, it was possible to make five, and 10-year projections of growth in markets and profitability, with some assurance of job stability, and with some assurance of achievement. This is now no longer possible in specialty steel—and some of us have had the shattering experience of seeing multi-million-dollar plant and equipment (planned and built over a three or four-year period and estimated to employ large numbers of skilled Steelworkers) come on stream just as the market for its products collapses—largely due to imports.

I stated earlier that changes in certain national government policies are needed to help American industry fight imports. Certainly among those will have to be a new over-all national import policy—and it will have to come soon—before this nation becomes the dumping ground for all the world's economic surplus.

If it does not come, and soon, the United States could become a "service economy", a vast national warehouse for the storage of overseas-produced goods—but I predict our people will lack the resources to buy them.

We find ourselves being asked to compete not just with individual foreign specialty steel companies for both domestic and foreign markets but with entire, well-coordinated "industrial states" (such as Japan and the Common Market), in which there is careful attention paid to common national goals in unified direction of production, finance, planning, marketing, labor, and government relations.

Those "industrial states"—judged by their present structure and past and current performance—are forcing economic reassessment in the United States, the kind of new thinking about economic policy which we, in this Conference, require for assistance in our particular economic problem.

It is our sincere hope that the impact of foreign imports on the specialty steel industry—now reaching catastrophic proportions—will serve to focus the attention of all, business, labor, and government, on the serious economic problems that confront our nation.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 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?

CAREER EDUCATION NOW

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Sidney P. Marland, Jr., the distinguished U.S. Commissioner of Education, delivered a speech at the Convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, in Houston, Tex., which I believe deserves the attention not only of the Members of Congress, but of all of those who are interested in improving America's vocational institutions.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on General Education, which has been deeply concerned with vocational education in this country, I am extremely pleased to learn that Commissioner Marland is an advocate of career education as a means of preparing young Americans for the world of work.

Commissioner Marland brings to the U.S. Office of Education an exciting dimension of understanding the needs of American education, and I believe it is safe to state that if he pursues diligently this course of restructuring American education to guarantee every young American a marketable skill, Commissioner Marland shall win the gratitude and admiration of all young Americans.

His enlightening speech follows:

CAREER EDUCATION NOW

(Address by Sidney P. Marland, Jr.)

Since I intend to devote a major part of my remarks today to the subject of career education, it seems appropriate to begin by mentioning that I am finding my new job to be a richly rewarding learning experience.

Take the matter of the Commissioner's place in the Washington pecking order. I have always held the commissionership to be one of the great and auspicious positions in the Federal Government. So naturally, when I learned that a prominent Federal official is issued a brand new \$30,000 bulletproof limousine each year, I immediately inquired into the nature of the transportation furnished to the Commissioner of Education.

It turned out to be rather basic—a small, misshapen, used Rebel. When I asked for an improvement, I was sent a slightly newer, small, misshapen, used Rambler.

I am not discouraged. I am merely chastened. It's really a very nice car. And, besides, I have been assured that the Commissioner hardly ever gets shot at.

Career education is an absorbing topic at the Office of Education lately. In essence we are attempting to answer a very large question: what is right and what is wrong with vocational education in America today and what can be done to build on our strengths and eliminate our weaknesses?

I will indicate to you in a few moments the major points of our reply, the steps we believe should be taken by the Federal Government and particularly by the Office of Education to strengthen your hand in refashioning the vocational or career curriculum. For we are in wholehearted agreement that it is in serious need of reform and it is my firm intention that vocational education will be one of a very few major emphases of the U.S. Office, priority areas in which we intend to place the maximum weight of our concentrated resources to effect a thorough and permanent improvement.

But let me broaden the discussion a bit at this point to talk about career education not simply from the Federal point of view but from the point of view of you and me and of everyone who has committed his life's work to the proposition that education's prime task is to seek and to free the individual's precious potential. My concern with this vital area of education was with me long before I came into possession of my bent Rambler. It is the result of more than 30 years in school life, ample time to observe the vocational education problem in such diverse settings as New York City, Pittsburgh, and Winnetka, Illinois. For even in Winnetka, archetypal suburb, blessed in material things far above most communities in this country, there are many people who are worried about the logic and relevance of what is being taught their youngsters, particularly when considered in the light of the amazingly sophisticated, complex, and rapidly changing career situations they will face upon graduation from high school or from college.

Winnetkans, like most Americans, ask: what are we educating our children for?

Educators, it seems to me, have too often answered: we simply are not sure.

Uncertainty is the hallmark of our era. And because many educators have been unsure as to how they could best discharge their dual responsibility to meet the student's needs on the one hand and to satisfy the country's infinite social and economic appetites on the other, they have often succumbed to the temptation to point a God-like finger at vocational educators and damn them for their failure to meet the Nation's manpower requirements and doubly damn them for their failure to meet the youngster's career requirements, not to mention his personal fulfillment as a human being.

Most of you are secondary school administrators. You, like me, have been preoccupied most of the time with college entrance expectations. Vocational-technical education has been a second-level concern. The vocational education teachers and administrators have been either scorned or condemned and we have been silent.

There is illogic here as well as a massive injustice. How can we blame vocational educators for the hundreds of thousands of pitifully incapable boys and girls who leave our high schools each year when the truth is that the vast majority of these youngsters have never seen the inside of a vocational classroom? They are the unfortunate inmates, in most instances, of a curriculum that is neither fish nor fowl, neither truly vocational nor truly academic. We call it general education. I suggest we get rid of it.

Whatever interest we represent, Federal, State, or local, whether we teach or administer, we must perforce deny ourselves the sweet solace of knowing the other fellow is in the wrong. We share the guilt for the generalized failure of our public system of education to equip our people to get and hold decent jobs. And the remedy likewise depend upon all of us. As Dr. Grant Venn said in his book, *Man, Education, and Manpower*: "If we want an educational system designed to serve each individual and to develop his creative potential in a self-directing way, then we have work to do and attitudes to change."

The first attitude that we should change, I suggest, is our own. We must purge ourselves of academic snobbery. For education's most serious failing is its self-induced, voluntary fragmentation, the strong tendency of education's several parts to separate from one another, to divide the entire enterprise against itself. The most grievous example of these intramural class distinctions is, of course, the false dichotomy between things academic and things vocational. As a first

step, I suggest we dispose of the term vocational education, and adopt the term *career education*. Every young person in school belongs in that category at some point, whether engaged in preparing to be a surgeon, a brick layer, a mother, or a secretary.

How absurd to suggest that general knowledge for its own sake is somehow superior to useful knowledge. "Pedants sneer at an education that is useful," Alfred North Whitehead observed. "But if education is not useful," he went on to ask, "What is it?" The answer, of course, is that it is nothing. All education is career education, or should be. And all our efforts as educators must be bent on preparing students either to become properly, usefully employed immediately upon graduation from high school or to go on to further formal education. Anything else is dangerous nonsense. I propose that a universal goal of American education, starting now, be this: that every young person completing our school program at grade 12 be ready to enter higher education or to enter useful and rewarding employment.

Contrary to all logic and all expediency, we continue to treat vocational training as education's poor cousin. We are thereby perpetuating the social quarantine it has been in since the days of the ancient Greeks, and, for all I know, before then. Since the original vocational fields were defined shortly before World War I as agriculture, industry, and homemaking, we have too often taught those skills grudgingly—dull courses in dull buildings for the benefit of what we all *knew* were young people somehow pre-judged not fit for college as though college were something better for everyone. What a pity and how foolish, particularly for a country as dependent upon her machines and her technology as America. The ancient Greeks could afford such snobbery at a time when a very short course would suffice to instruct a man how to imitate a beast of burden. We Americans might even have been able to afford it a half-century ago when a boy might observe the full range of his occupational expectations by walking beside his father at the time of plowing, by watching the farmers, blacksmiths, and tradesmen who did business in his home town.

But how different things are today and how grave our need to reshape our system of education to meet the career demands of the astonishingly complex technological society we live in. When we talk of today's career development, we are not talking about blacksmithing. We are talking about the capacity of our people to sustain and accelerate the pace of progress in this country in every respect during a lifetime of learning. And nothing less.

The question seems to be fairly simple, if we have the courage and creativity to face it: Shall we persevere in the traditional practices that are obviously *not* properly equipping fully half or more of our young people or shall we immediately undertake the reformation of our entire secondary education in order to position it properly for maximum contribution to our individual and national life?

I think our choice is apparent. Certainly continued indecision and preservation of the status quo can only result in additional millions of young men and women leaving our high schools, with or without benefit of diploma, unfitted for employment, unable or unwilling to go on to college, and carrying away little more than an enduring distaste for education in any form, unskilled and unschooled. Indeed, if we are to ponder thoughtfully the growing charge of "irrelevance" in our schools and colleges, let us look sharply at the abomination known as general education.

Of those students currently in high school, only three out of 10 will go on to academic

college-level work. One-third of those will drop out before getting a baccalaureate degree. That means that eight out of 10 present high school students should be getting occupational training of some sort. But only about two of those eight students are, in fact, getting such training. Consequently, half our high school students, a total of approximately 1,500,000 a year, are being offered what amounts to irrelevant, general educational pap!

In pained puzzlement they toil at watered-down general algebra, they struggle to recollect the difference between adjectives and adverbs, and they juggle in their minds the atomic weight of potassium in non-college science. The liberal arts and sciences of our traditional college-preparatory curriculum are indeed desirable for those who want them and can use them. But there must be desire and receptivity, and for millions of our children, we must concede, such knowledge is neither useful nor joyful. They do not love it for its own sake and they cannot sell it in the career market place. Small wonder so many drop out, not because they have failed, but because we have failed them. Who would not at the earliest convenient and legal moment leave an environment that is neither satisfying, entertaining, or productive? We properly deplore the large numbers of young men and women who leave high school before graduation. But, in simple truth, for most of them dropping out is the most sensible elective they can choose. At least they can substitute the excitement of the street corner for the more obscure charms of general mathematics.

I want to state my clear conviction that a properly effective career education requires a new educational unity. It requires a breaking down of the barriers that divide our educational system into parochial enclaves. Our answer is that we must blend our curricula and our students into a single strong, secondary system. Let the academic preparation be balanced with the vocational or career program. Let one student take strength from another. And, for the future hope of education, let us end the divisive, snobbish, destructive distinctions in learning that do no service to the cause of knowledge, and do no honor to the name of American enterprise.

It is terribly important to teach a youngster the skills he needs to live, whether we call them academic or vocational, whether he intends to make his living with a wrench, or a slide rule, or folio editions of Shakespeare. But it is critically important to equip that youngster to live his life as a fulfilled human being. As Secretary Richardson said, "I remind you that this department of government more than anything else is concerned with humaneness."

Ted Bell, now Deputy Commissioner for School Systems in OE, made the point particularly well in a recent speech to a student government group. He was speculating on the steps a young person needs to take not just to get a diploma or a degree today, but to make reasonably sure he will continue to learn in the years ahead, to be an educated man or woman in terms of the future, a personal future. Dr. Bell said:

"Here the lesson is for each person to develop a personal plan for lifelong learning: learning about the world we live in, the people that inhabit it, the environment—physical and social—that we find around us; learning about the sciences, the arts, the literature we have inherited and are creating; but most of all, learning the way the world's peoples are interacting with one another. If one educates himself in these things, he will have a pretty good chance of survival and of a good life."

In other words, life and how to live it is the primary vocation of all of us. And the

ultimate test of our educational process, on any level, is how close it comes to preparing our people to be alive and active with their hearts, and their minds, and, for many, their hands as well.

True and complete reform of the high school, viewed as a major element of overall preparation for life, cannot be achieved until general education is completely done away with in favor of contemporary career development in a comprehensive secondary education environment. This is our ultimate goal and we realize that so sweeping a change cannot be accomplished overnight, involving as it does approximately 30 million students and billions of dollars in public funds. Until we can recommend a totally new system we believe an interim strategy can be developed entailing four major actions:

First we are planning major improvements in the vocational education program of the Office of Education. This program, as you know, involves the expenditure of nearly \$500,000,000 annually and our intention is to make the administrative and programmatic changes that will enable the States to use this money to make their vocational education efforts more relevant to the needs of the young people who will spend their lives in careers in business and industry. We intend to give the States new leadership and technical support to enable them to move present programs away from disproportionate enrollment in low-demand occupations to those where national shortages exist and where future national need will be high.

Right now State training programs fill only half the jobs available each year. The other half are filled by job seekers with no occupational job training of any kind. We do better in some fields than others, of course, particularly production agriculture where we are able to come closer to meeting the total need because it is a relatively static job market with little growth projected. About 70 percent of the demand in farm jobs will be met with trained help this year compared with only about 38 percent in the health occupations and 35 percent in various technical fields. This is nice if you happen to own a farm, not so nice if you run a hospital or laboratory.

We obviously require greater emphasis on such new vocational fields as computer programmers and technicians, laser technicians, and jet mechanics. We particularly need qualified people in health occupations such as certified laboratory technologists, dental assistants, occupational therapists, and the like. And, of course, we badly need men and women to capably service the rapidly growing environmental industries. Though when we speak of new occupations it is always useful to remind ourselves that even some of the newest, such as computer programming, for example, will very likely be obsolete in 20 years or so, affirming once again the need for a sound educational base underlying all specific skill training.

Second—here I speak of all cooperating agencies of education and government—we must provide far more flexible options for high school graduates to continue on to higher education or to enter the world of work rather than forever sustain the anachronism that a youngster must make his career choice at age 14. This demands that we broaden today's relatively narrow vocational program into something approaching the true career education we would eventually hope to realize. Vocational students need much more than limited specific skills training if they are to go on to post-secondary education, whether at the community college or four-year level. And young people presently drifting in the general education wasteland need realistic exposure to the world of work, as well as to the option of general post-secondary schooling.

Third, we can effect substantial improvement in vocational education within current levels of expenditures by bringing people from business, industry, and organized labor, who know where the career opportunities are going to be and what the real world of work is like, into far closer collaboration with the schools. Eventually, further subsidies or other encouragement to industry to increase cooperative education and work-study could greatly enhance these programs. Efforts should be made by people in educational institutions offering occupational courses to get nearby employers to help in the training. This will not only aid the students but employers as well by providing these cooperating firms a ready supply of skilled workers well prepared for the specific demands of their particular fields. I would add only this caveat: that these work experience arrangements be accepted and operated as genuine educational opportunities, of a laboratory nature, not simply as a source of cheap help for the business and pocket money for the student. Youngsters should be given the opportunity to explore eight, ten, a dozen occupations before choosing the one pursued in depth, consistent with the individual's ambitions, skills, and interests.

Fourth, we must build at all levels—Federal, State, and local—a new leadership and a new commitment to the concept of a career education system. For we require leaders willing to move our schools into more direct and closer relationships with society's problems, opportunities, and its ever-changing needs. I believe these leaders will come primarily from the ranks of organizations such as yours. Not only will the present vocational-technical education leaders be partners in change, but general educators, long dedicated to the old ways, must become new champions of the career program.

In closing, a word about two very promising OE efforts to help strengthen vocational-technical education in its most crucial aspect, personnel.

The teacher is by far the most important factor in the school environment. We all know this. And we also know that vocation teachers are in seriously short supply.

We are also keenly aware that vocational-technical education is starved for other critical personnel, especially those qualified to develop and administer productive programs.

The first effort, called Leadership Development Awards, is a doctoral-fellowship program under the Education Professions Development Act. It seeks to identify and train a cadre of leaders for the vocational-technical career education field. As an initial move we have made the first group of awards to 160 experienced vocational educators to enable them to undertake full-time study at the doctoral level.

These men and women are attending 11 universities which share an emphasis on career education. These institutions pay special attention to the needs of the disadvantaged and handicapped; they cooperate closely with industry, the States, and the local districts; and they have established close working relationships with the surrounding communities.

Training lasts from two to three years. It is not tied to the campus but is essentially an intensive internship program with opportunities for research and exploration into the complexities of our constantly changing occupational structure.

We believe these doctoral candidates will make a very constructive imprint on the world of career education. But they will not be cast adrift upon graduation to search out their own niche in that world. Their home States will develop plans for the most strategic use of their skills—in colleges and universities which prepare career educators, in State departments of vocational education, in community colleges, and at the local level

for development of the entirely new approach school systems must take to career education.

Our second effort is a program, already producing impressive results, to help the States attract and train teachers and administrators in vocational-technical education. The Leadership Development Awards I have described will produce the shapers and developers of the new career education; this second effort will produce the teachers to carry out the realistic and contemporary plans and programs they develop.

We are funding a variety of State plans. The money is helping to train personnel to work with the disadvantaged and the handicapped, to develop innovative and effective methods of exchange between teachers and businessmen, and to design and carry out more effective vocational guidance, a particularly crucial area. The funds are also being used to increase the number of trades and industry teachers in the emerging occupations that I spoke of a few moments ago.

The overriding purpose of this program is to encourage the States to develop their own capacities and their own resources to produce vocational-technical teachers in the numbers we need and of a quality we need. This new blood will energize career education, particularly in our city schools, whose revitalization is certainly education's first order of business.

President Nixon put the matter well when he said, "When educators, school boards and government officials alike admit that they have a great deal to learn about the way we teach, we will begin to climb the up staircase toward genuine reform."

We have, I believe, begun to climb that staircase. We have begun, at least in part, the difficult, continuing work of reform. These recent tumultuous years of challenge and strife and all-encompassing change have given us lessons to learn, especially lessons in humility. But they have also taught us to hope and to act. The actions in vocational education and teacher education that I have outlined to you today are but the first in a series of reforms which I intend to initiate and carry out within the U.S. Office of Education. I solicit your reactions to what I have said for I particularly want to bridge the gulf between the Federal Government and the education leaders in the States, in the communities, indeed, in all the classrooms of America.

With a guarantee of your tolerance and support I will return to Washington and my new duties confident that the absolute need to develop a strong new program of career education is well understood by you who must understand it, that you and I agree on the kind of action that must be taken and the urgency of taking it. I respect and salute your capacity to reform the secondary schools of the land. In sum, the schools are engaged in swift change because you the educators have chosen to change them. The schools, I conclude, are in good hands.

POW MAIL PLAN

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a constituent, Mr. Louis D. Kugelman, of Youngstown, Ohio, suggesting a POW mail plan. I commend Mr. Kugelman's idea to my colleagues, as written to me:

Dear Sir: I am writing to you, personally, about a subject that I know is of prime importance to you and I and most fellow Americans.

So that you will not feel that I am a "kook" or "nut" of some kind—I will tell you a little about myself. My wife and I have met you at several rallies in the past, for which you could not remember. But—almost everyday there is a group that has lunch at the 20th Century Restaurant on Belmont Avenue—which "discusses the problems of the World"—myself—and two friends, one of which is Bob DeMar, and another is our "protegee"—Marcie Crann.

I have had a "brain storm" of an idea for quite sometime—which I have divulged to no one—regarding our P.O.W.'s in Viet Nam which I know all of us are quite concerned about. If this "scheme" should be successful, it would be of great humanitarian value. If you think it is worthy—use it—if not—forget it and all I have wasted is your time and mine.

I do not know whether you are familiar with an International Reply Coupon. This is a coupon, purchased at our Post Offices as well as any other member of the Universal Postal union, which I know North Viet Nam is not a member. As it has several languages printed around its border, and could be mistaken for being issued by the United Nations, and knowing the value of "saving face" before the world by the North Viet Namese, perhaps if the loved ones of every P.O.W. listed, and all lost in action, would mail a letter with an International Reply Coupon enclosed—we might have results.

Thanking you in advance, for utilizing your most valuable time, to read and digest a long epistle which may prove to be of naught value.

I remain,

LOUIS D. KUGELMAN.

THE CONQUEST OF CANCER

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to fully fund efforts to conquer cancer. This act, called the "Conquest of Cancer Act of 1971," is being introduced with bipartisan support and would authorize \$400 million immediately for a massive attack on this dread killer.

As soon as practicable, the funding will be increased to \$1 billion a year. There might be a question in the minds of some about this level of funding. Let me just illustrate the extent of this illness. Cancer kills 330,000 Americans each year. It afflicts almost one-fourth of our population. Of the 204 million persons now living in the United States over 51 million will develop some form of cancer. Of this number more than 34 million will die. Cancer does not respect age, it is the greatest cause of death in children between 1 and 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, I know first hand the horrors of cancer. Members of my family have suffered its ravages. I feel that the most eloquent and touching case for this all-out effort was made in a letter I received from a constituent. At this point I will include this letter without naming the author:

MY DEAR MR. COTTER: Last summer, I joined the ranks of the millions of Americans who have suffered the ravages of cancer. Because of malignant lesions, both of my breasts and the lymph nodes from under both arms were removed. After this I was exposed to a series of cobalt treatments.

As one who has endured this kind of physical and emotional pain at the hands of this disease, I plead with you to become a leading force in getting the Federal Government to make a solid commitment to finding a cure for cancer—not with millions of dollars—but with billions.

The creation of a National Anti-Cancer Agency—with a large enough pledge of public and private funds—would probably see the control of this killer.

I am not so naive as to believe that if malignant cells are still present in my system, this program will save my life; but I do believe that it might save those of my children and grandchildren.

Sincerely yours,

I hope this Congress will give rapid approval to this necessary legislation.

YOUTH INVOLVES ITSELF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in April of last year I launched an effort to investigate and initiate any necessary actions regarding possible linkages between water pollution and human health through the human food chain involving sea products. I conducted emergency hearings in my district which clearly established the need for such an investigation. The 91st Congress did not act on my proposed legislation and I am pursuing these worthwhile goals again in this Congress.

Be that as it may, I am not here now to plead for my cause but rather to note and commend the progress of another, a constituent and now personal friend, Kris Lindstrom. Kris testified before my emergency hearings and supported my legislative efforts. This idealistic young man, however, did not stop there but has time and again renewed his commitment to the goals—which I like to think we share—and actively participated in efforts and activities to seek out and rectify problems caused by man's disregard for his environment. He has worked with local city-organized groups—for example, as vice chairman of the Seal Beach Environmental Quality Control Board—and now with a national and international group—the committee on comparative oncology, under the auspices of l'Union Internationale Contre le Cancer. Kris will be working with two well-known and respected experts in the field on this committee, Dr. John Harshbarger, of the Smithsonian Institute, and Dr. Narbik Karamien, of the National Institutes of Health.

I rise in this body to commend Kris for these notable achievements and to wish him well in his activities in the future, of which he will have many—he is but 22 years old.

TRIBUTE TO HON. L. MENDEL
RIVERS: A GREAT AMERICAN

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess of the Congress our beloved friend and colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mendel Rivers, passed away and I wanted to take this means of paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of this great American statesman.

Mendel Rivers was a man of courage

and honor—he stood firm and unyielding for a strong defense for our Nation, believing that it is better to err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness in crucial matters involving national defense.

As chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services and as Representative from the First District of South Carolina, he served his district, State, and Nation faithfully and well. He represented his district with great ability and success and yet in a much broader sense he represented the best interests of the Nation.

We can thank his leadership in large part for our Nation's excellent state of

preparedness. He knew and understood our responsibilities and our heritage.

Mendel Rivers was a great personality—many who saw him often remarked that he looked like a Congressman. He had the stature, the bearing, the dignity—the charisma, if you will—of a great Congressman—a great American statesman.

Mendel Rivers will be greatly missed in these sacred precincts and I want to take this opportunity to extend to Mrs. Rivers and others members of the family this expression of my deepest and most sincere sympathy. My wife, Mrs. Evins, joins me in these expressions and sentiments.

SENATE—Thursday, February 4, 1971

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 26, 1971)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, help us to work amid the things which are seen and temporal with eyes of faith firmly fixed upon that which is unseen and eternal. Make us to be good workmen in striving for that kingdom, higher than all present earthly kingdoms, toward which all history moves, whose builder and maker is God. Uphold us this day that we may run and not be weary, walk and not faint. Make us to know that underneath are the everlasting arms which reach down to rescue, to hold, to sustain, and that the everlasting arms are Thy very own.

In the name of the Great Burden Bearer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 3, 1971, be approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 97) authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the publication entitled "History of the United States House of Representatives," and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION
REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 97) authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the publication entitled "History of the United States House of Representatives," and for other purposes,

was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING
SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S PROPOSALS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader and I have been discussing the 40 "leftover" proposals contained in a message sent to Congress by the President of the United States some days ago.

We intend to get together with the committee chairmen and the ranking Republican Members and ask them to expedite consideration of these Presidential requests as soon as possible.

Some of the measures were passed in the previous Congress. Some of them will take a little time to dispose of. Others may be readily disposed of. We are confident that the Senate, acting responsibly, will give due regard to the President's proposals termed "the unfinished business" which, I have indicated, number approximately 40. On the basis of a communication I received on January 26, they number 67 and, on the basis of a new compilation which will become available very shortly, I think number about 127.

Thus, we will have plenty to do.

Now is the time to do it.

The minority leader and I both hope that our colleagues will begin to undertake this endeavor.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I shall convey to the ranking members of the respective committees the suggestion of the distinguished majority leader and the information which he has conveyed just now, and additional information as received regarding measures undisposed of in the previous Congress.

Of course, I join the distinguished majority leader in urging expeditious action on these measures. I believe that we can expedite the proceedings if we can find

a way out of the present difficulty regarding rule XXII. I would hope that it will not go on at such length as to prevent our moving into the Nations business. At the same time, I think it was Abraham Lincoln who said, "No question is settled until it is settled right."

I have my own viewpoint as to the right way to settle, to amend the rule, but I will not go into that any further at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am in full accord with what the distinguished minority leader has just said.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time allocated to me.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING—
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT
(H. DOC. NO. 92-44)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

One of the best things about the American Constitution, George Washington suggested shortly after it was written, was that it left so much room for change. For this meant that future generations would have a chance to continue the work which began in Philadelphia.

Future generations took full advantage of that opportunity. For nearly two turbulent centuries, they continually reshaped their government to meet changing public needs. As a result, our political institutions have grown and developed with a changing, growing nation.

Today, the winds of change are blowing more vigorously than ever across our country and the responsiveness of